

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

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

Part III

Moral Lessons of The Scientific Machine & Political Agenda Behind The Scientific Method

(Long article ahead, prepare yourself for a wall of text.)

Side Note

Firstly, if there are any problems of technical nature, such as certain paragraphs are not separated or there is too much space in-between them, I assume it is because I type my articles in MS Word and then just copy them over here. So there must be some sort of “misunderstanding” between the MS Word layout and this page. I apologize for these “shortcomings”, but unfortunately they are outside of my scope of influence.

Second, if the reader has not yet read part I and II of this series I strongly recommend that the reader does so before proceeding to read part III of the series (especially part II which is a direct foundation for this part):

Part I: <http://vigilantcitizen.com/vc-community/modern-scientific-community-new-church-technology-drug-part/>

Part II: <http://vigilantcitizen.com/vc-community/modern-scientific-community-new-church-technology-drug-part-ii/>

Third, nothing too important, just something to consider when reading the text. I live in Sweden. Here there are about 10-15% Christians and about 2-5% Muslims. (If you look up statistics it will say around 70% are religious, but that is not true because some cities still write newborn as “members” of the Church. If you research how many consider themselves to be active Christians/Muslims/Religious at all, then the numbers I gave may not be precise, but are more accurate.) The rest, around 75-85%, are agnostics/atheists. So when I start generalizing about society, I’m mostly speaking for the country I’m in. Just so the reader knows...

Repetition

1. It turns out that my efforts in the previous article were not enough. So I will try this one last time. Are the following two statements identical and have the exact same message?
 - “Be careful with that knife, it is pretty sharp.”
 - “Knife is a terrible and completely insufficient tool that cannot be used to prepare dinner what-so-ever.”

To those of you who got it right last time, thank you. To those of you who didn’t, you’re not going to get it right this time either. The answer in your head is still “Yes, those two are exactly same sentences”, which

makes me wonder why I even bother...

2. The definition of the scientific method, in regards to the human nature within which the scientific method is applied, that I arrived at in the last article:

*“The scientific method is an attempt to gain an accurate description of the universe by procedurally appealing to majority of people [who share same amount of senses, nature of which is either identical or indistinguishably similar] **OR** [who’s brains perform cognitive-creative function identically or indistinguishably similarly]; who share roughly same vocabulary size, and who share same type and set of logical axioms building up definitions in that vocabulary.”*

To continue this a bit for those who still disagree...

It’s not that I forget testing, and empirical evidence, it’s that it is **impossible** for the scientific method to be anything else but an ad populum fallacy. Though I already took time and effort to write an entire article **proving** this very point, I will prove it again using less than 100 words.

If there was only one man on Earth who could see (literally see, the rest of the people were blind), and this man discovered that light behaves both as a particle and as a wave, could he claim his discovery regarding the nature of light to be scientific? It’s a simple question, yes or no. Remember, the experiments he conducts are not reproducible, testable, or measurable to **anyone else but himself**. Now to the real question, should the rest of the world consider his experiments scientific?

The scientific method is not about what can be tested; only what one can **convince** a certain group of people to be testable à appeal to majority.

Now that I said it, two things must be clarified. One, I redirect those who are confused or think that I misunderstand how scientific experiments work “in real life” to reread point 1 above. Two, fallacy \neq dysfunctionality. Something can be a fallacy and still be functional. Democracy is a good example of this. It is per definition an “appeal to majority” fallacy, but it works as a political system (most of the time). Simple as that.

In fact, democracy works so well that technological and scientific progresses are entirely based on democratic ruling (appeal to majority, again and again). Imagine if every scientist would arrive at his/her own personal conclusions after every experiment, without consulting the peers (consulting peers and peer-review are not the same thing), or used his/her own metric/measurement system. Do you really think we would still be able to send people into outer space?

I view science as Andrew Fassback views nature in World War Z (movie, not book), it loves disguising its weakness as its strength. Much of backlash for me declaring science a democratic process comes from the fact that people don’t realize that without international congregations, where scientists decide in groups, **even vote**, on whether or not to use mole as a measurement for amount of chemical substance, without the democratic process of appealing to majority on what’s right and what’s wrong, the science and modern technology would not even exist. One scientist cannot build a spaceship by himself/herself, and thus there must be cooperation, and that cooperation is based on agreement, and that agreement is reached through countless appeals to majority. **Hence it is impossible for scientific inquiry to be anything else but an appeal to majority.**

People simply focus too much on science as strong, and thus they forget that its own strength is also its greatest weakness. Remember, I’m only reminding you that the knife we are holding is sharp. Sharpness is the weakness of that knife, because it’s what makes it possible to accidentally cut oneself, or even other people, but it is the same sharpness that lets the knife cut vegetables and meat, no?

Scientific Machine – The New Pacifier

When talking about hidden morale and symbolism within science and scientific method I will use the term “Scientific machine”, for I do not blame individual scientist, or any one group of scientists. No, not even the scientific method itself. It is the scientific machine, which is made of worlds combined scientific communities, scientific method, history of scientific progress, and science itself, that becomes a modern religion that not only helps occultism and the New World Order/One World Government to be put into place; it also teaches satanic “truths” and morals.

Human civilization, whether in regards to an infinite supernatural creator, or a 13,8 (yes, I’m from Europe, so I use coma as point and point as coma in math) billion years old universe, is nothing but a baby sucking on a pacifier. That pacifier is religion, or really superstition in general. One may remove a pacifier from a baby, tell it to shut up, and expect it to be quiet. But that is not what is going to happen. The baby will continue to cry till it finds something new to put in its mouth. And isn’t it such a great and marvelous “coincidence” on a major historical scale that the scientific machine, through the scientific method, has just the right stuff to offer? So, let’s see what the scientific machine has in store for us to suck on.

What Occultism Is There In The Scientific Machine?

Scientific institutions wouldn’t be churches unless they preached something. Am I right or am I right? Finally, after about 11 pages of (obligatory) introduction we are at last getting to the heart of this series. (SM = scientific machine)

I: Disloyalty. The first thing that the scientific rationale teaches is that all and any allegiance to any idea or description should be abandoned in sight of a more useful idea or description. It is necessary for science to abandon loyalty in order to make technological progress like it is necessary for a human body to produce fesis in order to survive, but it doesn’t make the process beautiful or worthy of admiring. Loyalty is one of the most inspiring human qualities. A loyal companion or spouse, are things majority of people wish to have and spend their entire lives in pursuit of. To be so loyal and committed to a person, idea or country that you could die for it, was always considered to be the most heroic thing you could do during the entire civilized part of human history. Some people think it still is.

SM, however, frowns heavily upon any form of loyalty. The very fact that loyalty stems out of not gaining anything in return for doing something good to someone is pretty much kin to follow someone without them having to justify (with **material** evidence) why you should follow them. SM tells directly that theorizing without any clear evidence is illogical and shouldn’t be promoted. Yet, theorizing if you should engage in a serious relationship without any clear evidence on whether or not your spouse is going to be loyal to you is a crucial step in life.

I’m trying, I’m trying really hard, but I can’t put it in any other way: following evidence = following money & materialism. This is what SM aspires for us to do. “Follow whatever works, whatever can make a good prediction of the weather tomorrow.” If a friend or spouse lets you down, that means he/she isn’t good for you. After all, a scientific theory must be falsifiable. Wait, what happened to loyalty as a virtue?

It’s just, you can’t apply this kind of thinking on the “real world”. (Or well, you can, but that would make others perceive you as a pretty selfish and unforgiving person.) Unfortunately, since SM works so well in schools and at universities, most people don’t leave the scientific method there, but take it home with them.

This teaching of the scientific method coincides with the occultists ideas and life dogmas. Do you think they sell their souls for nothing? Off course not. It's important that whomever you choose must pay you the most. SM pays us the most in terms of technology and satisfies mankind's material lust better than any other religion. And what does the scientific method teach? Exactly that. To follow the biggest pile of money, the "best" and most satisfactory-for-your-mind /consciousness evidence (this is a direct build on the ground I mapped in part #2). (Combine that with appeal to majority and you've got yourself an almost undefeatable bandwagon fallacy, i.e. scientific method.)

This is in fact why science can never be consistent with itself. In the first article I mentioned how scientific communities sometimes accept preservation of older theories over truth. This is because it is a part of human nature to be loyal. SM, however, teaches directly against such loyalty. It goes against the human nature. Therefore, we **will** have things like "bad science", and **we** will have things like scientific paradigms. It is inevitable, because loyalty is a part of us, and it is impossible to get rid of altogether.

What's interesting is that there is not a single major religion on the face of the Earth that doesn't recognize loyalty as a human virtue. Except science that is. Makes you wonder...

Christian gibberish (you have been warned): I believe personally that the reason why science is so much against conservatism and loyalty, is because Satan, or Dajjal (which I personally think is a much more suitable name) would rather people be loyal to no one, than be loyal to God. You see, Satan/Dajjal wins even if people do not worship him. He wins simply by people not worshipping God. Therefore, he must promote either worshipping of himself, or discrediting worshipping altogether. Which science does.

Reading scientific history promotes not to be loyal and not to be steadfast to any idea or principle, to be "open-minded", except when it comes to being close minded. See what I did there? If a person is truly open-minded, and they would be proven that being close-minded is better for them, should such person then not accept close-mindedness as a better alternative? If the reader is beginning to think that we are getting too heavy on wordplay, I just want to remind them of this: we are playing a philosophical game of chess against God's allegedly most intelligent creation. Alas, the game is very sophisticated, every possible move by both us and our opponent must be considered wisely. Even one little misstep can lead to checkmate on either side.

II: Megalomania. This is going to sound weird, just like most of my assertions, but SM actually teaches megalomania. You see, all this promotion of "we are just animals", "there is nothing special with us", etc, etc.. is just an outward painting to hide the exact opposite for those who don't pay much attention. (Similar to how movies & pop-songs have several layers of different messages.)

I will give you a short example. I will not examine it too much since I think it should be self-testifying.

Humans are just animals, the Earth is not special in any way. These humans then go on to say that they will believe that an almighty, all-knowing creator of the universe exists if this creator presents "itself" under "accepted conditions". Those conditions are Monday-Friday 9-17, except 11-12, because then its lunch, at a certain place, in a way that satisfies these humans.

If the example I just showed doesn't make it clear that the true goal of SM is to inspire to megalomania, to make us believe that we can demand, not just say, but demand of creator of the universe and our souls Himself what do to and how to do it, then I don't know what will. To say to the omnipotent creator of the universe that one wouldn't believe in "it" unless "it" presents evidence is to literally tell creator of the universe to be ones bitch and do what one says.

Confirms yet another way of thought that occultists share: that they are greater than God almighty Himself.

III: Materialism. The biggest morale lesson that SM will ever teach anyone is this: only materialism

matters. Whenever anyone asks for “evidence”, they never ask for wisdom or internal happiness. The focus seems to always lie on **material** evidence, doesn’t it? Matter, matter, matter... That’s the only thing SM has ever cared about.

“Philosophy?”

“Great!”

“Logic?”

“Awesome!”

“Math?”

“Wonderful... But what **matter** do you have?”

Isn’t that the one-and-only decisive point in all of scientific discussions throughout past two hundred years?

Material lust, lust for gold, money, fame, power, pleasure of the flesh (sex) has always been around. But they have always been seen as something bad, something unwanted, unworthy of human time and life. People have killed each other over jewelry and spouses since the beginning of ages. However, what SM does, **that nothing else has ever done in the entire span of human history, is that it makes this lust for materialism legitimate**. SM says “what **else** is there but matter?”, “What else is there but **flesh**?... I encourage the reader to sit back and ponder at the depth of these questions for a while.

More Christian gibberish. I often hear, not only atheists, but people all over the world today saying “do the most with your life”, “be all you can be”. To me that sounds dangerously close to “Do what thou wilt”. One thing I noticed about all major religions in the world, is that none of them promote this way of thinking. **Not one.** Surely Satan/Dajjal had his fingers in all religions, but the universal truth that God gave men about materialism can be confirmed throughout all religions: **do not be materialistic**. Is it not then intriguing that SM challenges this very statement by saying “What else is there except matter? C’mon now, what else is there? Look what materialism can give us! Medicine, electric trains, power plants, engines of internal combustion. And your option, dear religion, to be the least you can be with your life? Ha! What has it given you, where has it taken you?”.

I’m not usually a person you would call bible thumper, but I find the following quote from KJV Bible very fitting in this context:

“For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” – Mathew 16:26

Is that not yet again such a marvelous coincidence that contemporary science and scientific method promote the exact same way of thinking that modern culture does? That only materialism goes. That what’s important is only what you can see, hear, and touch.

And of course, is that not what all these occultists ultimately sell their souls for? Materialistic pleasure? In all honesty, if one’s personal moral compass starts to point the same direction that Aleister Crowley’s did, is it then not time to stop and check where one gets moral principles from?

IV: Removal of superstition. Not as much a “satanic truth” per se, more of a “satanic agenda”.

Watch the following video with Michael Shermer.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DmXIEvum6PQ>

He says it straight into your face: “be superstitious, else you die fool”. How can the best possible argument **for** superstition be used **against** it? He literally gives the best possible reason to why we all should watch out for Satan and conspiracy theories, rather than deny them and wag them away with our hands like a bad joke. Do you see how hard people are being played? Like a damn flute.

Now, I understand everyone who comes back with “but we are not running in jungles anymore”. But that’s not the point he made in the video. The point was that superstition helps us survive against predators. Correct me if I’m wrong, but isn’t there one, last, great predator on this planet, the cleverest of them all, that we need to watch out for, closely? You guessed it: ourselves.

Yet again Christian gibberish. The way I think Satan/Dajjal sees it, is actually rather rational/logical. I mean, how is he going to unite the world under a new religion if people are still following all these “competing” religions? The only way to do it is to **erase all existing superstition**, just like you would erase a picture with a rubber on a piece of paper if you want to draw a new picture on the same piece of paper. Isn’t it such a remarkable fact then, that the scientific method works perfectly as a rubber for this job?

Another small addition I’d like to add for all out there who believe we have a soul. Why do you think that it is so important for people **not** to believe that they have a soul? Because why would someone care about losing something they didn’t believe existed in the first place?

Scientific Method as a Major Political Tool

V: Promotion of one world government. Since I live in Sweden, and am fairly interested in politics, I happen to know quite a lot about current political atmosphere here. It’s actually very frightening, and would make any doomsday fanatic scream out of happiness because their affirmation of NWO has just been sent on national TV.

The following video is taken from a Swedish show hosted by famous Swedish comedian. I don’t know much about this show other than this specific clip that I thought was quite thought provoking. It is in Swedish with no English subtitles, so I will just have to simply tell you briefly of what it’s about (you don’t need to watch it). If anyone here knows Swedish/Danish/Norwegian, and think that I summed up the talk presented in the video somewhat incorrectly, they are free to post a better/different summary of the video.

The video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uh4gS0G0eFo>

(Jimmie åkesson – Dark hair, glasses; Betner – the bold guy, the host; David Batra – red shirt with white squares and blue lines, glasses.)

My summary:

The video begins with Betner asking David Batra on his view of what is “typically Swedish”. Batra discusses how his personal view of his identity changes depending on where he travels. He mentions how he felt as a swede in USA, but as an indian in India (since he’s half indian). Then he says how a swedish life consists of drinking American cola and wearing American jeans, eating Turkish kebab, and cheering when Zlatan makes a goal, and asks whether or not these things classify a person as swedish and if this is “swedish identity”.

Do you see the argument? “What is swedish identity”? By default, I can ask that question of every single nation on the entire face of the Earth. Read the following argument and tell me what you think:

“Nationalism is just an old superstition, an unjustified belief that we are all separated by invisible lines. This erroneous belief cost billions of people their lives throughout history, as well as been undoubtedly the single biggest reason to all of human suffering. If it is true that we are indeed separated by some magical boundaries, where is the defining factor of them? What is American? What is Russian? Can anyone prove, with evidence, that eating meatballs is a character trait of Swedish culture alone? What about eating turkey? Are there any scientific evidence that this is in fact more American than French? If a person from Spain eats turkey and celebrates Thanksgiving because they happened to come to United States to visit their cousin during this one week, does this makes them an “American”? What constitutes a “Mexican”? Are we all not “just people”? If there are no scientific evidence that we are indeed separated by our cultures, that separate cultures even exist, then why don't we all just unite in one big nation we call Earth and throw that superstition we call nationalism into garbage bin?”

If you cannot prove that Russia, or Germany, or US, or any other country actually exists, as in, if you have no proof of the very existence of United States outside of people's heads, then such an idea is by definition superstitious. Do you see how scientific method is the perfect tool for destruction of any form of nationalism? By simply saying that you have no evidence of Canadian culture, or nation, even existing, I just painted you as an irrational, delusional, lunatic, ultra nationalist if you for some reason would not embrace one world government with open arms.

I made up the example in cursive above as I was writing this, but honestly, what would you say to defend your nation if your local group of politicians were saying this to you? If you can't prove that American/French/English culture exists, then why should you preserve something you can't even prove to exist?

VI: Preparation for the coming of Antichrist/Dajjal. If we are to assume, hypothetically, a scenario where a certain individual can perform miracles and claims to be God/Jesus, then scientific method will play a huge *political* role in giving power to such a person. If a person could perform scientifically reproducible miracles, then the chances are that those who believe in science will also believe this person when he/she(it claims to be of a supernatural descent).

Now, here's the problem: what if this person is lying? What defense does atheism, or any other philosophical dogma which bases itself on the premise of methodological naturalism being ontologically true, has against such a deception?

I'd like to share a couple of thoughts, though they don't contribute much to the topic. When I ponder at this question I always get a vision. I see people gathering around a Christ type figure and a group of people standing a bit away and looking. I see those standing around this Christ type figure laughing at people standing aside, saying “all this time they believed without evidence, now that their God has come in flesh and has evidence for them, they won't accept it!”. They stand their laughing, but the people standing aside have sad faces. They know who the person offering the miracles truly is, because they chose not to hear with their ears and see with their eyes, but hear with their hearts and see with their souls.

Grand Scale of Things A.K.A. Even More Christian Gibberish

Unfortunately, the knife was designed to specifically cut the psychology and morals of the user as often as possible, therefore I feel all the more urge to point out its exact design and what its purpose is. How do I know this? The same way all conspiracy theorists know which conspiracies are true and which aren't: too many coincidences. Is it a coincidence, that just in case we need to create and unite the world under one new religion, that scientific method works as a perfect tool to erase all the previous religions? Is it a coincidence, that the scientific method would also help one world government, in case politicians would

start drawing lines between nationalism and superstition? Is it a coincidence that scientific, rationale, method and history, all teach satanic “truths”? Such as that loyalty is bad, or that we, humans, decide what’s real or what’s not real depending on how satisfactory it is for our mind? Is it a coincidence that scientific method is the biggest promoter of naturalism and materialism?

When I try to look at it from a larger perspective this plan falls into the “problem-reaction-solution” category quite elegantly.

There are two parts to this plan.

I: Problem = Religious institutions persecuting scientific knowledge -> Reaction = people getting tired of this and wanting to know the truth about the universe -> Solution = scientific method and slow-but-secure eradication of all religion and all superstition.

II: Problem = we need a new religion because people innately know that they have a soul, and that this world isn’t the end and that there is a world beyond this one -> Reaction = New Age beliefs, et.al. -> Solution = a new religion uniting the world, confirmed by science and led by Antichrist/Dajjal.

In Conclusion

I would like to end this part of series, focused on scientific method and its morale associations, by saying that the scientific method is a knife, and it’s excellent for cooking, but it can’t help you sleep, or walk your dog, or take your children to school, or wash your car. Too often do college professors nowadays say “Well, if the knife can’t help you sleep, you shouldn’t sleep, if the knife can’t help you walk your dog, you shouldn’t walk your dog...” etc, etc. In other words, the scientific method seems to preach that unless you can prove something through the scientific method itself, it’s not real, and shouldn’t be considered to be a part of our “collective” reality. This is what appealing to majority for a long time can lead to, if left unchecked. Ergo why I firmly think that scientific community time-to-time needs people like Kuhn coming in and saying “Ah-ah, being a bit biased there I see”.

So, to conclude this, and to shed light on the whole point of this and previous article: I don’t think that scientific method and science itself are “evil”, but simply by knowing about symbolism that they bring with them from inside of the scientific machine, the reader can consider half of the battle already won.

A movie that is filled with occult symbolism is not, per definition, a “bad” movie. Science works and we still push forward limits of our technology and our understanding of the universe, despite the satanic messages it unravels. Simply be aware of the implications of science on our morality, and don’t use the scientific method as a personal compass on how to live your life, who to marry, whether or not to support your country, or what religion to adhere to. Simply put: just as you leave emotions at home when entering a science laboratory, leave the scientific method in the same laboratory when you step out.