

Did You Know You Can Choose to Subscribe to the "Best Science"

Yes, that's right, you can choose what science you agree with. The purpose being to use science for ones own ends. Currently, science twisters are using science to deliberately manipulate our society. This is nothing new, it's just that social media and the internet have provided an avenue for those 'in the know' to release their knowledge to us.

One of the ways we are manipulated is by governments and bureaucrats selectively using the results of scientific studies to further their own agenda. In doing so, they reject all other research and 'hammer home' propaganda using studies that agree with their program.

They are able to pick and choose information because science is all about challenging the *status quo* in an endeavour to see if there is a more accurate set of knowledge to be gained. This quest polarises scientists who, for one reason or another, adhere to just one of the particular outcomes of research in their field.

This article explains the origin of divisions among scientists which the public are not privy to. I'm hoping it will open my readers' eyes so that they are more circumspect about accepting anything that has the 'science tag' attached to it.



Believe it or not, there is a science to which the title 'Best Science' can be attributed¹. This dichotomy in the sciences has been hidden from society. The science taught in school simply indoctrinates students.² They believe that the science they are taught from books, the internet and the media is perfectly correct because science has all the truth. The only caveat to that is that new scientific discoveries do replace old science, but that's considered normal within the scientific community.

From school on, we are taught to follow the 'new' science, because it's more accurate than the 'old' science. We are always given 'big' examples of that exchange to force us to vehemently reject old science. For example:

- Flat Earth became spherical Earth
- Earth-centric solar system became helio-centric (sun-centred) solar system
- Disease-causing germs replaced phlogiston as the cause of disease
- Evolution replaced Special Creation
- Panspermia³ from space replaced evolution via the Primordial Soup as the origin of life on Earth
- etc., etc.

What we aren't taught is that in any sphere of science there are many theories and hypotheses which are touted as "true", rather than "possibly true". These ideas compete with each other within each stream and area of science, but it's only the scientists and their journal articles which reference the conflict. As far as the general public are concerned, there's only one paradigm or fact, because that's the one that gets disseminated as the truth. People therefore instinctively reject all other points of view and any new research until the media announce that there's been a change in thought.

Did you get that? **It's the media, not the science journals that project scientific truth to society.**⁴ The downside of that is that people, who are very gullible, fail to do their own research in the journals or secondary-source literature to check what they should believe. This is the psychology behind the use of the media to manipulate society.

1 – Given the title

2 – e.g. VIDEO: Gregory Wrightstone (23-4-2023) "Earth Day: Scientist Shares Inconvenient Facts" [from the CO₂ Coalition]
link.theepochtimes.com/mkt_app/earth-day-scientist-shares-inconvenient-facts_5161172.html

3 – en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panspermia

4 – e.g. "Media Is to Blame for COVID Vaccines' Wall of Infallibility" (4-4-2023)
www.theepochtimes.com/health/media-is-to-blame-for-covid-vaccines-wall-of-infallibility_5172071.html

The other night, I was pleased to hear one journalist, who writes on energy, refer to “the best science” on a SkyTV interview. When I heard him say it, I gave a hearty cheer and “It’s about time” in my heart and mind when I heard it. I had that response because I’ve known about “the best science” since the 1970s when I did my original vocational training as an agricultural research scientist. In that training, we freely discussed various theories and discoveries in our lectures and assessment tasks, just like scientific journals do. We all knew there were existing scientific facts that produced a variety of conclusions and various schools of thought. For me, that understanding was in any small area of agriculture, let alone the vast areas of science that exist.

I had the notion of “poor science” and “good science” brought home very strongly to me in my final research, before becoming as teacher. The results were published in the *British Journal of Dairy Science*⁵ as current fact, but I knew there were failings in our research techniques which basically invalidated the results. These failures were not included in the research paper that was published, even though I brought them to the attention of my professor who wrote the published article.

It’s a absolute fact for me, from my background, that anyone can subscribe⁶ to any scientific theory or research and believe it’s accurate, when it’s not. Therefore, I understand that this allows people to describe something that’s NOT the “best science”, even though it may have some truth in it.

Every person needs to understand this because they are manipulated by the media, politicians, and vested interest, to believe a narrative or paradigm that suits their purpose. This is especially true for the current topics of concern in our society. Here are just a few of them that are justified by ‘science’:

- Climate Change (more actually, Anthropogenic Climate Change⁷)
- Climate Emergency
- Evolution
- GM foods (Genetically Modified)⁸
- Renewable Energy
- Nett⁹ Zero
- Electric vehicles
- Nuclear Energy
- COVID vaccination
- COVID protection
- Animal sentience
- Artificial Intelligence (AI) is beneficial for humanity

Politicians, Chief Medical Officers, Chief Scientists, and others, state that “the science is in”, to neutralize opposition to their plans. However, they don’t tell you that the scientific community in every area of all the sciences has contested ideas leading to arguing and dissention among scientists. They ‘cherry pick’ the science that supports their cause and then ‘demonize’ any other science. This eliminates “the best science” from the media and from the mind of the populace. It also causes trouble for those who support the science that is contradictory.¹⁰

Here are some important quotes about real science (empirical science) from Professor Ian Plimer’s book “Green Murder”¹¹, from the section ‘How Do We Know What We Know’¹²:

5 – www.airitilibrary.com/Publication/alPublicationJournal?PublicationID=20442440

6 – Accept as truth. Believe as accurate.

7 – study.com/academy/lesson/anthropogenic-climate-change-definition-factors.html

8 – www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/food-genetically-modified

9 – How ‘net’ was originally written.

10 – Maryanne Demasi “Scientific Consensus—A Manufactured Construct”

[An editorial by the sacked presenter of the ‘cancelled’ Catalyst program on Australia’s ABC TV network]

www.theepochtimes.com/scientific-consensus-a-manufactured-construct_5212845.html

11 – Ian Plimer (2021) “Green Murder: A Life Sentence of Net Zero With No Parole”

www.amazon.com.au/Green-Murder-Ian-Plimer/dp/1922449822

12 – p:86-89

- “The nature of science is scepticism. Science encourages argument and dissent.”
- “Science is anarchistic, has no consensus, bows to no authority and it does not matter what a scientific society, government or culture may decide.”
- “Scientific evidence is derived from repeatable and reproducible observation, measurement and experiment and must be in accord with previous validated evidence.”
- “Scientists engage in healthy argument about the veracity of evidence.”
- “If a hypothesis is wrong, it must be rejected.”
- “Peer review¹³ depends on the discretion of the editor and integrity of the referees.”
- “The number of reviewers that can be called on for a submitted paper is generally two or three people.”
- “The media views science as a popularity contest in which those with the greatest numbers win.”
- “Consensus is politics, not science.”
- “Consensus is just mob rule.”
- “Funding, fame, power and self-interest drive on consensus.”
- “Post-modernists, Marxists and the cancel culture comrades try to deconstruct science because it is underpinned by evidence, reproducibility and is a way of understanding a truth.”
- “We now have previously well-regarded institutions discarding scientists whose work is against popular opinion.”
- “The age of open transparent science in some areas may be coming to an end.”

IMPORTANT: Be careful what you subscribe to as scientific truth/fact. Do your own research and be fully convinced in what you believe.

Example A: The media and companies have propagated the ‘organic’ paradigm for purchased items. This actually refers to organically grown products. ‘Organically’ refers to the husbandry or production regime which doesn’t use any artificial chemicals, only natural ones. This means there’s no use of man-made chemicals (viz. insecticides, herbicides, etc.) and no synthetic fertilizers (e.g. superphosphate). However, the term that the general public use is ‘organic’, not ‘organically grown’. ‘Organic’ is a misnomer, since all plant and animals products are organic. It’s the media and those with a vested interest in pushing the ‘organic’ band-wagon for profit, who have caused the public to change the terminology unwittingly.

Example B: (Here’s one of those topics that has two scientific perspectives, only one of which is presented to the public.) Does the sun cause melanomas? The current propagated ‘science’ says, “Yes”, and medicos will stand very firmly on that. Alternatively, there is an opposing view which answers “No” to the question, and is the one to which I subscribe. I know the sun is not the cause (or the main cause) of melanomas because the skin specialist who checks my body’s skin every year looks for melanomas in places the sun has never been. He looks between my toes, under my feet, and under my underpants. The sun has not seen those places on my body. So, skin specialists know that the sun doesn’t cause melanomas, but scientists and medicos would most likely disagree vehemently. READ this article so you can make up your own mind about the source of melanomas:

“The Surprising Cause of Melanoma (And No, It’s Not Too Much Sun)” (20-8-2015)
www.theepochtimes.com/the-surprising-cause-of-melanoma-and-no-its-not-too-much-sun_1726259.html

REMEMBER: Worldviews and training (i.e. university conditioning) affect how data is interpreted, which is the basis of all science. They are the main source of division among scientists in every area of scientific endeavour. To easily understand the importance of what I just stated, the following joke clearly

13 – The process of scientists in the same area reading and checking a scientific paper before it is published. Papers rejected are not published.

exemplifies the importance of those two sources that influence thinking:

“There are three men on a train. One of them is an economist and one of them is a logician and one of them is a mathematician. And they have just crossed the border into Scotland (I don't know why they are going to Scotland) and they see a brown cow standing in a field from the window of the train (and the cow is standing parallel to the train). And the economist says, 'Look, the cows in Scotland are brown'. And the logician says, 'No. There are cows in Scotland of which at least one is brown'. And the mathematician says, 'No. There is at least one cow in Scotland, of which one side appears to be brown'.”¹⁴

You now have some critical information to allow you to work your way through life in this technological and scientific age.

So, **be seriously wise.**



Further information on the reality of contests between scientists who allows pressure groups to manipulate society are found in my 3 follow-up articles:

- “An Example of Two Science Camps in the Same Field – Medicine” [LINK](#)
- “An Example of Two Science Camps in the Same Field – Nutrition” [LINK](#)
- “An Example of Two Science Camps in the Same Field – Economics” [LINK](#)

Also, check out these Institute of Public Affairs publications, to see that the science of ‘Climate Change’ isn’t settled:

- “Climate Change: The Facts 2015”
www.amazon.com.au/Climate-Change-Dr-John-Abbot-ebook/dp/B00S5L5Y0W
- “Climate Change: The Facts 2017”
www.amazon.com.au/Climate-Change-Facts-Anthony-Watts-ebook/dp/B074PRC25D
- “Climate Change: The Facts 2020”
www.amazon.com.au/Climate-Change-Facts-Jennifer-Marohasy/dp/192598494X

Laurence

8-4-2023

(www.CanberraForerunners.org)

COPYRIGHT

*This document is **free** to copy, republish and distribute, but only ‘as is’. It is free to quote from at length.
All Canberra Forerunners’ documents are licensed under
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License
Quotes are the copyright of their authors.*

14 – Mark Haddon (2014) “The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time” p:177
www.amazon.com.au/Curious-Incident-Dog-Night-time/dp/1782953469