

Re: Musings on Nasa and the Concept of Truth.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-08/0858.html>

From: Sander Vesik (*sander_at_haldjas.folklore.ee*)

Date: 08/09/04

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2004 10:38:40 +0000 (UTC)

In sci.space.policy Jonathan <anon@earthlink.com> wrote:

>

> *I agree completely. But much of the world fervently believes in
> a personal god. This discovery would show that we are but
> a drop in an ocean of life. It would be a direct challenge to
> fundamentalists and creationists all over the world.*

Really? want to give a cite for the "much of the world fervently believes in a personal god"? Because unless you do some very radical restrictiuons of what the world is, it does not appear to be anywhere near truth.

[snip]

>

> *The daily paper constantly drips with the blood of such religious
> extremism, we fear sparking more of it with good reason.*

Maybe you should move town?

>>

>> *Scientific truth is *not* subject to majority vote. On some matters,
>> interpretations abound, but whatever the final facts are, they are
>> independent of wether 51% believe in them, or not.*

>

>

> *I completely disagree.*

>

>

> *Truth is that which is unchanging, fixed or predictable. Such as
> the great 'laws' and 'facts' of science.*

>

> *Please point to me one thing in the universe that is unchanging, fixed
> or predictable. JUST ONE THING!*

The rest masses of elemntary particles.

sci.space.policy: Re: Musings on Nasa and the Concept of Truth.

>

> *The only 'truth' of the universe is that there is ...no...truth.*

> *There is only what we believe to be true, and we arrive at those*

> *'truths' by consensus.*

Bullshit.

>

> *Jonathan*

>

> *s*

>

Sander

+++ Out of cheese error +++