



Science as the Last Dogma: An Ironic Reflection

Manfred Doepp

HolisticCenter, 13 Haupt St., Abtwil 9030, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

There are several crises in our world, the allegedly dangerous content of which was initiated by scientists. Ever since the Club of Rome proclaimed the climate crisis in 1972 ("The Limits to Growth", 1,2), we have lived in fear that normal life on earth will soon no longer be possible. If it was acid rain back then, today it is CO₂ production, always man-made. Until recently, we lived in fear of the Covid-19 virus and around 2/3 of people underwent an insufficiently tested and probably dangerous vaccination, the composition of which was unclear. Today, we are astonished to see excess mortality and "post-vac syndrome". Conclusion : We should be suspicious when "The Science" publishes something. It may not be the truth.

INTRODUCTION

Thesis: A science that wants to force us to submit to a consensus and does not allow any debate or further development is acting unscientifically. For example, it forced us to accept the coronavirus measures as "without alternative". Now science and politicians are rowing back. Today, it makes it seem unavoidable to accept all climate protection measures - mostly bans - from the Green arsenal without objection. Science is the last generally recognized body of thought with compelling force at a time when faith in the church, political ideologies and dogmas has declined considerably. What is meant here is not the caliphate as the successor to the Catholic Church with its unique mixture of ecclesiastical and secular rule.

The author is talking about science. Today, this is understood to be static and closed, although a look at the history of science should show that today's truth is always tomorrow's ridiculed nonsense. Above all, it is completely unscientific to assume an inviolable majority opinion (the mainstream narrative) that allows no contradiction. If someone understands science in this way, it can be cited that they do not know what they are talking about, but have the desire to exercise power over people's minds. (3,4,5,6)

OUR APPROACH TO SCIENCE

Ears have the major disadvantage that, unlike the eyes, they cannot be closed. Whatever sounds are heard in the surroundings penetrate unhindered, and electrical devices ensure that the propaganda message being put out in the distance is at least passively perceived. Eyes, on the other hand, are closed when a sight becomes too difficult to bear.

So we need other strategies that make it possible to block out all too annoying nonsense, both acoustically and visually. There are such strategies. You could call them "attention control", and it takes training for them to really work: as soon as you hear a sentence that begins with "Science agrees that...", it's better to switch off. "Science agrees that..." means roughly the same as "All advertising posters say that...". So it means almost nothing.

Basically, this applies to every sentence that begins with "Science" or even just contains this phrase, be it "Science says" or "We can trust Science". Children learn in kindergarten when they hear words like "biology", "physics" and "chemistry" for the first time and are told that these are sciences of which there are at least several.

Later, people learn that there are, for example, imprecise and exotic and forbidden sciences, as well as auxiliary sciences, scientific theories, scientific sciences and also several different, conflicting schools of mathematics, physics, history, cultural sciences, pseudo-sciences, and so on. You have to learn that results and opinions that you can find on YouTube are to be doubted, whereas publications from universities are unquestionable. (7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15)

DOES "SCIENCE" EXIST?

If, for example, Albert Einstein and Max Planck had not denied Newton's physics models, we would know next to nothing about the universe today, and any honest physicist will confirm that, despite Planck and Einstein, we know next to nothing about the universe. There are models and hypotheses that have a certain degree of probability, nothing more. The strange terms *dark energy* and *dark matter* demonstrate this. Current truths are nothing more than current theses of ignorance; tomorrow they will be outdated. Nevertheless, every scientist stands at the catheder and says with full conviction: "As we know today, this and that is so and so". Which means nothing other than that what we knew in yesterday's present was at least inadequate or an untruth.

Because physics as a science does not consist of explaining to laypeople that a ripe apple falls from a tree and does not rise again. A somewhat more daring physicist might explain that one could theoretically claim that the apple stays in place while the tree and planet move a few meters upwards; it just depends on the "reference system". After all, everyone can see that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, so the sun must revolve around the earth: this was science until Galileo. (16,17,18,19,20)

But the thing that we are so urgently supposed to "trust" and "follow" is not science, but "**The Science**", and that is something else. Unfortunately, you can't see it, and you can only hear it if you emphasize it correctly. "Science" is a homonym (a homonym (Greek "of the same name") is a word that stands for different concepts or contents).

There can certainly not be a "consensus" within and between the sciences, which according to the dictionary means: "agreement, consent, analogous agreement of the will and declaration of intent of two contracting parties". (21) How is this possible when we are talking about different things in different contexts and terminologies? It is perhaps helpful to read the explanation under the German-Latin foreign word "consensus" that a "consensus communis" is the "general agreement of the Catholic Church on a doctrinal issue (i.e. evidence for the correctness of a dogma, 22)".

Consequently, we find that a science in which there is apparently a **consensus** is called the Inquisition and serves the purpose of maintaining power. And the Church has always been wrong when it comes to interpreting things, whether it's Giordano Bruni, Galileo Galilei, witches, heretics or children possessed by the devil. It just takes a few centuries for them to admit it. In earlier times, scientists were as dependent on the church as they are on the

mainstream today. The same applies to journalists: those who work in an editorial office with a focus on facts and background have little chance against the attitude journalists who know what their employers expect them to write. And they can always claim that their preconceived or predetermined attitude/opinion is in line with the vast majority of scientists.

"Science" is a strict, dogmatic, yet thoroughly contradictory and unscientific belief system - no, actually not even a system, but a confused arsenal of commandments and prohibitions, underpinned with illogical "models", peppered with inappropriate and inexplicable nonsense technical terms, which are served up as "no alternative" instructions for action, which - and this is the most important thing about it - are supposed to alleviate or solve or prevent or overcome crises and disasters, which are always of an existential nature. (23,24,25)

EXISTENTIAL RESULTS?

Existential means: if we do not obey "Science", we will die. Alternatively, it could be the planet that dies, or "The Climate" or the universe or the polar bear that can no longer walk on enough ice. In any case, we will die, collectively and generally and very soon, if "we" do nothing or rather do not do what "Science" says. And that is the decisive factor, as it allows any discussion to be nipped in the bud. When the existence of everything is threatened, politics and people with their reason and common sense have to shut up and believe "The Science", obey it and submit to what it demands.

In modern war, as it has been defined and waged by the "West" since around 1999, it is the same, but in reverse: here, negotiations with Satan and contacts with his people are forbidden - but not in order to prevent catastrophic mass death, but so that it can continue undisturbed, for the benefit of the arms industry and its collateral profiteers. Discussion and debate are not allowed in this case either, because the enemy is always the evil one, and the prehistory and genesis of a war are not taken into account.

Back to "Science": it has been telling us for decades that humans are destroying "the climate" with their CO₂ and that the world is therefore "existentially endangered". The time of doom is repeatedly postponed by five or ten years into the future, but it is inevitable that it will come. That is why mankind must be reined in and tightened up, it must tighten its belt, restrict and mortify itself and suffer and starve and obey the orders of "Science" in order to save what can still be saved, with trillions of taxpayers' money and right now. Because it is one minute to twelve since the Club of Rome announced it in 1972 (1,2)

Let's take a look at Donald Duck: there, too, we learned what to think of "science" and that it is not to be trusted. Daniel Jet Propulsion and Professor Knox knew more about the world than Professors Fauci (USA, 26) and Drosten (Germany, 27) put together, but if you trusted them and gave their "science" free rein, the result was rarely anything other than an exploded laboratory, a talking wolf with depression, an empty money bin or a similar disaster. (See also the Asterix volume "The Battle of the Chiefs").

Children know these things because they read Donald Duck and because they are not as religious as adults. Adults allow themselves to be talked into any nonsense, get excited at every warning, think every sunny day is a "summer from hell", every hailstorm is a climate catastrophe and every cough is a pandemic, the main thing is panic. What's more, they are

unconvincingly nailed down and blind to their own gut feelings, which could possibly explain the diet crisis, which has been rampant for about as long as the «climate crisis». Similar to this is the electric car crisis, which will not give the climate a bonus, because the electricity has to be generated by power plants with high losses, whereas oil/petrol/diesel have proven not to be finite. Cows have to be slaughtered all over the world to sink the even more dangerous methane. (28) The terms coincidence, correlation and causality are regularly confused (see Al Gore, 29). How can studies be manipulated? Most likely by omitting undesired results and test subjects. Secondly, by exchanging cause and effect when two variables behave in parallel.

The German Max Planck Institute found out: Man-made interventions into climate change cannot restore the previous climate. A new climate is being created. And : the following weather and climate manipulations are man-made and climate-influencing : Haarp, geoengineering, chemtrails, etc. (30) The Norwegian Institute of Statistics found that CO₂ is not capable of significantly changing the climate. (31) A huge outcry went through the scientific and other climate scenes.

This gives rise to the idea of wishing for conditions like those of the last ice age, in which humans, animals and plants almost died out completely - partly due to a lack of carbon dioxide. Incidentally, anyone who wants to save or protect "the climate" is logically no longer allowed to have children. Because the physical activity required to do so causes too much sweating and heats up the atmosphere. And because children are known to drink vast quantities of carbonated drinks and these only bubble so merrily because they are full to the brim with carbon dioxide, which bubbles out of the children after consumption, whereupon the glaciers melt and the polar bear starves to death and so on and so forth. Trust "The Science"!

CORRECT THESES?

One of the few theories that quite a few scientists agree on is as follows : A nuclear war in Europe would probably mean the end of civilization and human life in general in Europe and possibly beyond. Nevertheless, politicians are calling for the states of Europe to become capable of war again (as they were before 1939). (32)

Instead of maneuvering us back into the Ice Age by force and with potentially catastrophic consequences, the mass army of climate hysterics and other para-religious fanatics could use their energy to prevent a few insane politicians from bombing us back into the Stone Age. On the other hand, it has been historically proven that mass panic hysteria such as the millennium delusion and the climate delusion and almost every mass delusion of the last thousand years usually fade away very suddenly and are immediately replaced by the next delusion after a phase of disillusionment.

One suggestion : How about combating the man-made shifting of continental plates, which will inevitably lead to countries sinking and being turned into magma along with wind turbines and highways? Or do we tackle the really big thing right away? In about five billion years, the sun will explode as a supernova and swallow the Earth whole. This will certainly be due to human activities, such as the reckless tapping of solar energy using solar cells. And Bill Gates or Klaus Schwab - who will then only be living on USB sticks but will still be considered the world's greatest experts - or one of their enlightened world leader successors will certainly succeed in finding a technical solution to the problem, which will also lead to billions of people really

tightening their belts to the limit and the world leaders' foundations skimming off a few trillion dollars.

This won't save anyone or anything, but it has to be done because "Science" confirms and demands it.

CONCLUSION

In the early universities of the Middle Ages, doctors had to defend their theses and dissertations, professors had to defend their habilitations against other opinions, there was a culture of academic debate and unpleasant questions were asked. That was a good academic culture. Because today a majority decides on the so-called truth. Scientists who subscribe to the mainstream narrative (the so-called consensus) have nothing to fear. This applies in particular to proclaimed crises, be they caused by pandemics, wars or climate change. Alternative minority opinions and their publications are frowned upon or declared unscientific. It would be useful to note that the majority does not always represent the truth.

References

1. Dennis Meadows et al.: The limits to growth - Report of the Club of Rome on the state of humanity, DVA, Stuttgart 1972, ISBN 3-421-02633-5
2. Mihailo Mesarović, Eduard Pestel: Mankind at the turning point - 2nd report to the Club of Rome on the world situation, DVA, Stuttgart 1974, ISBN 3-421-02670-X
3. James Lawrence Powell: The Inquisition of Climate Science. New York 2012, p. 178.
4. Uri Shwed, Peter S. Bearman: The Temporal Structure of Scientific Consensus Formation. In: *American Sociological Review*. Vol 75, No 6, 2010, pp. 817-840, doi:10.1177/0003122410388488.
5. Peter T. Doran, Maggie Kendall Zimmerman: Examining the Scientific Consensus on Climate Change. In: *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*. Vol 90, No 3, 2009, ISSN 0096-3941, p. 22, doi:10.1029/2009E0030002
6. John Cook, Naomi Oreskes, Peter T Doran, William R L Anderegg, Bart Verheggen: Consensus on consensus: a synthesis of consensus estimates on human-caused global warming. In: *Environmental Research Letters*. Vol 11, No 4, April 01, 2016, ISSN 1748-9326, p. 048002
7. Jürgen Mittelstraß et al (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Philosophy and Philosophy of Science (1980-1996)*, Vol 1-4, Metzler, Stuttgart 1995 (new ed. 2005).
8. Helmut Seiffert, Gerard Radnitzky (Eds.): *Handlexikon zur Wissenschaftstheorie*. 2nd ed. dtv, Berlin 1992, ISBN 3-423-04586-8
9. Andreas Bartels, Manfred Stöckler (Eds.): *Wissenschaftstheorie. Ein Studienbuch*. mentis, Paderborn 2007
10. Dominique Lecourt (Ed.): *Dictionnaire d'histoire et philosophie des sciences*. P.U.F., Paris 1999 (new ed. 2006, ISBN 2-13-054499-1)
11. R. Boyd, P. Gasper, J. D. Trout (Eds.): *The Philosophy of Science*. MIT Press, Cambridge 1991
12. Martin Curd, J. A. Cover (Eds.): *Philosophy of science: the central issues*. Norton, New York/ London 1998, ISBN 0-393-97175-9

13. Marc Lange (Ed.): Philosophy of science: an anthology. (= Blackwell philosophy anthologies. 25). Blackwell, Malden, Mass. 2007
14. Peter Machamer (Ed.): The Blackwell guide to the philosophy of science. (= Blackwell philosophy guides. 7). Blackwell, Malden, Mass. 2002, ISBN 0-631-22108-5
15. W. H. Newton-Smith (Ed.): A companion to the philosophy of science. (= Blackwell companions to philosophy. 18). Blackwell, Malden, Mass. 2000, ISBN 0-631-17024-3.
16. Walter Brandmüller: Galilei und die Kirche oder Das Recht auf Irrtum. Pustet-Verlag, Regensburg 1982, ISBN 3-7917-0743-4
17. Albrecht Fölsing: Galileo Galilei: A trial without end. Rowohlt-Verlag, Reinbek, 1996, ISBN 3-499-60118-4
18. Matthias Dorn: Das Problem der Autonomie der Naturwissenschaften bei Galilei. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2000, ISBN 3-515-07127-X, pp. 75 ff
19. John Milton: Areopagitica. In: Ernest Sirluck (Ed.): Complete Prose Works. Vol 2. New Haven 1959, p. 538.
20. S. Drake: 1. The Title Page and Preface of Galileo's "Dialogue". pp. 5-21, in: Essays on Galileo and the History and Philosophy of Science. Vol 2. Toronto, Buffalo/London 1999
21. Duden, The dictionary of origins. Etymology of the German language. Topic: "Consensus". Dudenverlag, Mannheim/Leipzig/Vienna/Zurich 2006
22. https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/ADB:Spinola,_Christoph_Rojas
23. Uri Shwed, Peter S. Bearman: The Temporal Structure of Scientific Consensus Formation. In: American Sociological Review. Vol 75, No 6, 2010, pp. 817-840, doi:10.1177/0003122410388488
24. Naomi Oreskes: The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change. In: Science. Vol 306, No 5702, 2004, p. 1686, doi:10.1126/science.1103618
25. Paul C. Stern: Sociology. Impacts on climate change views. In: Nature Climate Change. Vol 6, 2016, pp. 341-342, doi:10.1038/nclimate2970
26. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthony_Fauci
27. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_Drosten
28. <https://www.thaimbc.com/2024/06/14/13-nations-sign-agreement-to-engineer-global-famine-by-destroying-food-supply/>
29. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_activism_of_Al_Gore
30. <https://www.mpg.de/5882583/geo-engineering>
31. Article of Dagsvik/Moen: <https://go.apa.at/x4EmyJTU> (archived: <https://perma.cc/6EDZ-E8JK>)
32. <https://www.noz.de/deutschland-welt/politik/artikel/nah-an-ruestungsbranche-lobbycontrol-kritisiert-strack-zimmermann-40051162>