

phil henshaw

From: amerikalistan-owner@mg.skola.mark.se on behalf of phil henshaw [pfh@synapse9.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2008 11:31 AM
To: 'Stanley Salthe'
Cc: amerikalistan@mg.skola.mark.se
Subject: RE: Environmental warnings as "religion" - "the end of the world is not for tomorrow"

IMHO That's what I saw the need for, and provided, with my detailed set of questions (what could be a more useful 'vague' answer but an appropriate question, right) for the development process of individual emergences.

Phil Henshaw

From: amerikalistan-owner@mg.skola.mark.se [mailto:amerikalistan-owner@mg.skola.mark.se] **On Behalf Of** Stanley Salthe
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 3:25 PM
To: pfh@synapse9.com
Cc: amerikalistan@mg.skola.mark.se
Subject: RE: Environmental warnings as "religion" - "the end of the world is not for tomorrow"

Re Phil's below -- This point has been made by others as well. For example, in great detail, by George Kampis, in *Self-modifying Systems in Biology and Cognitive Science*. Pergamon, 1991. As well, I have begun pointing out that science discourse is necessarily mechanistic, based as it is in logic and math. Mechanistic discourses cannot deal with the emergence of anything new, only with existents. So, I have advanced the notion that someone ought to try to develop a 'logic of vagueness' to help us with natural systems.

STAN

An interesting case in point of "science" becoming religion. I recently was asked to look at Robert Rosen's 1996 essay on the "Limitations of scientific knowledge" [fyi - http://www.synapse9.com/ref/Rosen_On_Limitations_of_Sci.pdf] in which he points out that science arbitrarily restricts itself to the mathematics of convergent series (determinant equations representing all variables as mutually controlled). In his impression both emergence and life in general appear to display divergent processes, that scientific convention disallow being studied.

This appears to be his central objection to the scientific method and the reason he has maintained that science can not represent life. If natural systems used divergent processes they wouldn't be following a predetermined path, but just throwing themselves pell-mell at their environments to see what happens. So, which seems more 'natural'.

Phil Henshaw

From: amerikalistan-owner@mg.skola.mark.se [mailto:amerikalistan-owner@mg.skola.mark.se] **On Behalf Of** Stanley Salthe
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2008 9:19 AM
To: helmut@ecoglobe.ch
Cc: amerikalistan@mg.skola.mark.se
Subject: Re: Environmental warnings as "religion" - "the end of the world is not for tomorrow"

I would see his approach as having the following meaning: Science is a process of generating and testing hypotheses. Generating hypotheses implies a possible belief in the one being generated. But when some highly corroborated theories and hypotheses become so stable that many scientists BELIEVE they are true (example: the Second Law of thermodynamics), then they are no longer being scientists, but are in a 'religious' frame of mind. Provisional belief has a place in generating hypotheses, but 'true belief' has no role IN SCIENCE. (But, of course, we need, I think, to believe in something in order to act in a principled way!)

STAN

How would you comment to this gentleman's reaction?

--

Helmut E Lubbers Ingénieur, MSocSc, DipEcol,
editor of www.ecoglobe.ch and ecoglobe.org
ecology discovery foundation ecoglobe
Wellington New Zealand and Geneva Switzerland
14 bd Carl-Vogt 1205 Genève
+41 22 3212320 helmut@ecoglobe.ch
<http://www.ecoglobe.ch/ecostory>

<<< reference mail received 01.09.2008 10:56 >>>

>Hello,
>
>The core problem IS economic growth, which must be halted and then
>we need contraction.
>The poor will not be most impacted. The poor countries, once the
>full effect of climate change starts hitting, don't matter anyway.
>Climate change adds to the problems created by imminent peak oil and
>peak-everything.
>The paradigm of economic growth is based upon the shallow notion of
>a flat world with endless resources.
>Factually the earth is round, finite and the planet's carrying
>capacity overshot manyfold.
>Cheers
>

I am trying to do serious science, not religion.
The end of the world is not for tomorrow.

Cheers

--

Prof. Roberto Roson
Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche
Universita' Ca' Foscari di Venezia
Cannaregio S.Giobbe 873
30121 Venezia

tel. (+39)-041-2349147 fax 2349176
Treviso: 0422-513742
mobile 328-2129160
<http://venus.unive.it/rosen>

<<< === >>>