

Wednesday, May 4th 2022 @ 4:57pm.
Green River, Wyoming

The Arbitrary Scope of Science

People discuss science as though its scope and definition are complete. I'm confident that if a "scientific" study about people's understanding of science were conducted, it would be found that people uniformly don't know what it is. I'm not saying this to offer mild complaint - rather I think it seriously damages our idea that we can call ourselves scientific et al. That some science is

being conducted does requires some clear definition about what science is supposed to be. My intention is not to say that there is no such thing as science, and that work that has been conducted along experimental and empirical methods has not been done and is not a major cause of our improvements in knowledge. That some have.

~~etc~~ What can we say about the scope of science?

Perhaps where people could agree about what

science is would relate to
our stored education in
prior to college. We learned
about a simple process of
forming questions creating
hypotheses, testing hypotheses
experimentally, and arriving at
temporary conclusions which are
understood to be incomplete,
not "whole truth," and subject
to replication (retesting to confirm),
revision, refinement, restatement,
and connection to more fundamental
and comprehensive views we
anticipate will arise. What
is the justification for this
expectation that something better

would arise that has used
~~the knowledge~~
some recordings from prior
work?

It appears our cultural
growth has disordered old
views for newer ones, erasing
some of
what is useful from older
views, with a result of increased
power, in ability to predict,
describe accurately, and
act in new ways using
technology that did not exist
earlier. There are cultural losses,
but there are definite gains
that did not earlier exist but
depended on what existed before.

it seems evident that such a growth has occurred particularly because today's growth is fast enough that we can feel it collectively. This is not to say losses have not happened. I know of no study that was scientific, however, that has shown, in a way not subject to the same revisions science calls for, that these are facts in actuaas are justified. It appears we believe in the growth of technology, power and knowledge because we collectively think

we feel it, but not because
we inferred it scientifically.

An implication of this
observation is that ~~science~~ growth
of knowledge itself is not
necessarily within the scope
of science. There are other
very different observations
which seem to confirm this
conclusion, which are
more interesting given my
current concerns.

Firstly, social history and
law about who owns the
results of efforts has a history
which is not based on

a scientific wayfinding, and subsequent scientific findings about the growth of knowledge as it relates to our personal and group relates ownership ; compensation ; welfare concerns. Asterisks, since seems to call for transparency, open information, sharing of results, simplicity of research, and global growth of knowledge. However, employment rules, corporate IP ownership, inability to share ; research freely, and inability to gain scientific instrumentation

which involves corporate
brands, and national
self interests, and
inability to translate (and
lack of desire to translate),
mutually indicate that
livelihood and group self
interest ~~can not~~
have not been
steered by science?

Great questions about
what science is and who
is really doing it.

Additionally, if you question
scientists about what they
do that is suggestive;
what not, I think

firsts what they would say
is not science as that
they are employed. When
they describe what they do
not is scientific, &
think they would reveal to
is that they have very few
methods and tools. That
all scientists are questioned
regarding this, & think the
findin would be that
science is not anything as
huge as what might
be believed. ~~Report~~ ~~it is~~
~~so simple~~ Since
knowledge is, accumulation
of records presented several

and growth of knowledge
is not due to a design
resulting from science,
(even if we append "Science"
to the word "librarian, for
"library science"), it ~~does~~
cannot be said to ~~include~~
^{all recordings of}
contain knowledge.

Further knowledge ? records
grow, ; science contributes,
but growth of knowledge
ought not to be confused
for science. People seem, in
my opinion, to ready to
sway the scope of science
to include all knowledge,
as if science (not yet well defined)

knowledge
design
"Science" for
several
years
of
study
orders
and
dye
and
in
ent
(desired)

has not existed power to, screen
and accumulations of
records did not already
have a trajectory that
did not include opinions
about how knowledge is
arrived at.

Some questions for the
reader that might provide
some clarity to the earlier
conversation:

1) If a person is employed
by a company to conduct
experiments, with the result
that their business processes are
better informed for profit, but
the information is never shared,
to what extent is it science?

2) Of what extent of
work like this related to
employment and ~~formal~~,
~~and informal~~, and
contamination with an
organization?

3) Does this relate to the
scope of science in that
science historically is
more about ideas on
experimental method & inference,
more than shared knowledge?

4). Would it change views about
the extent to which individuals
themselves are scientists, if
they are not themselves
employees using methods
and instruments of science,
and cannot fully obtain
knowledge to do so?

To what extent do I see myself as a scientist and as someone aligned to science?

I think perhaps I have a better view than many scientists about what truth conditions consist of, from eclectic studies including philosophy, logic, and mathematics, and psychology. (A science which states we are based), Based on what

I know, I think science has a very small methodological definition, and a very large set of disjoint processes, contained without sharing in various organizations in competition

it would not consider
knowledge itself scruples
instead it would reduce
science to specific processes
that create more trustworthy
knowledge, opposed to
superstitions, and claims
to knowledge that ~~not~~
relate to psychological
biases, desires, and ill-arrived
at conclusions.

However I am willing to
~~not~~ come to a conventional
agreement w/ others about
what science includes. What
it might or might not
include is not too interesting

to me. I think it
itself arbitrary. Suppose
we were to decide: the
core of science involves
a general process that
in which work processes
roughly conform. In
that case, I would be
willing to call it anything,
perhaps not even science,
so as to remove confusion
about how large science is
supposed to be. If science
must be larger than this,
I would consider that specific
pieces of recorded information be
included, ~~but~~ as part of

Requirements of the
the process of science
already described w/ would
include a need to research
it could be inclined to
separate it from business,
intellectual property, ...
unless we agree that science
is conducted w/
ownership barriers, but
In that case, again, science
is guided by history of law
in business, which are
larger processes which include
science as subprocesses

not the reverse.

At present I am inclined to think
science is better described as
a process of knowledge growth
than ...

JB continued.