

Corruption Of Science By Globalists

Description

Modern Reductionist Science is the stupidest of all knowledge seeking methodologies of mankind. A little before his death, Isaac Newton (1642-1727) is supposed to have remarked, “I don’t know what I may seem to the world, but as to myself, I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.”

The question today is: Is modern medicine scientific?

Modern Reductionist Science, on which the whole modern hi-tech society, including the nuclear power plants, are systematically built on, is no holy cow. Today this modern reductionist science itself is under scanner as to how much it is really scientific. Thus the answer to the above question is that the very science as is it is being practiced today is no longer anything genuine science.

In *What Is History?*, published in 1961 and still a celebrated book, its author Edward Hallett Carr, declared: “Before you study the history, study the historian.” In his view a historian’s background, and especially his social background, virtually determines the history he will write. Now I am introducing below the main ‘backgrounds’ or scenarios, of our present world and its so-called SCIENTISTS, by which the logic behind what is called the particle science that has raised the Higgs Boson furore may be better understood.

Physics, the king of sciences, got kudos for the discovery of atomic energy. It was Albert Einstein who wrote a “letter of conscience” to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, renouncing his lifelong pacifism. He wrote: “Certain aspects of the situation call for quick action... to set up a nuclear chain reaction in a large mass of uranium, by which vast amounts of power and large amounts of new radium like elements would be generated” on August 2, 1939 sowing the seed of the bomb that killed thousands of human beings like us in a few minutes on that fateful day in Hiroshima and later in Nagasaki. We do not know what happened to Einstein’s conscience on that day!

Particle physicists have been accused of gambling with the future of humanity since at least the 1950s.

Max Planck, the father of quantum physics, was unhappy when his three Nobel laureate students, Oppenheimer, Neils Bohr, and Enrico Fermi were trying to split an atom. He exclaimed, “I admire the cleverness of my pupils, how I wish they had used a bit of their wisdom instead.” The results of his apprehensions are there for all of us to see. The stock of plutonium waste, from nuclear reactors around the globe, that has accumulated now, if released, could destroy all living things on this planet for millions of years and not even a blade of grass would grow. Do our scientists and rationalists know where and how to safe-deposit this plutonium?

Over the last 40 years, with the ever growing pressures of capitalism on science, big business has inexorably infested the scientific world. Reductionist science, which is largely patronized by the corporate interests, causes and accelerates division, splitting and isolation for energy production.

Here let us examine the basic sciences. Ever since European universities started functioning around the thirteenth century, science was following linear mathematics. Linear mathematics does not always work in this dynamic universe. Let us examine something very simple. Hydrogen is a very volatile atom while oxygen abets volatility. The two atoms combined together, the resulting molecule must be terribly inflammable and volatile! Let us take water (H_2O) as a good example and set fire to it. Does it burn? The morale of the story is that the whole need not be the sum total of its parts; rather the sum of the parts is much different from the whole. . This is the essence of non-linear laws of the universe. If one concentrates just on the final outcomes of this kind of research we come across better realization of the futility of this kind of scientific pursuits.

Alfred Nobel discovered the dynamite, one of the milestone studies in chemistry and made millions, but killed millions in the bargain with his dynamite. There is no space here to talk about the dangers of chemical warfare, which is threatening to engulf the world, thanks to chemistry. The whole lot of artificial chemicals produced for pesticides and germicides have at last reached the drinking water table today, and also have already found their way into our system through vegetables and fruits. Hormones have got into us in a big way through chicken legs on the plate and the milk from cows. Today girls, even aged seven-eight start to menstruate and grow breasts! More on the catastrophic dangers of these synthetic nanoparticles and nanotechnology have already been discussed in chapter 4.

Albert Einstein once tried to write a book on physics for non-physicists but could not. Science only grew more and more abstract, specialized and compartmentalized. Today when Stephen Hawking tried a popular book on black hole he has only partially succeeded in terms of popularity for its success was only because of the curiosity attached to the concept of black hole. Scientists are simply unable to generalize and synthesize various ideas, and instead they go on this splitting trend, endlessly.

The main difference between modern science of induction and the holistic science of deduction is that while modern science uses brain to fabricate reality in controlled environment like laboratories, holistic science uses mainly the mind or conscience – wisdom – to understand reality in the natural environment.

When man was not chasing or being unmindful of truth, the ‘box of truth’ used to open all by itself and that was how man lived on his pristine planet for millions of years. Even as

wisdom look forward to Nature to deliver its own logical ‘golden eggs’ – as its endless exotic fruits and truths – rationalists or ‘pure logicians’, like the proverbial greedy farmer would kill (split) the ‘the duck that lays the golden eggs’ in the ‘hypothetical’ hope of collecting all the future ‘golden’ eggs in one go.

The main difference between modern science of induction and the holistic science of deduction is that while modern science uses brain to fabricate reality in controlled environment like laboratories, holistic science uses mainly the mind or conscience – wisdom – to understand reality in the natural environment. Here we can see that science ignores life in the name of verifiable facts of matter, that it misses out on 95 to 99 % of the workings, laws, and principles of existence, and that, in practical terms, modern science is filtering down to be an ideology of self-delusion and self-destruction.

During their golden age, some physicists thought seriously about what their new discoveries meant for human knowledge itself. As time went on and their reputations increased, fewer of them directed their attentions to that larger question. Werner Heisenberg, one of the most creative physicists of the twentieth century who played a pioneering role in the development of quantum mechanics, was among these few. In 1955, after the revolutionary and dramatic events of World War II, Heisenberg delivered the Gifford Lectures, summarizing what this new physics meant to our knowledge of the world. Some of his sentences were memorable. Among other things he stated that the scientific method has become its own limitation, since science by its intervention alters the objects of its investigations, “methods and objects can no longer be separated.”.... “The object of research is no longer Nature itself, but man’s investigation of Nature.”

Yet there were and are very few scientists who agreed with or were interested in Heisenberg’s epistemological statements during the last 20 years of his life. And Heisenberg too was moving, as were most other physicists, to seek a mathematical, a formulaic solution to the problem of physical knowledge, in pursuit of what is called a Unified Theory of Matter (or, by some, “a Theory of Everything”). Another quarter century later, a number of physicists began to encompass absurdities. The decline of physics began.

All of this happened during and after three-quarters of a century when physicists, inventing and dependent on more and more powerful machines, have found more and more smaller and smaller particles of matter, affixing them with all kinds of names. Until now, well into the 21st century, it is more and more likely that not only A Basic Theory of Everything but also the smallest Basic Unit of Matter will and can never be found. Why? Because these particles are produced by scientists – human beings themselves. Every piece of matter – just as every number – is endlessly, infinitely divisible because of human mind. Some scientists will admit this. Others won’t.

Now coming to this costly exercise, the question is whether the entire issue is that much important to us – especially when the whole thing is all about the presentation of IMAGINATION as FACT?

In human history, it is almost impossible to find an epoch of greater insecurity than ours. Planet Earth is in a traumatic turmoil. The case of climate change that is wreaking havoc on the world's population is just one among hundreds of similar or more catastrophic tip-off crises. The combined services of superpowers, hi-tech leadership of market and sciences, let alone the combined might of the UN and the related supra national agencies, could not put a dent in the problem. Here, why do our scientists fail to address these more vital problems and crises that are right in our front and staring at our face menacingly, unlike the highly invisible, hypothetical and misleading questions as the 'Higgs Bosons'.

The one category of species that needs urgent treatment are the so-called science geniuses (scientists, exactly) who, in their long experiments and 'discoveries' for human progress since about the last 200 years and having already put the whole human society in a highly broken-down condition, and therefore in a highly degenerative mode of 'development' and who are now on a hysterical hunt to find out what they call the 'missing truth' by further going on in their endless splitting process.

Hunt for the half-truth seems to have gone too far on the endless compartmentalization, fragmentation, specialization of the highly linear path of decay. Here we live in a decaying industrial era. We are mired in the mythic age. And myths will not get the world through its crises. The world was much better off without these scientists for tens of thousands of years.

There is no doubt that modern science, having gone too far on the linear reductionist path and reaching the minutest 'God Particle, has today fallen into its own BLACK HOLE. But the fear is about the imminent possibility of this Frankenstein juggernaut dragging the whole humanity into this hypothetical abyss, as modern science has already done the same in most other sectors it has taken over. Predictions that the collision of subatomic particles at the LHC might create a black hole and consume our planet, if not the entire universe, owe more to hysteria than to science. Fear has a way of expanding and exacerbating worst-case scenarios. And the history of the reductionist modern science is the creation of this kind of techniques of expanding and exacerbating worst-case scenarios and maintains its leadership through fear and blackmail.

Toxic materials filled world: Man enjoyed a pristine life on the once unspoiled Earth for millions of years without the present type of poisoning of our air, water, food and soil. The Roman Empire was defeated – not by an enemy from outside but by one from within – by the one of sheer ignorance, namely, lead poisoning through their lead water pipes. Modern civilization is badly ridden in the deadly ignorance of tens of thousands of such toxic materials that inflict massive damage to vital human life lines as what modern life style is doing – by the poisoning of our air, water, food and soil and exposing every centimeter of the Earth's surface to toxic radiation. The world is now filled with one hundred years of toxic industrial by-products that have polluted even the most remote and inhospitable regions of the earth.

Here science is capable of only providing certain superficial solutions to most of these fundamental problems it has created in modern world, like inventing and marketing (costly) oxygen parlors for the air pollution, scientifically ‘purified’ and bottled (costly) water to meet widespread water poisoning, and so forth. Science, as the breeder of problems, solves one problem only after it has sown the seeds of two or more basic problems. Every major scientific invention or discovery has been proved false, half-truth or even toxic later, as is the case of most of the inventions of modern Cartesian medicines.

Dualism of unity in Nature: Now let us examine the logic behind this Higgs Boson hunt in the light of the holistic science or the science of deduction. We all have studied about light as the tiniest particle of matter in the universe which is only a wave of energy and has no mass. The tiniest quantum of light is photon (electromagnetism) which is the most familiar tiniest particle boson. Now this tiniest particle light has a wholesome existence: this energy wave – electromagnetism – is dualist in characteristic as it has positive and negative poles/fields.

All matters exist as pairs – as WHOLISTIC – in Nature. Pair category recognizes the universal significance of the interactive dyad, or apposition of polarities, be it proton-electron, female-male, Earth-Sun, positive-negative, north-south poles of the magnet, matter-antimatter, light-dark, Yin-Yang, Adam-Eve etc. Typically, the ‘Cosmic Egg’ is almost universally conceived as a male-female dichotomy, or division into some type of opposite or complementary polarity. The nuclear pairing is most significant for nuclear physics; the electron pairings for chemistry and the formation of molecules. Water (H_2O) and molecular gases such as H_2 , N_2 , O_2 , and CO_2 are further examples of this simple level of atomic pairing. To be precise, matter exists as male and female in the organic world whereas it exists as matter and anti-matter in the inorganic world.

Now, in the Higgs Boson pursuit, scientists are trying to split and separate the minutest wholistic pairing (now only a hypothetical product) in the atomic world and capture the secret or ‘truth’ in the tiniest matter which, like the explosion fury of nuclear fusion event, may create a much greater catastrophic explosions in the separation process.

Modern science is the ‘particle accelerator’ – smasher – of wholistic matters in Nature: Modern science is the MILL and scientists are the MILLERS that go on MILLING everything wholistic across-the-board in Nature ever since Industrial Revolution Milling or splitting of the wholistic natural pairs in Nature result in the linear development of isolated state of existence of broken pairs as singles, leading to their premature decay and degeneration. Starting of the across-the-board DEGENERATION in Nature is the net consequence of this unprecedented and water-shedding development in the billions of years long natural evolution process. Please refer Chapter 10: Life on Degeneration (of my book Life On Meltdown)

Degeneration Catastrophe: With the all powerful scientific tools that go on incessantly splitting, isolating and degenerating the wholistic natural world, we are poisoning ourselves at a level witnessed never before in human history. And, as we all know, science is silent on all vital issues facing mankind. The fact that degenerative/genetic diseases have become catastrophic and also identical across species, is been discussed in Chapter 4 of my book Life On Meltdown, available at: .

The fast growing gap between the speed of technological advance and human understanding of its implications: Two episodes

Consider now two incidents: A repair crew disconnects a pump from service in a nuclear power plant, carefully placing tags on the controls so that the operators will know that this particular unit is temporarily out of service. Later a minor incident occurs, and as the operators attempt to deal with it, they initially diagnose it in a reasonable, but erroneous way. Eventually, the problem becomes so serious that the entire plant is destroyed: Among the factors hindering their correct recognition of the situation is that the tags so carefully placed to indicate the out-of-service unit hangs over another set of indicators, blocking them from view of operators. Could this have been predicted beforehand? May be. But it wasn't.

The nuclear power incident is the famous Three Mile Island event, the worst accident in the history of American nuclear power that completely destroyed the power-generating unit and caused such a public loss in confidence in nuclear power that no American plant has been built since. The operators misdiagnosed the situation, leading to a major calamity. But the misdiagnosis was a perfectly reasonable one. As a result, they concentrated on items they thought relevant to their diagnosis and missed other cues, which they thought were just part of the normal background noise. The tags that blocked the view would not normally have been important.

Consider another example of things that generally goes awry in man-machine synchronization. A hospital x-ray technician enters a dosage for an x-ray machine, then realizes the machine is in the wrong mode and corrects the setting. However, the machine's computer program wasn't designed to handle a rapidly made correction, so it did not properly register the new value. Instead, it delivered a massive overdose to the patient. Sometime later, the patient died of the overdose. The accident goes undiagnosed, because as far as anyone can determine, the machine had done the correct thing.

Moreover, the effect of overdose doesn't show up immediately, so when the symptoms were reported, they were not correlated with the incident, or for that matter, with the machine. When the machine's performance first comes under suspicion, the company which manufactured it explains in detail why such an accident is impossible. The situation repeats itself in several different hospitals, killing a number of patients before a sufficient pattern emerges that the problem is recognized and the design of the machine is fixed. Could this have been predicted beforehand? May be. But it wasn't.

In the hospital x-ray situation, the real error was in the design of the software system, but even here, the programmer erred in not thinking through all of the myriad possible sequences of operation, something not easy to do. There are better ways of developing software that would have made it more likely to have caught these problems before the system was released to hospitals, but even then, there are no guarantees. As for the hospital personnel who failed to understand the relationship, well, they too were doing the best they could to interpret the events and to get through their crowded, hectic days. They interpreted things according to normal events, which was wrong only because this one was very abnormal.

Over the past fifty years, science has built up a substantial body of experimental evidence that highlights dozens of alarming systematic failings in our capacity for reason. These errors are especially dangerous in an area as difficult to think about as the future of humanity, where deluding oneself is tempting and the 'reality check' won't arrive until too late. How can we form accurate beliefs about the future in the face of these considerable obstacles?

Now I have pointed out the above two incidents just to bring home the general examples of a sticky situation that mankind faces today. However, what this write-up deals with is not about the problems created by the machines and systems that malfunctions, like the two above examples of machines/systems that malfunction, but about the more fatal and more catastrophic ill-effects or after-effects of the machines and systems that are proving highly detrimental to mankind and environment even when they function perfectly in order, and even when they are managed by the best professional experts and in orderly situations.

Clash of two Mismatches: The adoption of new technology normally precedes complete knowledge of the repercussions of the technology. For example, we adopted a new system of raising and feeding animals – only to discover that our system helped spread a prion that decayed brains (including, apparently human brains). Imagine if prions had spread far more rapidly and had less effect on cattle and greater effect on humans – anyone who has eaten beef would be at real risk of having their brain turn to sponge.

Likewise, new evidence continues to come to light that cell phones have a greater effect on the brain than was previously thought. Will two or three decades of frequent use from an early age lead to widespread health problems among our youngest generation? In a similar vein, there is speculation that cell phones may be the cause of our current bee shortage – a shortage that threatens a number of crops. We are adopting new technologies every day – and any one of them could have unforeseen effects. In the worst case scenario, one of these surprises could threaten our civilization.

The predicament facing us is the horrible mismatch between requirements of these human-built mechanical systems and human factors. Machines are mechanical, humans are biological. Machines are rigid and require great precision and accuracy of control. We are compliant. Humans tolerate and produce huge amounts of ambiguity and uncertainty, very little precision and accuracy. The latest inventions of humankind are those of the digital technology of information processing and communication, yet we ourselves are analog devices.

Why do accuracy and precision matter? In our natural world, they don't. We are approximate beings: we get at the meanings of things, and for this, the details don't much matter. Accurate times and dates matter only because we have created a culture in which these things are important. Accurate and precise measurements matter because the

machines and procedures we have created are rigid, inflexible, and fixed in their ways, so if a measurement is off by some tiny fraction, the result can be a failure to operate. Worse yet, it can cause a tragic accident.

The same story is true of time, of facts and figures, and of accurate memory. These only matter because the mechanical, industrialized society created by people doesn't match people. In part, this is because we don't know how to do any better. Can we build machines that are as compliant and flexible as people? Not today. Biology doesn't build: it grows, it evolves. It constructs life out of soft, flexible parts. Parts those are self-repairable. We don't know how to do this with our machines: we can only build mechanical devices out of rigid substances like wood or steel or plastic.

People are compliant: we adapt ourselves to the situation. We are flexible enough to allow our bodies and our actions to fit the circumstances. Animals don't require precise measurements and high accuracy to function. Machines do.

THE ONSLAUGHT OF REDUCTIONISM

Man and nature existed in a united, holistic state for millions of years. Here we envision a world where we live in communion with the Earth, creating perfect harmony, health, and happiness. From the smallest nano-particle to the largest galactic formation, a web of electrical circuitry connects and unifies all of Nature, organizing galaxies, energizing stars, giving birth to planets and, on our own world, controlling weather and animating biological organisms. There are no isolated islands in an electric universe. As an organic species of Nature, man is allowed to live on and be a part of Earth. Humans are like cells functioning within a body of the Earth. As long as humans (the cells) live in a healthy manner we will live peacefully in correlation with Earth.

Mankind practiced this Nature's wholesome way of life – united state of existence – for millions of years, till as recently as up to the start of modern civilization, when suddenly everything sharply changed, thanks to shortcut methodologies like the analytical science of reductionism and middlemanism taking over the central role of the socialization process, basically since the 16th century. Here the purpose of knowledge is violated when modern science, in a mindless effort of transforming Nature without a thought for the consequences, destroys the innate integrity of Nature and thereby robs it of its regenerative capacity. As humans advance and create technology that intervenes with and begins to decay our environment we have become unhealthy cells within a functioning body.

Can life be reduced to nothing more than an interesting arrangement of atoms and molecules? The prevailing view of science today, sometimes known as reductionism is that life results from the combination of non-living molecules, or the totality of any particular wholitic matter/entity is the totality of the sum of its parts.

Modern mechanized world is a dualistic universe that exists in a state of dualism or reductionism. For millions of years, all matters on Earth – organic and inorganic, living or non-living – existed in a wholistic state, that is, in a state of dual unity. Here things fall into one of two poles like day and night, male and female, space and time, matter and energy, reason and passion, good and evil, positive and negative, pleasure and pain, success and failure, flower and thorn, fruit and seeds, solution and problem, and so forth. Even light has a dualistic characteristic and that is why they call it "electromagnetic radiation". The dual poles of light are the electro and the magnetic. The two elements make it when they come

together as the two opposites. So there is the duality and there is the unity.

Men and women are not equal but completely different. Male-and-Female is duality in unity. Only two contrasting fundamentals, as different as hydrogen and oxygen can produce water, or two contrasting fundamentals, as different as man and woman can produce a new human. The combining of whole hydrogen atoms in the universe cannot produce even a drop of water, nor can it by combining the whole of oxygen atoms in the universe.

Here we consider both, human and water, as whole. In the case of water (H_2O) the union of oxygen and hydrogen forms a chemically distinct substance. Water is a chemical compound in which the component elements do not retain the identities they have when separate or when part of a different compound. To study water, one does not study hydrogen and oxygen; what one studies is water.

Dualism, in philosophy, is the theory that the universe is explicable only as a whole, composed of two distinct and mutually irreducible elements. In platonist philosophy the ultimate dualism is between “being” and “nonbeing” – that is, between ideas and matter. In the 17th century, dualism took the form of belief in two fundamental substances: mind and matter. René Descartes, who is known as the ‘father of modern philosophy’, and whose interpretation of the universe exemplifies this belief, was the first to emphasize the irreconcilable difference between thinking substance (mind) and extended substance (matter).

The difficulty created by this view was to explain how mind and matter interact, as they apparently do in human experience. This perplexity caused some Cartesians to deny entirely any interaction between the two. They asserted that mind and matter are inherently incapable of affecting each other, and that any reciprocal action between the two is caused by God, who, on the occasion of a change in one, produces a corresponding change in the other. Other followers of Descartes abandoned dualism in favor of Monism (Greek monos, “single”), in philosophy, the doctrine that ultimate reality is entirely of one substance.

Descartes based his whole view of Nature on the fundamental division between two parallel but fundamentally different realms, the physical realm and the spiritual realm. Each of which could be studied without reference to the other. The dualistic notion of ‘mind-body’ and the analytic method of Descartes resulted in the replacement of an organic universe with a mechanical universe produced by divine reason.

According to Descartes, mind and body belonged to two parallel but fundamentally different realms, each of which could be studied without reference to the other. With his view of Nature as a perfect machine, Descartes replaced the ‘organic worldview’ of the Middle Age and created the conceptual framework for seventeenth century science.

This mechanical division or reductionism of Descartes and Newton was the foundation of all Western science until the twentieth century. In the popular mind, as well as in vast sectors of scientific and technological research throughout the world, it still remains so.

Overemphasis on the Cartesian method has led to the fragmentation that is characteristic of both our general thinking and our academic disciplines, and to the widespread attitude of reductionism in science – the belief that all aspects of complex phenomena can be understood by reducing them to their constituent parts.

In the Cartesian worldview, mind and body are separate, and animals – that lack a human mind – are said not to suffer. Matter lacks purpose, life-energy, wisdom and spirituality.

There is no room for music, art, love, emotion, faith, taste, smell, values, shared experience or surprise; these are all mere illusions in a world of fact. Isaac Newton developed the Cartesian idea of the universe as one huge mechanical system operating according to mathematical laws. He held that particles were ultimately homogeneous, all being made of same material substance. The universe, then, was driven by the laws of cause and effect, which operated in a linear fashion. Causes gave rise to predictable, measurable effects, and the universe was entirely predictable once we knew its details. Modernism thus unleashed forces of radical autonomy and isolation. They are prone to erratic fantasies, or states of dissociation of humanity beyond Cartesian dualism.

Between the 16th and 18th centuries there was a dramatic shift in the way people observed and thought about the Universe. This new system of thought was based on the philosophy of Rene Descartes who promoted a mathematical description of Nature and the use of analytic thought – the Cartesian System. Descartes' vision was to give a precise and complete account of all natural phenomena with absolute mathematical certainty. To accomplish this he compared natural phenomena with machines. Descartes even drew parallels between a sick man and an ill-made clock.

Later Isaac Newton synthesized the works of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo and Descartes into a complete mathematical formulation of Nature – Newtonian Mechanics. Towards the end of the 19th century scientists believed that eventually all natural phenomena would be explained by reducing them to the motion and interaction of particles. Albert Einstein too was actually a bad representative of reductionist position on predeterminism, despite his enormous academic stature, because he himself could not accept much of even modern quantum physics — it was too counter-intuitive to him. Einstein was so uncomfortable with the implications of quantum mechanics that he was famously quoted as saying, “God does not play dice.”

This reductionism led to the expectation that: physics would eventually explain chemistry; chemistry would explain biology; and biology would explain psychology. Love, joy and courage had been reduced to certain chemical reactions within the brain.

Complex systems are therefore broken down into their components and each piece is studied individually by way of disciplinary and sub-disciplinary approaches. The challenge is to find the entry points from where to address the particulars of the system. Once one knows the parts, the dynamics of the whole can be derived. In general, scientists have been so successful in applying this method that instead of reverting back to see how their discoveries fit in with totality, they have continued to dig deeper into their specialties, continuously narrowing the focus of their research.

A Misperception of Reality: Everything That Remained NORMAL For Millions Of Years Have Suddenly Become ABNORMAL Since Largely The Last 100 Years

To separate is to die a little. Call it reductionism, dualism, atomism, our world has suddenly come to acquire a narrow, specialized outlook in place of the millions of years long holistic, comprehensive and integrated outlook. Milling or splitting up of the wholistic NATURAL PAIRS (unity-in-duality mode of evolution) in Nature result in the linear development of isolated state of existence of broken pairs, as singles (existing in duality), leading to their premature decay and degeneration. Here modern reductionist science is working as the

'particle accelerator' – smasher – of Nature. In our day, modern science is the MILL and scientists are the MILLERS; and they go on MILLING everything wholistic across-the-board in Nature, ever since Industrial Revolution

Massive degeneration brought about by the massive mechanization, massive split up of most of the wholistic matters in the world, including mankind, resulted in the genetic tampering that greatly reduced the quality and changed the properties of everything including man, society and planet.

United we stand, we live; divided or separated we fall, we decay and we degenerate. Here we are excommunicating Nature, and now Nature is all set to excommunicate us. The modern story of human evolution is more about its development from the long Unity-In-Duality mode of regenerative existence of natural wholism to the modern Dualist Mode of degenerative existence of mechanical reductionism. Here we will see how the reductionist science generates the problems in wholesale and solves some of these problems in retail.

The developed, led by the West, has been playing havoc with the health of the world which they call 'progress', and today it has reached a chronic stage of no return. The mechanical system too has developed degeneration or degenerative diseases. Today, we have every reason to consider the core of modern society as a highly traumatized and dysfunctional society. Here the more traumatized and the more dysfunctional are the more mechanical and the more marketed parts of the modern society. And with globalization becoming total, the disease is spreading to the whole human society on the planet. But mechanization and advanced mechanization being the order of the day, we don't see it as anything abnormal, traumatic or dysfunctional but as quite normal – indeed as 'development' and 'progress'.

How is right and wrong decided? Neither Nature nor any species in Nature ever depended on majority approval or others opinion to know as to what is right and wrong for them to follow, or how to live their social life. Nor did the pre-modern humans that lived on Earth for millions of years depend on the 'majority' yardsticks. However majority dependency has become the main yardstick to establish right and wrong, good and evil in the world today. If the ruling class in modern society is insane, the situation today warrants that the sane must go to the hospital for treatment. "When the world goes mad, one must accept madness as sanity; since sanity is, in the last analysis, nothing but the madness on which the whole world happens to agree", wrote George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950).

We normally think that those that are mad are in the minority but what if we, the majority, are the mad ones and they are in fact the sane ones? Just because we are in the majority does not make you right or sane etc. Great historic examples are Nazism, genocide etc. That is why it is said that 'in a mad world, only the mad are sane'.

It is an apparent fact that today 95% mankind today suffer from some kind of degenerate mindset. However, when nine out of ten people are sick, it is impossible to even think of solution/remedy especially when majority (being sick) is the norm. Majority is presumed to be right and normal when, technically, these degenerated minds are in majority. For, being in majority, degeneration becomes right and normal, whereas healthy people, being in minority, become abnormal and wrong. Everything in society turns upside down. What were wrong, evil and irrelevant for millions of years in the past suddenly become right, good and relevant.

When the whopping majority suffer from some disease, especially degeneration diseases of both mental and physical variety, the occurrence become normal and usual, and the thin minority who are safe from this development are viewed as abnormal or even considered as

sick. Most frequently, this is the situation wherein the overwhelming (usually underpowered) majority of observers willingly share in a collective ignorance of an obvious fact, despite individually recognizing the absurdity.

As mankind got inundated in the machine-generated splitting and reductionist explosions and the resultant pollutions that led humans to virtual devolution, evolution is now degenerating the human. The latest design of man guarantees extinction. The rate of human descent today is perhaps thousands of times faster than the rate of its ascent. Latest evolution of life on earth is turning aberrational and abnormal.

Development of various genetic abnormalities has become normal. Breast growth for infant girls starts at age 5. Once thought as diseases of the ‘developed’ West, like diabetes, obesity, cancer, hypertension and all that, are the order of the day everywhere in the world and the trend is gaining momentum. The developing brain blunders, resulting in “neuro-developmental disorders,” the odd wiring risk of autism, like schizophrenia, is the evolutionary price we are simply paying for our rather modern brain updates, starting from our modern scientific ‘motherboards’.

As for the ongoing abnormality in weather conditions, Nature is increasingly becoming unpredictable and that cyclones, earthquakes, tsunamis are on the rampage. Whether it’s due to man-made climate change, or ‘extreme weather events’ as they are being called, weather patterns in general, and the monsoon rains (in India) in particular, are becoming increasingly erratic, that, in other words, even weather-wise the abnormal is becoming the norm, so much so that meteorologists are beginning to question the use of the term ‘normal’ in relation to weather conditions.

And it’s not just the weather that’s becoming normally abnormal. For instance, persistent inflation, particularly food price inflation, which seems to resist all efforts to curb it, is no longer considered an ‘abnormality’, but a ‘normal’ fact of daily life, which we just have to learn to live with. Similarly, entrenched and seemingly ineradicable corruption and ingenious scams of all varieties are no longer the exception to the rule but appear to have become the rule.

What to tell of a situation that today even corruption has become the way of ‘normal’ modern life

Is It Logical For Scientist To Evaluate And Examine Science When Science Itself Is Basically Faulty?

Let the age-old or real Science — the Holistic Science — examine the ‘Reductionist Science’

Science is an additive discipline in which each novel contribution builds upon the breadth of existing scientific knowledge and acts as a launch pad from which to pursue further study. The scientific community is currently in the midst of a crisis: many studies are not reproducible, meaning that results cannot be adequately verified by other scientists.

According to estimates, approximately 75-90% of preclinical studies published in high-impact journals, such as *Science* and *Nature*, cannot be replicated (Begley and Ioannidis

2015). This lack of reproducibility undermines science as a vehicle for human progress as it means that new research avenues are being pursued based on presumptive hypotheses and unverifiable findings. The result is a widespread waste of resources, a loss of public trust in the scientific establishment, and a reduced applicability of science as a tool to better the quality of human life. Potential solutions to this crisis include improving researcher training, employing more rigorous peer review, and increasing the transparency of scientific literature.

The most notable cause of the data reproducibility crisis is the use of poor scientific practices (Begley and Ioannidis 2015; Yarborough 2014). As there are more professional scientists than ever before competing for their share of ever-shrinking funding budgets, there have been increasing pressures in the scientific realm to publish novel results as quickly as possible in an effort to establish credibility, obtain fame, and solicit increased funding. This rush to publish has led many researchers to use questionable ethics and research practices, which, in turn, have produced haphazard results. Examples of these practices include falsifying data, poor experimental design, improper or omitted controls, inadequate blinding, and the misuse of statistics (Landis et al. 2012; Nuzzo 2014). Since new scientific endeavors are based upon previous work, the net result of these practices is a gross waste of time and money allocated to projects that are partially or wholly unfounded. This waste breeds the public's wariness and distrust of science, which can affect scientific funding and the rate of scientific progress. Therefore, it is the duty of the scientific community to earn and maintain the public's trust by conducting research in a manner that minimizes the waste of time and money and produces reliable data (Yarborough 2014).

The lack of transparency in the reporting of research methodologies in published research also harms data reproducibility. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a fellow scientist to completely understand or reproduce the findings of a study when it is unclear what work was done to establish a particular conclusion (Ryan 2011). According to Landis et al. (2012), there seems to be a correlation in the scientific literature between poor reporting of experimental methods and poor experimental design, especially when the experiments utilize animal subjects. This trend has gone largely ignored in scientific manuscripts, even in those that have undergone the process of peer review. However, it is not always the case that poor reporting indicates poor science. In some disciplines, such as field biology, it is customary for observational methods to be vaguely described because of the innumerable variables present in nature. Consequently, the presumed quality of the work is dependent on the reputation of the investigator (Ryan 2011). Nevertheless, poor reporting of data and methods harms the potential of the scientific community to reproduce a study and verify its data, meaning that the validity of the study cannot be adequately evaluated.

Improving the reproducibility of scientific work is challenging, but not impossible. Foremost, scientists need to be better trained to ensure adherence to good research practices, to employ sound experimental designs, and to value research ethics. To meet this need, universities and other research institutions need to provide better training and increase the emphasis placed on these techniques. As science is a self-assessing discipline, peer review should be more stringent to ensure that the data and methods included in a manuscript are adequately described and therefore possibly reproducible. To this end, alternative peer review systems such as open peer review, in which the reviewers are no longer confined to those elected by the editor of the journal, have been established as an alternative to traditional peer review. This has the effect of increasing the number of reviewers on a pre-print manuscript, which should result in a better quality publication.

Additionally, to solve the data reproducibility crisis, the transparency of scientific publications should be increased. Some journals, such as Public Library of Science (PLoS) One, require that the full dataset and methods used to derive the findings of a paper be made freely available to the public upon publication. However, these requirements are not yet standard practice in the publishing industry and are noticeably absent from many high-impact journals. Sometimes, especially in highly competitive fields or when doctor-patient confidentiality is an issue, data is intentionally omitted or is only vaguely described in published research (Ioannidis and Khoury 2011). Often this data can be obtained by request, but to label this as full transparency is debatable since there are still barriers to accessibility. The sharing of these data, when ethical, serves to advance scientific progress and ensure the quality of scientific studies.

Some publishers have taken this transparency a step further. Following the open access movement, publishers such as the PLoS and BioMed Central have made their entire catalog of scientific publications available on the internet for free with the philosophy that publicly funded scientific research should no longer be restricted to the bounds of a paywall and its subscribers. It is the hope that the open access movement will increase the reproducibility of data and the accessibility of scientific information for the greater good.

It is the duty of scientists to maintain the public's trust, ensure that research is conducted ethically and efficiently, and ensure that science continues to advance mankind in its endeavors. It is important to note that the data reproducibility crisis is not a reflection of a failed scientific method; rather, it is the result of the tendency of researchers to neglect scientific rigor in the process of professionally practicing science (Begley and Ioannidis 2015). Therefore, science is not doomed. There is hope that the data reproducibility crisis can be thwarted and that science can return to its role as a self-correcting discipline that strives to satisfy curiosity and improve the quality of human life.

Many fields outside of science use peer review to ensure quality. Philosophy journals, for example, make publication decisions based on the reviews of other philosophers, and the same is true of scholarly journals on topics as diverse as law, art, and ethics. Even those outside the research community often use some form of peer review. Figure-skating championships may be judged by former skaters and coaches. Wine-makers may help evaluate wine in competitions. Artists may help judge art contests. So while peer review is a hallmark of science, it is not unique to science.

In modern history, mankind has long been getting systematically fooled in the name of expertise and specially trained people, whom we call ‘experts’.

How logical it is for an expert to assess or measure his own work, especially when the very concept of expertise itself is under a scanner or is getting discredited?

How can scientists examine or assess science? When modern reductionist science itself is increasingly becoming the problem or disease or getting discredited (many humanist leaders including Rousseau and Gandhi have described modern reductionist science as a disease), how can a problem or disease examine and advise its own cure? Isn’t it as absurd and illogical as the culprits or thieves becoming the judges of their own deeds?

Is it logical for scientist to evaluate and examine science, when science itself is basically faulty?

Professional Reality Deniers

Many of our most stubborn and cherished dualities are the product of western philosophy! in using the western philosophical method, we are employing a medication that comes from the same part of the world as the disease. that is, to solve a problem created by the dualist mechanism, we are using the same dualist mechanism.

Related blogs:

- MODERN REDUCTIONIST SCIENCE IS NO HOLY COW:
<http://www.humanfirst.in/uncategorized/modern-science-is-no-holy-cow/>
- How Societies, by Promoting Collective Stupidity, Choose to Self-Destruct:
<https://www.facebook.com/notes/john-muthukat/how-societies-by-promoting-collective-stupidity-choose-to-self-destruct/10204982609867059>
- The Birth Of Machine And The Death Of Man (taken from excerpts of chapter 6 of the book ‘Life On Meltdown’): <http://www.humanfirst.in/essays/the-birth-of-machine-and-the-death-of-man/>
- Immature Civilization Builders And Psychopathic Societies:
<http://www.humanfirst.in/essays/immature-civilization-builders-and-psychopathic-societies/>

Category

- Blog

Date Created

March 2017

Author

admin