

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:



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