

## Re: OT: Definition of science (WAS: Making money from Java)

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Cobol/comp.lang.cobol/2005-12/msg01036.html>

---

- *From:* [docdwarf@xxxxxxxx](mailto:docdwarf@xxxxxxxx) ()
  - *Date:* Fri, 16 Dec 2005 10:29:30 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In article <[TOkof.1745\\$lv3.496@clgrps12](mailto:TOkof.1745$lv3.496@clgrps12)>, Oliver Wong <[owong@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:owong@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

>

><[docdwarf@xxxxxxxx](mailto:docdwarf@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:dnscei\\$kiu\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dnscei$kiu$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>> In article <[5Hhof.166802\\$yS6.142470@clgrps12](mailto:5Hhof.166802$yS6.142470@clgrps12)>,

>> Oliver Wong <[owong@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:owong@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

[snip]

>>> If someone says "I have a theory about how electrons work, and I came  
>>>about this theory because I did such and such experiment and arrived at  
>>>these results", someone else, on the other side of the world, reading  
>>>about

>>>it over the Internet, should be able to say "Let me try the same  
>>>experiment

>>>and see if I arrive at the same results".

>>>

>>> Most of psychology, anthropology, etc. does not fall under this  
>>>definition, but psychologist, anthropologists, etc. sometimes get touchy  
>>>if you try to tell them what they are doing is not "real" science.

>>

>> That might be because human beings – the objects of study for the 'soft  
>> sciences – are not electrons. On the other hand psychologists can say  
>> 'given a certain set of behaviors it has been found that, in a number of  
>> instances, they can be changed if...'

>

> Yes, and if another psychologist on the other side of the word tries the  
>same experiment and gets a completely different set of results, what then?

Then exactly what I described above – '...in a number of instances ...' –  
is seen to happen.

>The results are not typically reproduceable, and hence, not "science" under  
>my definition.

Hence the 'soft' adjective; they do their best to apply the discipline  
associated in science... it just might be that the subject of study is, by  
nature, incapable of producing 'typically reproducible' results.

DD

---

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
    - ◇ From: Peter Lacey
  - ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
    - ◇ From: Oliver Wong
  - ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
    - ◇ From:
  - ◆ **OT: Definition of science (WAS: Making money from Java)**
    - ◇ From: Oliver Wong
- 
- Prev by Date: **Re: OT: Religion and Science (WAS: Making money from Java)**
  - Next by Date: **Re: OT: Religion (WAS: Making money from Java)**
  - Previous by thread: **OT: Definition of science (WAS: Making money from Java)**
  - Next by thread: **Re: OT: Definition of science (WAS: Making money from Java)**
  - Index(es):
    - ◆ **Date**
    - ◆ **Thread**