“Metapsychology” and Other Ideas of Sigmund Freud – Critical Analysis

≈≈

Supplement 1

L’Aquila Earthquake, Fukushima Nuclear Catastrophe, Trial of Science, and Survival of Mankind

≈≈

On October 22, 2012, seven members of the Italian National Commission for the Forecast and Prevention of Major Risks were convicted of manslaughter (309 dead) and sentenced each to six year in prison and restitution. The group includes three seismologists, two engineers, a volcanologist and a public official [w3]; presumably, their crime is downplaying the risk of a major earthquake. The sentence triggered articles in media and intense reaction of scientists and the scientific societies, because the perception is that “science itself has been put on trial” [w10].

The German National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina and the French Académie Des Sciences issued statement in support of intention of the Italian National Academy of Sciences to set up “an independent expert commission of geologists and legal experts” to evaluate the L’Aquila verdict [w14].

Other reactions might be divided into two groups – two interpretations of the same facts [see the list of the web publications with the facts, arguments, and evaluations, on which my Post is based, in the ***References*** to the entire file]:

1/ Emotional defense of the scientists with comparison of the sentence to medieval persecution of science and “witch hunt”; even Galileo’s name is evoked to convince that the lawsuit and verdict are unjust [w6, 9, 11, 12, 13]. This group of arguments intends to associate the contemporary court with the medieval Inquisition, therefore, to portray the accused as the martyrs for the science.

The rationale behind emotions is that earthquake cannot be predicted, thus, the accused members of the Italian National Commission for the Forecast and Prevention of Major Risks are not responsible for their assurance of L’Aquila residents that the earthquake will not happen (that is disregard of a possibility of the earthquake) and the consequent death of the people who relied on their opinion and did not leave the dangerous zone.

Consequently,

– Italy Environment Minister Corrado Clini hopes that the verdict will be overturned, “because it is impossible to make precise and timely predictions of earthquakes" [w5] and the verdict might confirm the principle that “no doubt is permitted in any scientific evaluation" [w11]

– the Royal Society of London (the UK) and National Academy of Science (the US) issued joined statement with concerns that the sentence might become a precedent in law, and the “scientists will be afraid to give expert opinion for fear of prosecution or reprisal.” The authors of the statement assert that as soon as government and societies rely on “good scientific advice,” the scientists should be allowed “to contribute what they reasonably can, without being held responsible for forecasts or judgments that they cannot make with confidence” [w4]

– the seismologists in Japan recalled the earthquake and tsunami of March 2011, which was impossible to predict [w12], and which ruined the nuclear plant in Fukushima and triggered the unprecedented nuclear catastrophe (see website http://enenews.com/category/japan/fukushima…). Although worldwide, almost 20% of all yearly earthquakes with magnitude above 6 happen in Japan, a recent meeting of the Seismological Society of Japan stated that “the science of predicting tremors… is today considered very difficult” [w12]

– the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in its letter to the Italian President proclaimed that “The charges against these scientists are both unfair and naïve” [w15].

In summary, the verdict is seen as

a/ direct threat to the freedom of speech [w3]

b/ a possibility of restriction of scientific inquiries and communicating the scientific findings, because of the fear of reprisal for “honest errors” [w1, 4]

c/ “absurd and dangerous” [w12].

2/ The second group of arguments supports the verdict, which pronounced that the accused have provided “superficial and ineffective” assessment of seismic risk and disclosed “inaccurate, incomplete and contradictory” information regarding earthquake danger [w12]. Although the scientists assumed responsibility to evaluate the actual risk, they have disregarded the factors pointing to the increased probability of earthquake (such as multiple tremors and history of earthquakes in region [w7, 11]), or simply “didn't do their job” [w1]. For instance, the article in *Economist* suggests analogy with a physician “who ignored orthodox remedies, with fatal results” [w3].

Fabio Alessandroni, a civil lawyer who represents the relatives of victims, provided the following summary of the case: “It is possible to predict a risk and to adopt measures that mitigate that risk…it’s what the commission is supposed to do, taking various elements, like a city’s seismic history, into account. And this was not done in L’Aquila” [w13].

According to the L’Aquila survivors,

1/ scientists “reassured us and then we died in our homes”

2/ the civil protection agency summoned the experts “specifically to reassure people”

3/ “there were no evacuation plans that could save lives” [w11, 15]

4/ the scientists have to be punished not for the failure to predict earthquake, but for “unreasonable reassurances that no earthquake would come” [w6].

Indeed, although the scientists worldwide argue that it is not possible to predict when an earthquake happens, and therefore the Italian scientists should not be held responsible for the failure to predict the earthquake, in L’Aquila case, the scientists – “cream of Italy's earthquake experts” [w11] – assumed the ability to predict that the earthquake will not happen.

Consequently, it should be either unknown circumstances or additional information, which could explain the actions of the group of the Italian scientists in L’Aquila.

Three facts (1/ 2/ and 3/) facilitate comprehension of the science fiasco in L’Aquila.

1/ Italian laboratory technician/researcher Giampaolo (in another article Gioacchino) Giuliani spoke (on Italian television) of his expectations of a major earthquake a month before it happened, after measuring increased level of radioactive radon emitted from the ground. Director of the Civil Defence Guido Bertolaso accused Mr. Giuliani of “being alarmist,” and Mr. Giuliani was forced to remove his findings from the Internet. A week before the main quake, Mr. Giuliani sent cars with loudspeakers, which drove around the area broadcasting the researcher's warning that an earthquake would happen soon. He was reported to police for “causing fear” among the local population [w7, 8].

Consequently, some of defenders of L’Aquila experts put blame for the verdict on Mr. Giuliani, because of his attempt to warn the people of the region. For instance, Erik Klemetti, the “assistant professor of Geosciences” with “passion in geology” of volcanoes, made references to “the charlatans who claim to be able to “predict” earthquakes” and “witch hunts,” and asked the question: “If Giampaolo Giuliani hadn’t bandied about his unsubstantiated claims about radon being used to predict the earthquake – which caused undue panic and uncertainty that the government tried to quell – would these seven be potentially headed to jail?” [w9].

As the philosophers of the past knew, unbiased reasoning (that is the irreplaceable quality of the scientific mind) and passions are incompatible. If “scientific passion” results in insults of other people because they have courage to make their point of view known, even if all the official science is against them, that is when

the “witch hunt” happens. “Witch hunt” definition is not relevant, if the people are held responsible for the consequences of their actions and failure to perform their duties.

In addition, although the increase of the level of emission of radioactive radon is not directly linked with exact time–space point of the following earthquake, as of today, nobody has confirmed that increased level of emission of radioactive radon is not connected with earthquakes***Σ1***.

2/ At the time preceding L’Aquila earthquake, Director of the Civil Defence Guido Bertolaso was under investigation for corruption and his telephone was wiretapped. The investigators overheard that Guido Bertolaso has intention to stage a “media event” to “quite imbeciles” that fear an earthquake [w6] (or to “shut up any imbecile” [w3]) and to take legal actions against a local scientist who informed the people that the earthquake is imminent, because he detected increased level of radon emission.

In another wiretap released by prosecutors, Guido Bertolaso instructed Enzo Boschi how to speak to the press after the main earthquake [w6] (in 2009, Mr. Boschi was the leader of Italy's national geology and volcanology institute; after the verdict he compared himself to Galileo [w11]).

As Mr. Vittorini, the local councilor (who as many other people decided to stay home after the reassuring meeting with “the cream of Italy's earthquake experts” and who survived, while his family died under the ruins of his home), inferred, the “wiretaps show the complete control of the state over science” [w6].

3/ The indictment stated that the group of the experts acted as “a chorus without soloists, an organism that speaks with a single voice” [w3].

In summary, as witnesses and published articles describe, the group of experts obediently served the interests of the state and accomplished their mission, which according to Mr. Bertolaso, was to reassure the public and “shut up any imbecile” who fears the earthquake [w3]. However, the experts failed to perform their duties concerning safety of the population – the subjects of the state, the people who make existence of the state possible and whose well–being and life the science and the state are expected to protect [w1, 3, 6, 9, 11].

So, what L’Aquila tragedy can reveal concerning the contemporary science?

What is the role of science and what the society can reasonably expect from the scientists and experts?

As a preliminary note concerning overall position and significance of the contemporary sciences, it might be said that the current domain of “knowledge” called “science” contains many questionable, unproved, and simply false assertions – myths, figments of imagination, which the ordinary people must accept as articles of religious faith. The so–called “experts” disguise their announcements founded on insufficient information or even completely false assumptions with arrogant pretence on extraordinary abilities, superior knowledge, and influence that lift them up over all the others – “imbeciles,” “chaps and chapsesses,” “charlatans,” and other simple mortals – the rest of the world.

The root of such arrogance can be found in Plato’s “consummated/divine philosopher,” the opposite of the mob, a semi–god who knows the thoughts of gods and is destined to rule the others [e.g., in: *Parmenides* 134b–e; *Phaedrus* 249d; *Republic* 500b–d]; it could be easily inferred that “consummated/divine philosopher” is Plato’s self–description, and many scientists, especially those at the top of scientific hierarchies, assume Plato’s outlook.

Concerning the contemporary mostly atheistic reality, Mr. Jenkins infers, “Science has taken the place of religion in a cocoon of uncritical certainty. Those who claim the title “scientist”, be it natural or social, expect to combine the immunity of diplomats and the infallibility of popes” [w1].

From another side, the daily reality of many researchers is that those, who dare to have their own opinion and to exercise the freedom of speech communicating the results of their inquiries and points of view different from those of the official establishments and scientific hierarchs, are subjected to formal and informal sanctions, insults, and reprisal. Their opinions are disregarded (for instance, as was ignored opinion of Kunihiko Shimazaki, professor of seismology at the University of Tokyo, who alerted about vulnerability of Fukushima’s ocean coast [w27]); ultimately, they are either silenced or expelled.

In addition, some facts concerning those who expressed their opinion regarding L’Aquila tragedy would facilitate comprehension of the phenomenon known as “the contemporary science” and make clear the foundation, on which the scientists come to the vision of the world, assemble their science, exercise their “immunity” and “infallibility,” and perceive the verdict as injustice.

It was mentioned above that the Royal Society of London (acting as the UK’s Academy of Sciences) along with NAS of the US [w22] expressed the opinion that the scientists should not be “held responsible for forecasts or judgments that they cannot make with confidence,” that the scientists are entitled to express their judgment made without confidence as the “expert opinion” and “good scientific advice” [w4]; so, the experts must be free of responsibility for their words.

Three preliminary notes:

a/ judgment made without confidence is guess, belief, or assumption/figment of imagination

b/ guess, belief, and assumption/figment of imagination are not products of science: the purpose of science is to create knowledge, which empowers man to act

c/ actions based on beliefs and assumptions lead to collapse and ruin; actions empowered by adequate knowledge of the actuality lead to accomplishment of the purpose for the sake of which the mind seeks knowledge.

The Royal Society was established in A.D. 1662, by Charles II, king of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, the Defender of Faith, etc., etc., etc. The king decided to extend the boundaries of his empire and also the arts and sciences; he “with particular grace” intended to encourage “philosophical studies, especially those which by actual experiments attempt either to shape out a new philosophy or to perfect the old”; so, “the whole world of letters may always recognize” him not only as “the Defender of the Faith, but also as the universal lover and patron of every kind of truth” [w17].

In 1663, the establishment became “The Royal Society of London for improving Natural Knowledge” with perpetual succession and the king as its founder and patron who expected that the studies of his society “are to be applied to further promoting by the authority of experiments the sciences of natural things and of useful arts, to the glory of God the Creator, and the advantage of the human race” [w18].

Therefore, the king created a system that was expected to achieve three purposes:

1/ expansion of the English empire
2/ service to the glory of God the Creator
3/ advantage of the human race.

Consequently, the king (as a founder and as the lover and patron of truth) endowed his system with resources and means to accomplish its purposes: he granted it rights, grants, and privileges, among which are the right to sue and to be sued, the Grant of Arms with Supporters – two “white hounds gorged with crowns,” the right to modify its statutes (within the limits of the law), and to communicate with all sorts of foreigners concerning the philosophical, mathematical, and mechanical subjects. The king also set the model of behavior, compliance with which he expected from the members of his society: they should be distinguished for the study of every kind; they are expected to be “noted for integrity of life, uprightness of character, and piety,” and to “excel in fidelity and affection of mind” toward the king, king’s crown, and dignity [w17, 18].

The Society’s motto “Nullius in verba” – “take nobody's word for it” – expressed the determination of the members to withstand the domination of authority and to verify all statements by an appeal to facts received through experiment [w16].

Among the rights granted by the king, it was a peculiar right to use bodies of executed criminals – “to anatomize them, in ample manner and form, and to all intents and purposes” for “the better success in their philosophical studies” as it is allowed for the College of Physicians and the Company of Surgeons of London [w17].

Initially, the Royal Society included physicians and “natural philosophers” inspired by Francis Bacon***Σ2***. The source of the inspiration (whose career includes posts of the Attorney General and Lord Chancellor of England) was released from his duties at the royal government for corruption and barred from the right to hold official positions and to sit in parliament; in addition, the Francis Bacon’s career advanced through

a/ support for execution of Mary Queen of Scots

b/ support for unification of England, Scotland, and Ireland

c/ cooperation in investigation of treason of his initial benefactor and friend Lord Essex, who was executed [w37].

Francis Bacon’s “revolutionary method” that made him (in Marx’s opinion) “the father of science” (that is the father of Marxist science), is concoction of

a/ materialism

b/ application of Aristotle's logic of simplification***Σ3***, on which Aristotle the ancient slave–owner based his geometrical–physical philosophy–theology and social–political utopia

c/ rejection of the natural philosophy.

The current works published by the Royal Society reveal adherence to the Aristotle's doctrine and Aristotle's logic. For instance, one of the last issues (2012) begins with proclamation: "Humans are animals that specialise {*sic*} in thinking and knowing." Then, the authors express their conviction that they have "chimpanzee cousins and Stone Age ancestors," yet in contrast with them, they are "complex political, economic, scientific and artistic creatures" [w20].

{*The question: is "Stone Age ancestors" pseudonym of Darwinian apes, or something else came up as the result of either anatomizing executed criminals in ample manner and form for the better success in philosophical studies or exceptional devotion to the studies of rodents, which for the contemporary natural sciences became the main objects for studies of the human nature?*}

If to compare the proclamation [w20] that expresses "new thinking" of the members of the Royal Society with the writings of Aristotle, it could be inferred that new thinking and additional complexity [w20] are only in wordings: Aristotle wrote of man as of a political animal; the contemporary scientists use word "humans" and see themselves not only as political, yet also as "complex… creatures" [w20]. However, Aristotle's legacy includes *Oeconomica* – tractate how to manage the household of a slave–owner [*Oeconomica*], and plenty of writings concerning politics, arts, sciences, and even physical–geometrical theology; so, even in his time, man as animal has some other activities, which could differentiate him from the "chimpanzee cousins" of his contemporary descendents. How, then, this "new thinking" of the Royal Society Fellows is different from the thinking of the ancient heathen who lived 24 centuries ago?

Furthermore, Darwinist identification of origin of man ("chimpanzee cousins") and Aristotle's terminology and method of scientific inquiry exclude any slightest relevance of the Royal Society to the service of the glory of God.

In summary, the actual core of the **Royal Society of London for improving Natural Knowledge** is contradiction; for instance,

1/ the Royal Society was established as the system serving the interests of the state and abiding the laws of the state (e.g., by the will of its founder – the king, it was opened to a possibility of legal actions)

↓ ↑

in the same time, the actual source of inspiration/model of behavior accepted by the members of the Royal Society (corrupted personality, logic of insufficiency, and withstanding the domination of the authority which purposes it was expected to serve) and current rejection of responsibility for the actions of scientists do not sustain purposes and expectation of the system's founder

2/ the Royal Society was expected to glorify God, either to shape out a new philosophy or to perfect the old one, and to facilitate advantage of the human race

↓ ↑

in the same time, the progress of their philosophy was connected with studies of death, and the logic of ancient heathen – Aristotle – materialist and slave–owner who rejected the Absolute Good (therefore the very idea of God) as impracticable, was accepted as the foundation of the Society's scientific inquiries.

Such a system was precluded from creation of knowledge adequate to the actuality – contradiction and inconsistency incapacitated the system and made it incapable of sustaining progress of its supersystem–state/consumer of knowledge created by the members of the Royal Society:

a/ its core purpose is service to the king, therefore, servitude, and its symbol is hunting dogs, while expectations are freedom from the domination of authority

b/ its source of inspiration is corruption, while expectations are dignity and virtue

c/ its foundation is heathenism {*and the heathenism includes such inventions as slavery as the universal order (Aristotle), mythical and symbolic reasoning resulting in misguided imagination (diviners), and equation of man with animals, because the main deity of adherents of the Orphism (Plato and his followers) is the ancient arch–serpent filled with forms of all living beings (Plato's forms/ideas), among which the humans are not the best and not the first, with the issuing custom of human sacrifices to the deified beasts*}, while expectations include the service of the glory of God the Creator and advantages of the human race

d/ shaping philosophy and arts with actual experiments along with their "better success" in philosophical studies expected to be achieved through ample anatomizing cadavers of the executed criminals. Philosophy is love to wisdom; which kind of wisdom the mind could find in disintegrated flesh of a human being who died in agony, by forceful death inflicted by the tools of the executioner? In addition, the right to examine the cadavers already was granted to the professional associations, therefore, it should be a specific reason for such a grant (besides professional knowledge, which is sought by forensic experts, yet which was not a primary purpose of the Royal Fellows).

The initial core of contradiction explains the Royal Society's statement [w4] with unrealistic expectations concerning freedom from responsibility, therefore inability to comply with the laws of the state (the law institutes responsibility for the consequences of words and deeds) as well as with its own Chapter.

Such system has no potency to accomplish its purposes: any expectations of the abilities to trigger development/evolution of the empire/state should be unreasonable. So, did the Royal Society achieve the purposes of the king–founder?

Although the present is the fruit of collective efforts of generations of kings, their governments, their scientific advisors, and their subjects, and it would be unjust to ascribe the servants/scientists–advisors the actual power over the mind of their masters/kings–governments (therefore, full responsibility for king–government actions), the Royal Society definitely has made its contribution to the current state of the affairs. And the present is the complete failure to achieve the purposes for the sake of which the Royal Society has been created [w17, 18]:

1/ the English Empire is no more: England now is just one of many members of the European Union, which (in contradiction to the purposes and the nature of the European Union) strives to keep the remnants of sovereignty, and which in the near future might enter the stage of the ultimate disintegration (if independence of Ireland and Scotland is actualized); therefore, the actual history of the empire, for expansion of which the Society was established, is collapse and disintegration, not evolution–expansion–development

2/ service to the glory of God the Creator became impossible with acceptance of the heathenism – Aristotle's doctrine – as a method on inquiry and foundation of reasoning, Lord Beacon as the source of inspiration, and Darwinism as the outlook

3/ actual advantage of the human race that can be achieved by the UK government, to which the Royal Society serves, might be inferred if to consider the overall position of the UK government officials toward safety and health of the crown subjects: their actions in response to the news of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear accident are quite revealing.

In particular, according to *Guardian*'s publications [w20, 21] based on a/ leak of the emails sent by the government officials and b/ the British government public announcements, the government officials conspired with the nuclear companies to arrange a particular public relations strategy with the purpose to play down the Fukushima nuclear accident even before the extent of the radiation leak was known [w20 – *Revealed: British government's plan to play down Fukushima*; 21 – *Fukushima spin was Orwellian. Emails detailing how the UK government played down Fukushima show just how cosy it is with the nuclear industry*].

The *Guardian*'s articles [w20, 21] suggest an inference that the referred UK government officials do not take into consideration safety of the UK subjects.

However, while the UK government plays down the nuclear catastrophe in Japan misleading its subjects concerning the probability of Fukushima's likeness on the British soil, the UK population might comfort itself with the belief that the UK possesses the highest "soft power" over the world [w23 – *Britain ousts the US as world's most influential nation: Country tops rankings for 'soft power'*], and completely disregard the disturbing news concerning technical problems with European nuclear reactors (total cost to fix about €25 billion), which leaked into the French and German media [w23, 24].

However, the Royal Society currently serves as an advisor to the European Commission and the UN (in the matters of science) [w22].

However, the Royal Society is just one of scientific establishments apparently aiming to facilitate progress of the human race.

The mentioned above nuclear catastrophe looming in Japan illustrates consequences of the shift of priorities, when the advantages of the human race are disregarded for the sake of national pride and expectations of profit.

Although Japanese scientists cannot predict the exact time and location of the future earthquakes (and triggered by them devastating tsunamis), they do know the places at which earthquakes and tsunamis frequently occurred in the past, and also know that, at some point of time, they inevitably strike again. Although some scientists and experts warned of the possibility of disaster [w27], the nuclear power plants have been strategically located at the places with high risk of major

earthquakes and some of them without reliable protection from tsunamis triggered by the earthquakes. The Report of the Independent Investigation Commission on the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Accident and the article written by Japanese authors refer to the "utter unpreparedness," while the tsunami "could and should have been anticipated," a "culture of overconfidence and arrogance among the national regulatory agencies and other relevant nuclear professionals," "the culture of secrecy and technical loftiness within the Japanese nuclear community," and "astonishing negligence of safety standards" along with "a public myth of "absolute safety" that nuclear power proponents had nurtured over decades" [w25, 26].

According to the report of The Independent Investigation Commission on the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Accident, TEPCO (owner of the Fukushima nuclear plant) falsified the safety records and was unwilling to cooperate with IAEA's safety review programs [w25]; the overall unpreparedness was "aggravated by dysfunction within and between government agencies and TEPCO" [w26]. The nuclear energy plants are the creatures of the nuclear science – nuclear scientists and experts habitually participate in a choice of locations, design, and maintenance of all nuclear plants; therefore, the opinion of scientists–employees of TEPCO concerning safety of the nuclear plant was either disregarded or never voiced.

The overall conclusion of the experts is that the Fukushima catastrophe could have been prevented [w27, 28].

Then, do not the mentioned "cozy ties" between government and nuclear industry of Japan [w27] look similar to those in the UK mentioned by *Guardian* [w20, 21]?

Would actions of the governments of other countries be different of the actions of government of Japan, which violates the rights of its subjects to health and life and left affected by the nuclear disaster people without sufficient help and attention [w29, 30; see also postings at website http:// enenews.com/ category/japan/ fukushima…]?

So, what was the role of the official science in the Fukushima nuclear catastrophe, why it was unable to prevent the faulty design and placement of the nuclear reactors in the most dangerous places?

Could the utter disregard of public safety be the result of inhumanity inherited from the scientists and researchers or Unit Tōgō in Zhongma Fortress built by the Japanese Imperial Army near Harbin during the Second Sino–Japanese war, 1935–1945 [w31], and the Unit 731 in the Northeast China [w32], at which Japanese scientists, under leadership of the chief medical officer of the Japanese Imperial Army, conducted research into biological, epidemic–creating, and chemical warfare with lethal inhumane experiments on living human beings, (e.g., testing of grenades and other explosive devices and chemical weapon on people tied to stakes, vivisection without anesthesia, infection with lethal diseases), including infants, pregnant women, and the elderly [w31, 32]? After completion of the war, many of the Unit 731 researchers made "prominent careers in post–war politics, academia, business, and medicine" [w32].

Currently, the Japanese government intensifies investments and development of infrastructure and transportation systems in the Mekong Delta ("with India on the horizon and looming large")[w33], which definitely, will be followed with expansion of Japanese possessions and consequent re–location of people and business from contaminated Japanese islands into the lands untouched by the Fukushima's nuclear pollution yet. Among Japanese government's promises and planned actions in the Mekong Region countries are such as "Pillar 3 Ensuring Human Security" through "disaster risk reduction" [w34] and "construction of a society that values human dignity" [w35]. The question: which kind of "human security," "disaster risk reduction," and "human dignity" the countries participating in Japanese Mekong project, would expect from the Japanese government

a/ whose "cozy ties" with domestic nuclear industry, "astonishing negligence of safety standards," and "culture of overconfidence and arrogance among the national regulatory agencies and other relevant nuclear professionals" [w25, 26, 29, 30] made the Fukushima catastrophe the nightmarish reality of daily life of its citizens and threat for the entire planet

b/ whose scientists, politicians, and business executives are brought up in the society molded with participation of the Unit 731 researchers [w32]

c/ that seeks new inhabitant places leaving behind the incurable plague of Fukushima – "wide–spread contamination of the environment" and "infinite damage to the daily life of residents" [w36]?

Two tragedies – L'Aquila and Fukushima – although different by the scales of consequences, reveal the same pattern of arrogance, professional incompetence, and indifference to the public safety. This pattern describes

1/ government – as a failed system incapable to act adequately to its main purpose (safety of own subjects)

2/ science – as a failed system incapable of creation of knowledge, which empowers government to act for the sake of survival of its subjects.

In general, the problem that made possible both tragedies is much more complicated than arrogance and professional incompetence inseparable from disregard of the Absolute Good, issuing inhumanity of science, slavery of some "scientific minds," and failure of some government officials to perform their main duties – to secure public safety. Both tragedies confirm the failure of two domineering systems – government and science – responsible for survival of the state subjects, and the consequences of this problem are grave for survival of entire mankind: the contemporary sciences simply and logically came to the ultimate end – the sciences of death, which was designed in the time of liberation of sciences from

a/ the categories of the absolute good (undertaken by Aristotle***Σ4***)

b/ natural philosophy as love of wisdom (accomplished by Lord Francis Bacon***Σ2***– the Royal Society's inspiration)

c/ human values (completed with invention of ethics–free sciences fathered by Max Weber***Σ5***).

Along with disregarding "the glory of God the Creator" and the Absolute Good, the sciences disregarded "the advantage of the human race"; they became the sciences of death, and their results are well known; for instance,

1/ nuclear bombs, biological and chemical weapon, and other kinds of WMD

2/ genetically modified food, commercialized medicine that poisons patients with unproved and dangerous remedies developed on the genetically modified rodents and chimeras, yet applied for humans

3/ non–proportional development of the power–hungry technologies without adequate development of the sources of power

4/ scientific inquires and research conducted with the logic of simplification and at the inadequate levels of complexity, which result in acceptance of faulty designs and disregard or inability to foresee the consequences (e.g., probabilities of the future catastrophes and failures).

Concerning the problems specific for the scientific establishments, it should be noticed that disregard of the Absolute Good and commercialization of sciences resulted in utter corruption (e.g., climate–gate, swine–flu–gate, immense influence of the drug companies on the medical practitioners). Those who deliver such "fruits of knowledge" do not hesitate to defraud their masters and consumers of figments of their imagination, as well as to steal finding of the others and to use the work of the others for own advantages.

If the human race is to survive, as the first general remedy, neither official statements of scientific establishments nor acceptance of opinions/points of view as truth should be allowed only because someone at the top of the establishment assumed the authority to define his/her opinions as knowledge and to decide how other members of the establishment must evaluate a particular event. Arrogance that covers ignorance and self–aggrandizement, elites, authorities, hierarchies, and privileges in science have no reason for existence: the mind of the researcher should be free, unbiased, unsullied, and focused on the good of a human being, firstly, on responsibility for the consequences of own words, concepts, theories, experiments, inferences – all that is seen as the sources of scientific knowledge, which, in theory, should be the knowledge of truth.

In fact, there is only one difference between freedom and slavery, therefore, between life and death of human reason: responsibility for own thoughts, words, and actions.

Otherwise,

a/ there are no means to comprehend the nature of things and to survive – there are sets of false assumptions and myths resulting in death and destruction

b/ there is no science – there is ignorance that pretends on the place of creator of knowledge promising to serve the human race, yet delivers figments of imagination leading to death and suffering of human beings

c/ there is no scientists – there is pack/flock/herd following the leaders, even if the leaders conduct vivisections on the living human beings [w31, 32] and lead into the pit of destruction [w3, 6, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27].

In conclusion, from my point of view, the accusations of the “cream” of the Italian science have as much rationale as accusations of the executioners who perform their duties in state prisons would have: both categories are the products of their systems, both follow the nature of their business, and both perform their services to their master – the state. Besides, the L’Aquila “experts”

1/ are deprived of a possibility to inflict more harm on the people: they lost the right to hold official positions, so, they will not again have the “immunity of diplomats and the infallibility of popes” [w1]

2/ will have their ultimate punishment, if someday their human conscience awakes and the memory of victims of L’Aquila becomes their permanent companion.

Therefore, the L’Aquila verdict should be overturned in regard to the persons who should be entrusted to their conscience. The science itself should be put on the trial, not those who have been molded by the system/state and diligently performed their service to the system/state.

Consequently, it should be logical

a/ to disregard the contemporary science based on fantasies of Aristotle the old heathen materialist slave–owner as the worthless and dangerous system

b/ to create a new science, which would be centered on studies of the normal human nature and would take the good of a human being as the first priority

c/ to re–define the purposes and to re–create the educational and research institutions; for instance,

to accept the ethics and human dignity as the inseparable professional features

↓

to abolish fixed hierarchical structures, permanent hierarchical positions, and honorary titles within all academic, research, and educational institutions

↓

to liberate scientists and researchers of the dictate and tyranny of government officials.

The L’Aquila verdict attracted my attention, because I would like to see it as an omen of the new era, when the responsibility for own thoughts and words and created knowledge will be the distinctive mark of the researchers, as it should be according to the nature of human intelligence/reason; otherwise, mankind would not survive as the human race…

≈≈

Notes:

Σ1 Concerning unpredictability of earthquakes: the current attempts to predict earthquakes are based on observation of the events and identification of their physical parameters, which an observer connects with a consequent earthquake. Irregular behavior of fishes and animals, sounds, lights, tremors, emissions of gases, increase in seismicity, and other “abnormalities” believed to be the precursors are recorded and studied with the purpose to identify patterns or models, which would allow prediction of time–space points of next earthquakes. As of today, all trends, patterns, and models are not successful: while they might help in identification of a possibility within the possible region (forecast) because of the history/occurrence of such events in the past, they do not give the exact time and location of earthquakes in the future.

Three events – history of unpredicted earthquakes, results of studies of precursors, and overall impasse of the science of prediction – lead to the conclusion that the search for decision is carried out in the wrong direction. Indeed, the studies are conducted at the level of observation of the physical parameters, the favorite method of Aristotelian science (experiment) is not feasible, and the Aristotelian logic of simplification (e.g., modeling) accepted as the main tool of knowledge creation is insufficient.

The decision should be sought at another level of complexity, at the levels that correspond to the laws, which define nature of the planet and manifestations of her life, such as earthquakes, volcanoes eruption, ocean currents, climate shifts, and the others.

For instance, structurization/arrangement/creation, evolvement, changes, and collapse/disintegration of all perceivable by senses material structures are the consequences of cycles of transformations of the unperceivable by senses energy within the system of the energy fields that accommodate creation, existence, and collapse/disintegration of the material structures that compose the planet Earth and her components – lands, bodies of water, atmosphere, plants, living beings. This system or firmament *{**στερεωμα** – Genesis 1:1–10}* – the structure that sustains life of the planet – manifests itself through magnetic and other energy fields that contain specific kinds of the energy, accommodate cycles of energy transformation, and trigger energy releases. The transformations and releases of the energy underlie the correlated intertwined natural events, which are life of the planet and which a human mind perceives as earthquakes, tornado, hurricanes, rain, floods, winds, changes of seasons, and so on.

If the cycles of transformation of energy and changes in the energy fields that sustain life of the planet can be measured, monitored, and evaluated (e.g., as a physician evaluates condition of health by measuring pulse, blood pressure, temperature of a human body), the problem of predictability of earthquakes, hurricanes’ paths, and their consequences would be no more. The practical beginning of such study could be identification and mapping of fluctuation of the magnetic, gravitation, and other energy fields and correlation of these fluctuations with changes in geo–physical parameters and other features of natural events (including earthquakes).

For, instance, initially, such studies might include finding explanation of migration of birds that fly to their destination (dwelling and nesting places during different seasons) by orientation on the magnetic fields, migration of fishes within oceans and seas, identification of differences among the ecosystems the unity of which composes the living wholeness – the earth – by identification of different parameters of the energy fields and their derivatives – the time–space–complexity points at which the ecosystems exists, evolve, and collapse.

The main obstacle for such studies is necessity to recognize that the planet was created and exists as living wholeness controlled by the universal law – the law of God the Creator. For the contemporary atheistic–materialistic Aristotelian (therefore heathen) science, to recognize existence of God the Creator means to commit suicide. Besides, the science, which had wasted centuries and vast resources studying decomposition/death in a search of cognition of creation/life, simplified modeling in a search of comprehension of complexity, and rodents and chimpanzees in a search of understanding the human nature, is sustained by the false assumptions; it has neither theological nor philosophical foundation adequate to the complexity of life, therefore it is not capable of creating knowledge adequate to the actuality – life.

The following Notes 2, 4, and 5 contain excerpts from my book *The Invincible Empire* [Savitsky (2003)]***:***

Σ2 Concerning Francis Bacon:

…The inheritance of the Inquisition includes not only the elaborated methods of surveillance, inquiry, and torture adopted by many governmental and oppressive structures. This institution had prepared ground and triggered off the most tragic event in the history of knowledge. In the seventeenth century, Francis Bacon ***[[***characterized by the founder of Marxism as a “father of modern science” [Marx, ref. in: Larrain 22; Toulmin VII]***]]***, comprehended the end of the Inquisition’s stagnation as the time to separate natural sciences from their basis – philosophy, and the philosophy itself from its basis – theology.

Even at the time of triumph of the Inquisition, there were the philosophers and scientists who felt constrained within the Aristotle’s inadequate logic of simplification and based upon it scholastic constructions. Besides, the ideals of Christian love officially recognized by the papal church of Rome were so convincingly disproved by the Inquisition’s crimes against humanity, that any revolt against any official papal doctrine was doomed to be successful irrespective of its essence and the foreseen consequences.

On such a prepared ground, Francis Bacon described the natural philosophy, founded upon the Plato and Aristotle’s concepts as corrupted “by logic” and “by mixing of it up with superstition and theology” [Bacon, Francis *Novum Organum* 327–328]. Aristotle was held responsible for corruption by logic, Pythagoras and Plato

were blamed for superstition. Since, the Western culture has been recognizing as a great virtue and power of human reason to apply only those methods of scientific inquiry, which

exclude non–cognizable God from the created by Him Universe

*[[*very convenient for self–esteem: indeed, if it cannot be cognized and explained, it does not exist at all*]]*

and

withdraw logic – as the science or reasoning and inference – from any application toward materialistic natural sciences.

Since, the theory of knowledge has the choice – three ways for epistemology exist:

1/ to serve as the foundation, or as the "methodology" [Arbib and Hesse 1] cleared from any philosophical justification for new natural sciences, which are based only upon evidences provided by or cognized through sensory perception. After Francis Bacon, only the phenomena, events, dimensions, which can be discerned, measured, sensed, and evaluated by the organs of sense, reproduced or explained by experiments, might be accepted as scientific facts and the basis for the theories and concepts introduced by the natural sciences.

In fact, such a position materializes the old advice to disregard the Ideal Good in the process of investigation and to clarify the objects of intellect by the objects of senses [Aristotle *Magna Moralia* I.i.21–26]; so, it looks like Francis Bacon – recognized by the Marxists as the "father of modern science" – is a loyal apprentice of Aristotle and the Bacon's apparent crusade against Aristotle is only the tactic maneuver in hidden war against the papacy

2/ to accept atheism as own basis and to explain existence the Universe without its Creator

3/ to continue development within the framework of theology and religious philosophy.

For instance, the basic axiom of the formal logic holds: only direct observation and inductive inference from it can produce knowledge [in: Harris 49], that is the same Aristotle–Francis Bacon's notion, which formed the basis for materialistic natural sciences…

Σ3 See analysis of Aristotle's doctrine in its influence on theology, philosophy and science in my book *The Invincible Empire* [Savitsky].

Σ4 According to Aristotle:

No one science should "predicate goodness of its end," because a physician does not proclaim that health is the good thing, and the universal (Absolute) Good should not be a subject of single science. Social science, as any other single science, must not consider the Absolute Good; its subject is "the best that is the best for men" [Aristotle *Magna Moralia* I.i.14–23].

In traditional (pre–Socratic) Greek philosophy, the Absolute/Ideal Good is the cause of all things within the Universe, the main object of cognition, and the main standard–virtue, therefore, the essence of existence of men and the property of all creations of the Intelligence. Consequently, the sciences should study the particular measure of good dispensed by the Intelligence into specific things, relations, and properties within the material world, and provide recommendations how to employ this measured good for the good of men. Separation of the Absolute Good from the material things–creations of the Absolute Good, from the sciences as the means to create knowledge, and from the virtues as derivatives of the Absolute Good, completed the disconnection of the Aristotelian world from the Intelligence and Absolute Good. Later, the Aristotle's assumption that no science should refer to the Absolute/Ideal Good became the Max Weber's concept of ethical neutrality of sciences.

Σ5 Concerning Max Weber:

…Max Weber (the Nietzsche's admirer) invented the value–neutral social sciences; Weber was named as the "scholarly sage," in his time, and, in 1987, as the "foremost social theorist." According to Professor John P. Diggins, Max Weber celebrated the beginning of World War I and had "periodic visitations of 'demons,' which kept his mind in "restless torment" [Max Weber ref. and qtd. in: Diggins 63, 265, 273, 277, 315].

Max Weber's outlook was formed under the influence of Friedrich Nietzsche. For instance, such assertions as the good and the evil are "an old illusion" and all knowledge grows "beside the bad conscience" [Nietzsche (1924) LVI.7, 9] might be easily traced in the Weber's concept of value–neutral social sciences and subsequent admission of the morally contaminated data as the basis for scientific concepts and recommendations.

In 1900s, Max Weber and other "left radicals" founded the German Sociological Society devoted to the advancement of sociological knowledge received by "purely scientific" methods with rejection "all concerns with practical (ethical, religious, political, esthetic, etc.) goals of any kind."

Since, the Weber's doctrine of a value free approach – "value–free scholarship" [Weber ref. and qtd. in: Dahrendorf 2, 3], or the ethics–free (or value–free) science, influences the majority of the contemporary sociological studies, and the overall activity of social sciences unfolds under the widely accepted Max Weber's notion of value neutrality supplemented with the following assumptions:

– the social science is independent from the morality [Weber ref. in: Simon xv]

– the politics should be separated from the ethics similarly to the science, because "where values begin, science leaves off"

– statesmen cannot expect any good from philosophy, because philosophy is the search for the truth, and the politics is in an irreconcilable conflict with the ethics [Weber, ref. and qtd. in: Diggins 262, 264, 113].

Along with other factors, the Weber's value–free sociology had prepared the ground for acceptance of the Nazi ideology with such "purely scientific" value–free consequences as the fields of Nazi Germany fertilized with human ashes produced by the concentration camps from the members of "inferior nations" and political dissidents. The value–neutral sciences began to operate with the "morally contaminated data," which include results of experiments and observations received, for instance, by the researchers in the totalitarian states (e.g., Nazi Germany, Bolshevik Russia). These researchers conducted experiments on prisoners at concentration/death/labor camps, prison hospitals, and mental hospitals–prisons for the dissidents.

The idea of moral neutrality became the common possession of all kinds of scientific research; in particular, the questionable sources of data provide the foundation for "much of modern medicine" [Rescher 4].

The essence of the social knowledge made on demand of the controlling structures of societies and states illustrate the results of the materialistic sciences, which operate within the Aristotelian framework. Some researchers assert that

– the state, politics, and social knowledge are historically "intimately intertwined" [Rueschemeyer and Skocpol 310]

– the society itself becomes "indistinguishable" from the state and nation, and the science finds the roots in the political structures [Stehr 21, 257]."

However, for a human being, the knowledge without good and truth does not exist because without the knowledge of good, a human being is no more human and no more being, or, paraphrasing the Max Weber's dictum ("where values begin, science leaves off"), where the good leaves off, death comes in.

The L'Aquila and Fukushima illustrate the consequences of ethics–free science "intimately intertwined" with politics.

Posted 12.12.2012, 1:07 am ET

[[@ my Blog Cyber Defense and Systems Logic; currently, blog is closed]]

≈≈