

Modern Scientific Community – The New Church & How Technology Is A Drug Part I

 vigilantcitizen.com/vc-community/modern-scientific-community-new-church-technology-drug-part/

Let me start by saying two things. First, I am an Orthodox Christian. I will do my best at staying neutral in regards to the subject, but I am also a human being, thus my ways in expressing things may seem at times, although unintendedly, as crazy Christian propaganda. Second, I do **not** think that we should abandon all technology and scientific research and go living in caves. I will make a couple of rather bold claims in this series of articles. Therefore I ask of you to please keep those two in mind, so that you can more effectively comprehend the picture I am portraying, rather than focusing the debate on the nature of ink I used to paint it with.

Now. If you are visiting this site often, you know that simply because fundamental religious dogmas are regarded as obsolete in most parts of the western world (N. America & Europe) does not in fact mean that the same brainwashing that was used on the masses through religion has seized. It simply shifted form to another medium: science. This is because even though religious institutions have lost their power to shift laws and preach morality, the “elites” have not lost their. Modern scientific practices and methods have moral lessons too, which in fact coincide with occult beliefs. Not only that, but the entire scientific community, consisting of everyone with a master’s degree or higher and currently involved in any form of research, if looked upon as one body, acts as a religious organization in of itself. Pretty bold claims, I better have some pretty bold arguments to support them, eh? (It would of course help to have at least a couple of years of college/university studies under the belt to follow this article, but it is not a requirement.)

I. My first argument is that if you wish to become successful in the world of science, your ideas, no matter what percentage of truth they have, must succumb to the consensus of the current scientific community in your particular field of study. I cannot really describe this unless you know what the phrase “scientific paradigm” means. I would recommend reading “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”, by Thomas Kuhn, since he describes what I am about to tell you much more thoroughly in his book. (Or at least read the damn wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Structure_of_Scientific_Revolutions)

The world of science behind the closed (lab) doors works differently that the one shown in the media. Most people in the “mob” think that if you can provide empirical evidence for a groundbreaking research you can change what is written in science books. Such is not the case. Even if a scientist has enough data, both empirical and theoretical/logical, to support a hypothesis, if the said hypothesis means that a large portion of an already established net of theories in that specific field must be changed or altered, then the hypothesis is most likely to be rejected by the scientific community in the said field of research. Unless the scientist sacrifices his/her entire life to prove that his/her idea was true and more accurately describes the universe than the already established network of theories, then the chances are that this hypothesis will be forgotten and lost in history like a fart in a windy storm. Though even if the scientist does in fact sacrifice his/her entire life, if his/her ideas would give us certain “knowledge” about the universe that the “elite” does not want us to have, “they” can create pressure on the scientific body of respective field so great that no major incorporation of the scientist’s ideas into the wider net of our scientific perception of reality will be made. Is it too farfetched? Well, since we’re dealing with people who basically control the world through politics, military, banks and media, I do not think that science somehow gets a pass.

The outcome of this all is that, from a macro-point of view, your local science institution does not really behave much differently from a local church: you are not allowed to preach unless the pastor has

approved your preaching as “truth”.

Practically speaking, there is no organization or business on this planet that you can be a part of without accepting its policies. Surely this is rational, but the problem arrives when scientific institutions make established theories as their policies, while at the same time claiming that they are searching for “the truth”. If a theory or hypothesis contradicts too much another theory that has already been widely accepted, then the new theory will meet a lot of resistance, maybe even not getting approved at all in the end, no matter if it is a better theory and/or a better description of reality. You might say that such is human nature, that we are all deep down somewhat conservative and do not want to change or are too lazy to change rules that already seem to work just fine. My problem is that people neglect this when dealing with scientific research communities, while religious communities face this sort of criticism all the time. I believe that we should be able to either criticize both sides of the fence by the same merit, or neither.

II. When we are children we are taught from the very early stage in our lives that $1 + 1 = 2$, with no explanation to how this comes to be, nor are we allowed to think “outside of the box”. I am not saying that it is bad for us to know how to add, subtract, multiply, or divide. All I am saying is that the process by which we learn the foundation of all scientific knowledge is exactly the same as the process by which we learn the foundation of knowledge in any religion in this world.

Even as simple claims as $1 + 1 = 2$, and $1 = 1$ rely entirely on you believing it to be true. Knowing some basic arithmetic can help you out a great deal in your day-to-day life, but the problem is when mathematicians start to claim these as “universal laws of all and any logic”. In the real world, if there is one apple and another apple that is also one apple, I might say $1 \neq 1$. For we have not agreed beforehand by which measurement we define that each one of those two apples holds exactly the same “amount of apple” in it. If one apple is twice as heavy as the other then by default I can claim that we either have 3 apples or 1,5 apple, but in no way do we have 2 apples. Conclusively, if I say that it is “logical” that we have two apples since 1 apple plus 1 apple = 2 apples, then you are taught to accept it as an absolute truth, even if we have not agreed on the underlying abstract logical rules that guide this thinking process.

III. The same policy is used in any scientific community as in any religious community: in order to criticize a Church/Mosque/Synagogue/[insert religious temple here] and give your own interpretation of The Holy Bible/The Quran/Torah/[insert religious scripture here] you must already be indoctrinated with the established beliefs, or else you are not allowed to criticize them. If you do not “understand” and do not agree that 1 apple + 1 apple = 2 apples, then your critique of any scientific theory in any field of study in any scientific community will most likely be neglected.

If you wish to provide some research/critique on your own you must either a) have a Ph.D. or higher, meaning that you must already be indoctrinated by the current scientific view in that particular field, or b) show forth “evidence”, that may or may not later be accepted due to the current scientific paradigm. Not to mention that the scientific community can very easily reject your evidence if it does not match their criteria for “evidence”, again all is a part of a scientific paradigm.

(Another useful link before we go on: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Popper#Philosophy_of_science)

IV. The culmination of scientific bigotry: positivism backed up by inductive logic. A fine specimen: theory of gravity. There are two sides of it, and I will address both. Newton’s version: “There is a force of nature. You cannot see it, hear it, or test it. There is no proof that it even exists, but this is how it works: [insert formula]”. This claim has not had any sort of concrete empirical data to show that such a force does in fact exist and yet was widely accepted by scientists all the way till Einstein, which is about 250 years.

I could, using the same logic, say that the gravity, whether a force or distortion, is actually caused by Zeus. He did it in such a way that we can discover formulas that help us make use of this awesome power of

Zeus. (Then I would have to prove that Zeus exists, but that is irrelevant.) There is no way I could falsify theory of gravity, because you cannot falsify a force that appears to be nonexistent (a nod to all atheists out there). But in return, no scientist on Earth could falsify my claim either back in those days.

Einstein's version: "There is a distortion of space-time continuum. You cannot see it or hear it, and you must have some super-duper sci-fi technology to test it, but here is a more sophisticated formula on how it works: [insert complicated formula]".

I do know that scientific models and theories developed today must hold this "falsifiability" status, but the theories that are still around from before Popper's time not always do. So okay, fair enough, Newton's view was proven wrong and thrown in the garbage can. Do you know when? About 3-4 years ago. That's right, there was no concrete evidence that either of them were wrong or right until about 3-4 years ago, when NASA provided some empirical data that did actually support existence of a space-time distortion as suggested by Einstein. Most physicists also think that we will find graviton quite soon, but until then, and during the entire past 350 years (before Einstein was "proven" right), every scientist who ever thought the gravitational force/distortion exists, has truly been a believer in every sense of the word.

P.S. Who really believes NASA today anyway. (S:CP)

In Conclusion

Let me make it real easy for you, real clear: **I do not say that scientific evidences and facts are based on faith, what I am saying is that behavioral patterns of a combined body of scientists in a scientific (research) community, and approaches which they take to investigate these evidences and facts, closely resemble those of a religious one.**

You may say that all of my arguments are simple rationale of human nature, that are not inherent to religion, but to the humankind as a whole, and thus transcend together with our society when we go out of religion and into science. If it is indeed a part of human nature, then what gives scientific communities right to criticize religious ones, but not the other way around? I firmly believe that one should not judge unless prepared to be judged by own principles.

In the next part I will focus on scientific procedures and methods that are widely accepted, approved of, and used by scientific communities all over the world; and how these same procedures have underlying moral and philosophical lessons that affect us, most likely unconsciously, guiding this world towards a specific mindset shared by the "elite". Stay tuned!