

THE Science Community

For starters - THE Science is an oxymoron. There's no THE science - well there is - we're living with it - but *real* science doesn't work like that. There's information gathered, analysed, reported - to support **a** (not THE) hypothesis - amongst a range of other hypotheses. The spirit of science - is to say: *here's what i've come up with - here's my reasoning - prove me wrong - I welcome the scrutiny*


Not: yell at/ban anyone asking questions. What's up with that?

The media kept telling us: (T)he *vast majority of scientists* who have studied the virus agree that it evolved naturally (and are tired of fighting) conspiracy theories that have **plagued** attempts to keep people **informed** during the pandemic (such as) .. the idea that the coronavirus was created in a laboratory.

That tells me that *the vast majority of scientists*@universities/institutions are: complicit.

Nature even drops the *vast majority* qualifier saying:

Image not found or type unknown



Scientists believe - those two words sum up everything about how we got into this mess.

Scientists - not *some* scientists, not *most*, but ***scientists*** - as a species - *believing* - same as a religion - then vilifying anyone questioning their beliefs.

This from: *Nature's Editors. THE Science's* official mouthpiece

On one hand *Nature* waffles on about the sovereign rightness of their empirical agnosticism - on the other hand:

- *Now i'm a Believer!* -

What is it you believe again?

that an animal is the most likely source of the coronavirus

Not sure if that's simply bad English or a cunningly left back-door exit for later. Humans *are* animals. *See - we never ruled that out - we were right all along!*

Even some scientists who questioned the origin of Covid fell into this trap:

The only way of proving the true origin is through science - everyone else needs to stand back - let us take up the fight - don't muddy our waters with your unscientific speculations. (I'm paraphrasing someone here)

Aitologically speaking, I lean towards the conclusion that that's the same wrong-headed empiricist-thinking that caused Covid.

I know they *mean well* - scientific input *is* valuable - I'm not anti-science - but scientists - or anyone - segregating the truth into their closed-society domain ... please don't do that - it does *more harm than good*.

The fatal flaw with Empiricism is *believing* you are right. That *only you* have the solution.

Then insisting everyone else *believes* you - unquestioningly.

That's a guaranteed recipe for *getting it wrong*. It's also a dangerous breeding ground for tyrannical thought - as we've seen.

Scientists - for or against: Present your info - argue your case - but don't ask us to *believe you!*

Science is *part of* the answer - empiricism has something to contribute - but be humble enough to recognize that it was this same culture that caused then covered-up Covid - with it's consequential War-on-Freedom. It cannot be brushed over - it needs fundamental deconstruction/reform.

Empiricists are great at looking at trees - in microscopic detail - not noted for transcending that mindset - to see the forest. The *Shakespearean tragedy* is they think they can - but they can't. Then the fallout from that hubris.

That's where we need our discarded humanities thinkers* back in the band - involved in decisions that require forest-seeing skills. Or normal people with common sense will do fine.

(*Australia's government recently raised fees for [History and Philosophy students by 113%](#) - to discourage them - because, they *believe*, such knowledge does not have economic value in today's society.)

Why science is not the answer to a problem caused by science:

Premise: Modern Science (Empiricism), by its own definition, involves an immense amount of minutiae.

Including unrevealed bits of minutiae, which, in turn, provide wiggle room for counter arguments/misinformation tactics - that the mainstream science community will exploit - like their lives depend on it - which they do.

For example: Worobey - Oxford chums from the 90's with Farrar, Gao, Eddie, Rambaut - pops up for a rear-guard action with his Dec *Patient-Zero* silliness splashed across all media like it was the last nail-in-the-coffin of the lab-leakers. The goal is not to present truth - it's, paradoxically, purely about muddying the waters. It works great - if you do it long enough. People still think SARS came from civets.

Then there's the matter of *the holy grail* for some of the lab-leak-scientists. If you're going the scientific hard-data route, you're racing to find what, exactly?

An exact genetic match on a WIV database - which was taken offline.

All on-site samples have been destroyed.

That shit's not gonna magically reappear. The *smoking gun* has long since gone up in smoke.

If that's your definition of proof you're playing into the hands of those who seek to cover it up - they can forever say it remains unresolved.

Fighting the might of the science community on their own turf/terms, is to take on an empire that has never lost a match when it comes to dragging origins into a *muddled memory*.

same as [SARS](#)

same as [MERS](#)

same as [HIV](#)

same as [Ebola](#)-14 outbreak - Constantine Nana wrote a book on it in 2016 - it's persuasive.)

same as Anthrax

Meanwhile the poor-old *normal person* is told to wait outside patiently for an answer that's never coming - not before we're engulfed by the next world drama, anyway.

To borrow Andersen/Rambaut/Holmes's phrase, there's a:

much simpler and more cost-effective way

deduction -

Scientists will say: *Yes, but it's not real science.*

Sure it is. It's logic - which is philosophy - which is the original science. Done properly, there's no wiggle-room.

Here's an easy example:

1. Scientific discussions relating to the Feb 1 Teleconf were hidden from view (redacted)*
2. Therefore the participants are hiding something
3. All Feb 1 Teleconferencers are leading anti-lab-leak advocates
4. Therefore; they're **not** hiding information that supports their case
5. Therefore; they *are* hiding information that potentially incriminates them
6. Therefore; they are *suspects*
7. Therefore; #dack-the-redactions - interview the *suspects*. Give them lie detectors - apply interrogative pressure - one of them will spill.
8. Case solved.

(*some discussions have been released after this was written - they do incriminate the [Feb 1 Teleconferencers](#) big-time - exactly as hypothesized - but still no interrogation)

So simple, right? Don't have to be a scientist to understand it - or prosecute it.

But the real beauty is:

*it's simple to **disprove***

No decades-long investigation presided over by a closed-society. All you gotta do is unredact the emails relating to the Feb 1 Teleconference - we could know the origin - either way - *natural* or *not* - as soon as this afternoon.

These are not private sextings from sports stars that the media Hungergames for/publishes - they're *the* scientific decision-making details of public-funded experts who helmed the world's response to Covid. The biggest global catastrophe since WW2. That war was fought to stop fascism. The Covid Response amounts to a war on freedom. We have a right to know the root cause.

Ohr, no, we couldn't do that because ...you know ... uhmm ... these are complicated matters...uhm.. I could explain it ...but ...you know ... you wouldn't understand.

We're not asking you to explain - we're asking you to unredact the science discussion.

Uhm... we are committed to being [as transparent as we can be](#), in principle - but people need to understand that's not the way it works in the science world. (not real quote, except for Farrar's [as transparent as we can be](#))

Exactly, that's why we need *the* scientists to dial down their domination tendencies - let logic have a go. Really, it's *not* complicated.

Revision #7

Created 29 December 2021 23:21:23 by dulanrft

Updated 9 February 2022 23:27:27 by dulanrft