If not refuted soon enough, a theory becomes irrefutable.

The "Theory" that when a battery lights a lamp it uses electric current is now irrefutable. The "Theory" that a charged capacitor has a static electric field is now irrefutable, regardless of what The Royal Society may say, http://www.ivorcatt.co.uk/yak.htm that **there is no such a thing as a static electric field in a capacitor.**

From the journal, "The Institute of Mathematics and its Applications", June 1972, is the following statement on page 185 of an article called BAYESIAN STATISTICS, by D.V. Lindley, M.I.A, U.C. London.

On page 185,

"..... as Popper points out (in THE LOGIC OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY) every failed counter-example adds strength to the theory....."

"Discussion of objections to axiom systems is valuable but the real testing-ground must lie in the results that spring from the formal theory....."

This attitude is very dangerous. It leads directly to a situation where current scientific theory is merely a melange of those theories, or axioms, which were not refuted early enough after their inception. After being propounded in the first place, a theory reinforces itself each time it is tested by experience, and as time goes on it becomes less and less vulnerable to refutation because it gradually moulds the whole framework of thought around itself to suit itself. It is a flywheel which gradually gathers momentum. If it is not stopped or deflected early in its career, it gains such momentum that it ignores and crushes everything in its path. It becomes Koestler's "closed system", Galbraith's "conventional wisdom".

(The unrefuted theory or axiom gradually moulds the whole framework of thought around itself, because that is the purpose of a theory or axiom.)

Ivor Catt, July 1973.

Crouch Hall,
Redbourn,
Herts AL3 7EU.

(All but last sentence a copy of a note dated Oct. 72)