



Why Do People Claim They Own “The Science™”?

Description

US : In a truly remarkable article, seemingly packed with anti-scientific claims masquerading as scientific rigour, Dr Jonathan N. Stea asks why people fall for “Fake Science News.”

It isn't entirely clear what Dr Stea is talking about because he doesn't give any examples, just some vague generalities about people having the gall to question “the Science .”

For example, he wrote:

[. . .] health-related misinformation and fake news related to a myriad of scientific topics persist and spread...

OK, but before we can take Dr Stea seriously we first need to establish what “misinformation” he is referring to. What does Dr Stea consider to be “fake science news”?

A simple Google search can reveal a disconnect between the scientific consensus and particular pockets of public opinion on topics ranging from vaccine safety to the treatment of mental health disorders and from evolution to climate change.

Aah!

It appears that Dr Stea is suggesting that anything that disagrees with the alleged scientific consensus, on a range of scientific issues, is “fake science news.” Therefore, it is reasonable to deduce that questioning the claimed “scientific consensus” constitutes “misinformation” in Dr Stea's scientific opinion.

There is no such thing as unquestionable science. If something is said to be beyond question, or doubt, it is not science. Consensus is not evidence, and claiming it is evidence is just about the most anti-scientific statement anyone, or any alleged scientific body, could ever make.

Take the Canadian ScienceUpFirst Initiative (SUFI) for instance. Dr Stea proudly states that he is a coalition member of SUFI. The SUFI collective openly declares:

ScienceUpFirst is a national initiative that works with a collective of independent scientists, researchers, health care experts and science communicators.

For alleged “communicators,” accurately conveying the meaning of words seems to present a tricky problem for the SUFI expert collective. Just how “independent” SUFI scientists might be is certainly debatable because SUFI is a project of the Canadian government.

SUFI informs us:

If we consider this statement in the context of science, it is partially accurate. Science does reach consensus through consistent, verifiable results following “continuous challenging, reexamination, re-testing, and criticism of other scientists’ work.”

On the other hand, the notions that “only experts in the field have the requisite understanding to debate the consensus” and the claim that “presenting only a few pieces of opposing evidence is not enough to invalidate the consensus” are completely and utterly wrong. At least from a scientific perspective.

Take epidemiology for example. Epidemiologists are the “experts in the field” but much of their work is based upon data analysis. So “nonexperts,” who are not “in the field,” such as statisticians, computer scientists, software developers and mathematicians are perfectly capable of questioning various aspects of the epidemiological consensus. As is anyone else who is sufficiently interested.

Asking questions contributes toward scientific rigour. Refusing to answer them doesn’t.

A theory only remains valid while it accounts for “all” of the evidence. If verifiable evidence is presented that contradicts the theory, then this must be accounted for by the theory.

While this alone is “not enough to invalidate the consensus” on a given theory, if the further scientific research, consistent with the theory, cannot account for or invalidate the apparently contradictory evidence, then the scientific evidence suggests there is something wrong with the associated scientific theory.

Consensus is completely irrelevant in such circumstances. Only when the contradictory evidence is either discounted or explained by the newly amended theory can it be deemed worthy of genuine scientific consensus.

What SUFI and Dr Stea appear to be describing is “the Science™.”

The Science™ is a closed shop where only certain “experts” are deemed credible, usually by each other. Dissent from “the Scientific Consensus™” is actively resisted by non-scientific means. Censorship, personal attacks, denial, ridicule, refusal to debate and so on.

Ignoring scientific evidence, denying evidence exists—when it clearly does—applying made up

propaganda labels to evidence, in order to marginalise or discredit evidence without examining it, refusing to discuss evidence and misreporting evidence—to deceive people into imagining the evidence is not relevant—are not principles found anywhere in any version of the scientific method. But they are found everywhere in “the Science™.”

For our purposes—exploring Dr Stea’s argument—we need to draw a distinction between “science”—based upon the principle of doubt, verifiable evidence and hopefully some eventual proofs—and “the Science™”—based upon certainty and consensus—which is much preferred by governments, intergovernmental organisations and the people paid by them.

Yes, the world certainly should know that a bunch of self-appointed technocrats not only believe they own science, their grasp of the scientific method is so pitiful they imagine it is possible to own science.

Dr Stea seemingly shares the same delusion. He cites a number of other “researchers” who also hold similarly woolly views.

According to the UN’s Melissa Fleming, the Google search results for “climate change,” and related topics, lists UN and UN approved results because the UN has “partnered” with Google to ensure that they do.

Searching Google for anything other than the UN owned “Climate Science™” is a mostly a waste of time unless you use advanced search operators and already have an idea what you are looking for.

It isn’t really a search engine, more of a propaganda platform for the policy initiatives of the UN global governance regime.

Dr Stea considers that anyone who questions the “consensus” on “climate change” lacks the cognitive ability to form rational opinions. So people like Nobel Laureate Professor John F. Clauser and Nobel Laureate Professor Ivar Giaver, who stupidly question the “Climate Science Consensus™,” are idiots who believe “fake science news.” Presumably, the rogue academic Albert Einstein was also a blithering dullard as far as Dr Stea is concerned.

Questioning “the Jab Science Consensus™” is also the folly of the hard-of-thinking according to Dr Stea. For example, Dennis Rancourt PhD is not a scientist because he can’t get a paper peer reviewed for love nor money and keeps providing the wrong kind of scientific evidence.

For instance, by showing that the jabs may not be “safe and effective” after all but are, instead, potentially bloody dangerous.

The German scientists, who have independently corroborated Rancourt’s finding, haven’t got a hope in hell of getting their paper peer reviewed either. Such work is all a bit too much like science and not welcome in the annals of the Science™.

Dr Stea continues with his dubious claims:

[. . .] people who put more faith in their ability to use intuition to assess factual claims than in their reasoning skills are more likely to support conspiracy theories.

There isn’t a shred of plausible evidence to back Stea’s claim. But that’s OK because this is the

Science™ and not science, which are two completely different things.

Stae's "opinion," about people he labels as conspiracy theorists, is based upon the worst kind of pseudo-scientific babble imaginable. Stemming largely from the woefully unreliable "science" of experimental psychology, the underlying alleged psychology, supposedly driving so-called "conspiracism," is found in a body of "the Science™" that is best described as anti-scientific junk.

The alleged "Scientific Consensus™" on the definition of a conspiracy theory—which isn't remotely scientific—is that it is any theory that questions the pronouncements of the "epistemic authorities." The "epistemic authorities" are said to be:

[. . .] the distributed network of knowledge claim gatherers and testers that includes engineers and politics professors, security experts and journalists

Not all engineers, academics, intelligence assets and legacy media hacks are viewed as being part of the "epistemic authorities." For example, the 1800 or so scientists, economists, engineers and other academics who signed the World Climate Declaration—stating that there is no climate crisis—are not considered members of the "epistemic authorities." Only those who agree with whatever the State decrees—and funds—are welcome.

This is exemplified in the psychology meta-analysis paper cited by Stea. He claims this paper goes somehow toward explaining why people fall for allegedly "fake science news."

The paper states:

[. . .] the low levels of factual and epistemic knowledge [. . .] would be less disconcerting if large proportions of nonexpert audiences would routinely defer to scientific judgment and make policy choices that are consistent with evidence-based consensus within the scientific community.

So there you have it. Just believe whatever the State approved epistemic authorities tell you. If you don't agree with "the Scientific Consensus™," no matter how well qualified you might be, you lack epistemic knowledge—you're a bit thick—and you are a conspiracy theorist—meaning you are both stupid and psychologically deranged.

Dr Stea continues to ramble on:

While individual-level factors can help explain why people fall for fake science news, it is impossible to understand the complexity of this problem without situating it in its social context.

Perhaps so, but nor is it possible to identify any "fake science news" problem in the first place if your only criteria for calling it "fake science news" is that it contradicts some sort of fictitious Scientific Consensus™. It seems that what most of us call "scientific debate," Dr Stea calls the "fake science news" problem.

Dr Stea is a friend of Dr Peter Hotez. Therefore, given Dr Stea's opinion about the anti-scientific sanctity of the "Scientific Consensus™," and in light of Dr Hotez practically identical views, it seems the pair are in friends in agreement.

Dr Hotez' scientific beliefs are overtly political. He calls the "fake science news" problem—identified by

Dr Stea—“Antiscience™.” Dr Hotez defines Antiscience™ as follows:

Antiscience is the rejection of mainstream scientific views and methods or their replacement with unproven or deliberately misleading theories, often for nefarious and political gains.

We need to unpick this Science™ related vocabulary.

“Rejection” means presenting scientific evidence that questions the Science™. “Unproven” means that the epistemic authorities deny or refuse to acknowledge the offered scientific evidence and both “misleading” and “nefarious and political gains” means the presented and studiously avoided scientific evidence is incongruous with the social and political objectives promoted by “the Science™.”

In the bizarre scientific world of people like Melissa Fleming and Drs Hotez and Stea—which is more like the fantasy realm of wannabe dictators—the Science™ they “own” is closely tied to the policies favoured by the emerging global State. Only this Science™ is approved via the limited hangout overseen by the “epistemic authorities.”

Dr Stea wrote:

The spread of health-related misinformation and fake science news is not a trivial matter. When it comes to health, lives can be at stake.

Dr Hotez is more forthright:

Antiscience has emerged as a dominant and highly lethal force, and one that threatens global security, as much as do terrorism and nuclear proliferation. We must mount a counteroffensive and build new infrastructure to combat antiscience, just as we have for these other more widely recognized and established threats.

If you question the Science™ owned by Dr Hotez, Dr Stea and other members of the “epistemic authorities,” not only are you stupid and probably a conspiracy theorist, you are also an extremist—tantamount to a terrorist—who presents a threat so dangerous to “global security” that the questions you ask risk devastation on a par with nuclear holocaust. According, that is, to Dr Hotez and, presumably, Dr Stea.

You must not doubt their lunatic-fringe assertions because, like Anthony Fauci, they represent the Science™. Which makes them beyond reproach.

Dr Hotez echoes the global governance sentiments of the UN regime. The UN is practically obsessed with the “fake science news” problem outlined by Dr Stea. In particular, it worries that the public is losing “trust” in the diktats of the “epistemic authorities.” The UN addresses this in its 2022 Information Mapping Report:

The epistemic authorities are “the traditional actors and gatekeepers of information and news” whose role is to ensure we all unquestioningly accept the Science™. Dr Stea and Dr Hotez are aghast that “non-traditional actors in the infosphere,” i.e., the people, are even allowed to question the “gatekeepers” of the Science™.

They needn’t worry too much. The UN is among the “epistemic authorities” that are building the “counteroffensive” infrastructure, avidly promoted by Dr Hotez, to “combat” Antiscience™.

The UN’s proposed International Convention on Countering the Use of Information and Communications Technologies for Criminal Purposes, better known as the UN Cybercrime Treaty, intends to make the sharing of information that “may have an adverse impact on States, enterprises and the well-being of individuals and society” a global crime.

If, for example, you commit the likely Antiscience™ thought-crime offence of questioning Covid jabs, you will undoubtedly fall foul of global “cybercrime” censorship and may face arrest and prosecution. The UN’s “partner,” INTERPOL, has already created its Global Policing Goals (GPGs) which includes efforts to ensure no one commits any “Climate Antiscience™” crimes, such as questioning the epistemic authorities’ climate alarm claims.

INTERPOL states:

We developed seven Global Policing Goals (GPGs) to address a range of issues related to crime and security. [. . .] INTERPOL’s Global Policing Goals are therefore aligned with the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Among the UN SDG compliant ambition for INTERPOL’s GPGs is to “secure cyberspace for people and businesses.” To this end, INTERPOL has established “partnerships to secure cyberspace.” It has expanded its “cybercrime investigative expertise” in order to construct the “critical infrastructure” Dr Hotez claims we all need and must accept.

Consequently INTERPOL has formed some global public-private partnerships as part of its Global Cybercrime Programme. Among them is its partnership with the World Economic Forum (WEF), called the “Partnership Against Cybercrime” (WEF-PAC).

Consistently political, and supportive of UN goals to censor any and all dissent from gatekeeper accredited information, Dr Stea’s close friend, the “scientist” Dr Hotez, wrote:

Drs Stea and Hotez share their fears about “disinformation” with the UN, the WEF and INTERPOL, who are all equally concerned about the public losing trust in the “epistemic authorities” that set the allegedly indisputable Science™.

Dr Stea and Dr Hotez are evidently advocating a peculiar form of “science” based upon globalist policy objectives rather than scientific evidence.

It seems they demand that we believe whatever they tell us without question and suggest we should be punished if we have the temerity to question them as representatives of the Science™. Doing so undermines “trust” in governmental and intergovernmental institutions and is therefore verboten.

This, obviously, has nothing to do with actual science. Far from it, everything that Dr Stea and his friend Dr Hotez argue for is the antithesis of real science. It genuinely is anti-science.

Science does not fear debate because science is based on the objective evaluation of scientific evidence. Those who attack science, such as Drs Stea and Hotez, evidently do fear scientific debate because the Science™ they evidently peddle is either based on deliberately restricted scientific evidence or extremely questionable science.

This was underscored by Dr Hotez refusal to entertain a “scientific” debate on vaccine safety and efficacy with the lawyer turned politician—and layman—Robert F. Kennedy Jr. Dr Hotez is a “Gatekeeper Scientist™” who, as a member of the epistemic authorities, should have been able to run scientific rings around the “nonexpert” RFK jr., due to his superior knowledge of the Science™. According to Dr Stea at least.

Instead, Hotez declined and, unwilling to defend his Science™ in a public debate, he said:

In science, we don’t typically do debates. What we do is we write scientific papers [. . .] one doesn’t typically debate science.

Hotez’ excuse was abject anti-scientific dross. The scientific debate couldn’t be more important to science. It is only completely irrelevant in the Science™. There is no debate in the Science™ because it is based upon “the Scientific Consensus™” which cannot be questioned according to Drs Stea, Hotez and others.

Oxford Royale is an international academic feeder programme run as a partnership between Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial College London, Yale and Berkeley universities. Seeking the next generation of “epistemic authorities” in their field, Oxford Royale comprehensively contradicts Dr Hotez and states:

Throughout history, even before the formal development of the scientific method, scientists debating theories and changing their minds once existing ideas were disproven has given us an ever-greater understanding of the world around us.

And that process continues today. Within the scientific community, lively debates continue about questions from whether amyloid plaques cause dementia to what a healthy diet really looks like.

Sadly, so pervasive is the corruption of science by “the Science™” that Oxford Royale then repudiates its own statement and spreads “Official Disinformation™”:

Outside the scientific community, debates continue on manmade climate change, vaccination and evolution, even though the scientific consensus on these topics is clear.

Having acknowledged how crucial scientific debate is, these august academic institutions then categorically deny its value for the “theories” they unscientifically assert are beyond question. Such illogical, self-contradictory nonsense is another defining feature of the Science™.

Noble Laureate Professors, who questions the Climate Science™, are not “outside the scientific community.” Nor are PhD scientists who question the safety and efficacy of the jabs.

In science, their views and their findings form part of “the body of evidence” informing all science. Excluding their papers and research, refusing to debate that scientific evidence, and idiotic anti-scientific presumptions about owning science, are only found in the unhinged, despotic Science™ of the politically motivated “epistemic authorities.”

So before we accept Dr Stea’s claims about the “fake science news” problem, let’s nail down precisely what he is talking about. Because if it is just anything that questions the Science™, there is absolutely no reason to give anything he has written any credibility at all.

BY Iain Davis

Category

1. Big Pharma Terror-Pandemic-Lockdowns
2. Crime-Justice-Terrorism-Corruption
3. Disasters-Crisis-Depopulation-Genocide
4. Main
5. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyrrany

Date Created

03/28/2024