Aimé Michel
la Haute Combe
04570 St Vincent les Forts
France

2d Aug. 1978

Dear Sir,

Welcome to the Zetetic Scholar, and herewith some questions which I should like being discussed in.

— When radioactivity was discovered, did it "contradict a well-established theoretical principle" (Beaure-gard, Z.S. Vol 1, N1, p 5)? Was it an "anomaly"? Were the physicists who studied radioactivity before any explanation was found, paraphysicists?

— Untill 1900, did or not the u.v. collapse in the black body contradict "well established th. pr." of then existent physics? if yes, was it an "anomaly"?

— Are now quasars "anomalies"? If not, is Bessie one? Why?

— Are there tests, or theoretical means, or whatever means, available, in order to clearly distinguish between things that are not yet explainable but will give birth later to outstanding advances in science, and "anomalies"?

— According to most physicists (for an analysis, see Clarke, C J S: The Hinterland Between Large and Small, in: Duncan and Weston-Smith: The Encyclopaedia of Ignorance, Pergamon Press, New York, 1977, p. 111), Relativity and Quanta are mutually contradictive. Is Physics a Parascience?

— Is the Hume Rule a scientific Rule, or

a psychological observation?

I apologize for my poor english and my handwriting.

Sincerely yours.

(Service de la Recherche de l'ORTF retired, interested in UFOs, though not an "ufologist")

Aimé Michel
La ~~Haute~~ Haute Combe
04570 St. Vincent-les Forts
FRANCE

(and that "contradict well established principles")

Welcome to the ZETETIC SCHOLAR and herewith are some questions which I should like to see discussed:

When radioactivity was discovered, did it "contradict a well established theoretical principle?" (Regard ZS, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 5)? Was it an "anomaly"? Were the physicists who studied radioactivity before any explanation was found paraphysicists?

1 ? Until 1900, did or did not the u. v. collapse in the black body contradict "well established theory" of then existent physics? If yes, was it an "anomaly"?

2 ? Are now quasars "anomalies"? If not, is Bessie one? Why?

Are there tests, or theoretical means, or whatever means, available in order to clearly distinguish between things that are not yet explainable but will give birth later to outstanding advances in science, and "anomalies"?

According to most physicists, [for an analysis, see Clarke, C. S. J., "The Hinterland Between Large and Small," in Duncan and Weston-Smith, The Encyclopedia of Ignorance (NY: Pergamon Press, 1977), p. 111], relativity and quanta are mutually contradictory. Is physics a parascience?

Is the Hume Rule a scientific rule or a psychological observation?

(1) the ultraviolet collapse (I suppose that this is ~~the~~ its english name) is the anomaly (versus the pre-quantum physics) of the completely nonsensical findings in the measures gotten from the Black Body spectrum (findings) which were eventually explained (in 1900) by Planck ~~and~~ through his Quantum interpretation. Now (in 1978), the non-collapse of u.v spectrum out of the bl.-body spectrum would be a terrific anomaly, because normality has become quantum like.

The uv collapse ~~was~~ is the anomaly which destroyed the "physique du continu" (Maxwellian and Newtonian) and inaugurated modern Quantum Physics.

(2) Oh yeah! Apologies to Nessie, whom I thoroughly regret not to know personally, so misspelling her name. Long live Nessie.

× × ×

– 5th of Oct 1978

Dear Marcello Truzzi, Thanks for your answer and your idea of publishing my letter – Actually what I

is that, after sufficient discussion, it will result out that there is not such a thing as "anomaly". I think that the concept of "anomaly" is referring to an obsolete philosophy of science, inconsistent with the accepted modern patterns of scientific thinking.

The so called "anomalies" are contraptions that fall out of the accepted patterns of 19th century scientism, but within the sole permanent pattern of science: curiosity.

Or perhaps anomalies are facts which, when studied, don't give rise to cumulative knowledge or for which no productive method can be established. But every science has first to ~~find~~ look for its productive methods, sometimes for centuries. For example mechanics, which went wandering for 20 centuries through every possible silly things, until your compatriot Galileo Galilei threw his little pebble from la Torre di Pisa. Parla Lei Italiano? I love Italy.

Ciao!

PS And many thanks for your correction