

## Martin's personal outline

**Post by “DavidN” of February 8, 2024 at 4:04 AM**

I like and agree with most of what you put forward, but coming from a technical field I do have to comment on models. I can't count how many hours I've wasted arguing with engineers about how a reactor works in their model and how its performing in reality. As if reality is wrong because it doesn't match his model, and because of this it's become one of my main gripes with current scientific culture as well. As far as I'm concerned until you test your model against reality it isn't worth the silicon it's written on. Which is also why I share Epicurus reservations about math and his elevation of sensory evidence. E.G. My chemical engineers models may say that these two chemicals are compatible in the same dosing line but my sensory observations of the situation tell me a completely different story. I don't know how or why they're crystallizing and clogging the line, I'm not a chemist, but they are. Or I've watched engineers "improve" there modeling and change the chemical feed ratios to improve the bottom line, pushing the safety tolerance of the metallurgy but making management happy. However changing the model doesn't change or negate the reality of the metallurgy of the reactors, and when people choose to believe models over sensory evidence you end up with a burned out reactor.