

# Why Scientists Disagree

The heading sounds like an oxymoron, a contradiction. Don't scientists all agree on the same topic? After all, don't they all agree that gravity exists and that its value on Earth is  $9.8\text{m/s}^2$ ? The answer is no, which is a surprise to most people. You see, the reason we have this childish view that scientists all agree, because the evidence is proven, is just that, childish. It comes from the science we learn at school, where everything was factual or proven.

The reality is that on any topic of fact, about anything in the universe, there are different camps of scientists with opposing views. For example: Not all evolutionary scientists believe that life on Earth started in one particular way. There are a variety of competing views on the origin of life, as my textbook 'Unmasking Evolution'<sup>1</sup> demonstrates. My book also shows that on another 73 different evolutionary topics, prestigious scientists disagree.

Why is this so?

The answer is their worldview, philosophy and belief system, as well as their culture, which all frame how they understand what they see. These also impact how they interpret the data, and that's the 'biggie'.

With evolution, it's the scientists' evolutionary mindset that causes them to see everything they analyse from that view. In other words, evolutionists can't see anything other than evolutionary activity in the data they analyse. They simply cannot see a higher order spiritual being (AKA 'God') having anything to do with it.

We've seen this discrepancy between scientists in two arenas in recent times:

1. Anthropogenic Climate Change (ACC)
2. COVID pandemic intervention

It's been a stark demarcation between those who disagree with others in these two areas. Each group claims to be right and so they oppose the other. (Children aren't taught this in school, unless its in terms of 'climate change deniers' and 'anti-vaxers'.) In both these cases, the scientists have accessed the same data and have come up with different conclusions.

How can this be? The scientific method, which uses empirical science, was designed to get to the truth in every investigation. (At least, that's what science teaches children at school.) This is the science I learnt in my training as an agricultural research scientist at university in Sydney. It's also the method I use to analyse everything natural in my life, and how I solve problems.

One answer to the question of disagreement is that not all scientists use the scientific method. This is especially the case in human studies because we can't make people do everything identically, like you can with a pen of sheep. You also can't kill people to do post mortems and analyse their bodies for the sake of gaining knowledge. This is the case with medical science, psychological science, etc. There are also other areas of study which can't be analysed in a laboratory or where there is only one variable to test. This is the case for atmospheric science, meteorology, cosmology, oceanography, solar science, etc.

The second answer lies with (believe it or not) philosophy. Yes, there is such a thing as the philosophy of science.<sup>2</sup> Every scientist subscribes to a particular philosophy of science which drives their thinking and their analytical processes. Some philosophies actually contradict the scientific method, or empirical science. Those who subscribe to these 'different' philosophies are quite content to use methods that are not empirical, and are very confident that their findings are accurate. This is the area that's bringing more scientific contention these days, as those who study in non-traditional scientific fields are held up as

1 – [canberraforerunners.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Unmasking-resource-book.pdf](https://canberraforerunners.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Unmasking-resource-book.pdf)

2 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy\\_of\\_science](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_science)

experts. This has, unfortunately, extended to non-scientific areas where investigators or practitioners call themselves scientists and are described as experts. The problem being that the populace has been taught the scientific method at school, so they blindly believe what all scientists (and pseudo-scientists) state.

One area that's come to my attention recently is the practice of 'scientists', especially in the non-traditional sciences, not to work under the principle of research called falsifiability.<sup>3</sup> Falsifiability was promoted by Karl Popper<sup>4</sup> and is an important method in empirical scientific research.<sup>5</sup>

Falsifiability is a standard by which scientific theories and hypotheses are evaluated. It is the cornerstone for testing solutions to all types of problems. A theory or hypothesis is falsifiable (or able to be refuted, refutable) if it can be logically contradicted through empirical testing using existing technologies. The purpose of falsifiability, even though it's based on logic, is to ensure that a theory or solution to a problem is tested properly.

The logic behind falsifiability is the reasoning that if something is definitely true, then it's never wrong, and can never be found to be wrong. This is our common understanding of truth. For example: Burning hydrogen in air, anywhere in the world, will always produce water (as vapour) as the end product, nothing else. This is what school science teaches in the lab. The way falsifiability works is simple: If a solution or fact is shown to be wrong at any time, even once, then the solution or fact has to be discarded or re-investigated. After all, something can't be truth or a fact if it can be shown to be false on the occasion that it's shown to be wrong.

This is the logic that the populace works under. It's the way we logically deal with life and solve our own problems.

Unfortunately, there are scientific philosophies which contradict falsifiability. This has caused it to come under criticism,<sup>6</sup> with controversies following on.<sup>7</sup> For example:

*"A second, related criticism of falsifiability contends that falsification fails to provide an accurate picture of scientific practice. Specifically, many historians and philosophers of science have argued that scientists only rarely give up their theories in the face of failed predictions, even in cases where they are unable to identify testable auxiliary hypotheses. Conversely, it has been suggested that scientists routinely adopt and make use of theories that they know are already falsified. Instead, scientists will generally hold on to such theories unless and until a better alternative theory emerges."*<sup>8</sup>

Notice in this quote that dissidents to falsifiability, use common scientific practice as the benchmark. That's false reasoning, because the aim of science, like the legal system, is to get to the truth (to find out what's real). Hailing to current scientific practice is the same as saying, "We should make illegal drugs legal because we can't stamp them out." Or, "We should not get rid of bribery among politicians because that's what happens in politics today, all around the world." The search for truth is not tied to what type of science people conduct, it's aim is to find out what's real.

Philosophers such as Deborah Mayo consider that Popper "comes up short" in his description of the scientific role of statistical and data models.<sup>9</sup> This gives statistics and modelling a way out. They don't need to go through a process of falsifiability or verifiability<sup>10</sup>. As we have seen so many times, statistics and models used to support a scientific 'fact' are 'massaged' when there is enough pressure from elsewhere to challenge their accuracy. This is known as 'shifting the goalposts', a the common reaction to

---

3 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Falsifiability](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Falsifiability)

4 – e.g. "Karl Popper: Philosophy of Science" [iep.utm.edu/pop-sci](http://iep.utm.edu/pop-sci)

5 – It was introduced by the philosopher of science Karl Popper in his book *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (1934).

6 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl\\_Popper#Criticism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Popper#Criticism)

7 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Falsifiability#Controversies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Falsifiability#Controversies)

8 – [iep.utm.edu/pop-sci](http://iep.utm.edu/pop-sci)

9 – Deborah G. Mayo (2018) "Statistical Inference as Severe Testing: How to Get Beyond the Statistics Wars" section 2.3

10 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Verificationism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Verificationism)

criticisms of evolutionary theories. We saw this with ACC which start out as Global Warming, then it became Climate Change, and now it's Climate Emergency. We've seen this goal-shifting during the COVID pandemic of 2020-2022. Lock-downs were eventually stopped, vaccines were found not to prevent the disease, and the medical advice from the various state and federal Chief Medical Officers changed month-on-month.

Failure to follow the scientific method, empirical science and falsifiability has brought about the situation we find the world in where scientists pridefully adhere to their own understanding. They will defend 'to the death' the 'truth' they've uncovered, despite others showing that it's not exactly true. 'Scientists' don't like falsifiability because it means continually looking to see if they can find faults in their published treatise. Falsifiability is unpalatable to them because it doesn't fit in with their pride, their desire for academic prowess or with their dogged adherence to their pet theories or beliefs

This lack of scientific rigour (i.e. using only empirical science and falsifiability) has led to an the increase in fields of study, which are non-traditional sciences, being labelled as sciences, because 'science' means 'knowledge'. This has allowed for the development and promulgation of pseudo science and false science (in contrast to empirical science, which is the common understanding of 'science') and the rise of disagreement among scientists based on their philosophy of science.

You may not think that the philosophy of science has a big impact on how scientists think and analyse, but you'd be wrong. For instance, when I published my book 'Unmasking Evolution', one of the emails I received questioned my understanding of what's really real – reality, in other words. There are many who philosophise that we can't understand reality, because it doesn't exist – or ideas like that. Because of their philosophy on reality, they're quite okay with calling a theory (e.g. evolution) as fact. Doesn't sound logical, but that's how they think and operate in science.

Try reading this science article to expand your understanding:

- "Questioning Truth, Reality and the Role of Science"  
[www.quantamagazine.org/questioning-truth-reality-and-the-role-of-science-20180524](http://www.quantamagazine.org/questioning-truth-reality-and-the-role-of-science-20180524)

\*\*\*\*\*

## NOTE

It was the development of the scientific method and empirical science which overturned fallacies (what was unreal) of the past that we now called myths and legends. However, back in history, they were accepted truths which came from poor understanding and from indoctrination. Here are a few:

**Flat Earth** – Right up to the times of the Greeks, the Earth was believed to be a flat disk. Plato and Aristotle began to propose a spherical theory in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC but it didn't take off universally. Even right up to the 17<sup>th</sup> century AD, China believed the Earth was flat.<sup>11</sup> A practical demonstration of Earth's sphericity was achieved by Ferdinand Magellan and Juan Sebastián Elcano's circumnavigation (1519-1522).<sup>12</sup> Today we know the planet is ellipsoid (a slightly squashed sphere), a theory that was actually proposed by Isaac Newton in *Principia* the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

**Geocentricity** – Up until the release of Nicolaus Copernicus' theory of the solar system, it was believed that the Earth was at the centre and the planets and sun revolved around it. Copernicus's calculations in 1543 showed that the sun was at the centre (heliocentricity). However, that caused controversy because it contradicted the Roman Catholic Church's doctrine which they supported with scripture.<sup>13</sup> Galileo Galilei was charged with heresy in 1633 and placed under house arrest for the rest of his life where he remained

11 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flat\\_Earth](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flat_Earth)

12 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spherical\\_Earth](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spherical_Earth)

13 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicolaus\\_Copernicus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicolaus_Copernicus)

until he died.<sup>14</sup> It was Johannes Kepler's laws of planetary motion, published in 1609 & 1619, which had elliptical orbits of the planets, that set astronomy on its final stage of understanding reality.<sup>15</sup>

**Phlogiston** – The phlogiston theory of 1667 stated that *phlogisticated* substances contain phlogiston and that they *dephlogisticate* when burned, releasing stored phlogiston which is absorbed by the air. Growing plants then absorb this phlogiston, which is why air does not spontaneously combust and also why plant matter burns as well as it does.<sup>16</sup> This was the widely held belief of chemists until it was shown by Antoine Lavoisier in 1772 that oxygen is involved in combustion and the Oxygen theory replaced it.

**Spontaneous Generation** – This theory of Aristotle (350 BC) stated that living creatures could arise from non-living matter and that such processes were commonplace and natural. It was believed that fleas could arise from inanimate matter such as dust, and that maggots could arise from dead flesh. The theory was not disproved until the work of Louis Pasteur and John Tyndall in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>17</sup>

**Blood-letting** – The withdrawal of blood from a patient to prevent or cure illness and disease, whether by a physician or by leeches, was based on an ancient system of medicine. It was believed that the blood and other bodily fluids were regarded as "humours" that had to remain in proper balance to maintain health. It was the most common medical practice performed by surgeons from antiquity until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, a span of over 2,000 years.<sup>18</sup> It was the work of physician-physiologist John Bennett at that time, which led to the understanding that it didn't work.

\*\*\*\*\*

## MORE ON PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES

Strange as it may seem, philosophies override science. By that I mean the knowledge gained from empirical science is rejected in favour of philosophies that academics, researchers, educators, etc. subscribe to. The reason for this is that the word 'science' means:<sup>19</sup>

- Knowledge gained through study or practice; mastery of a particular discipline or area.
- The fact of knowing something; knowledge or understanding of a truth.

This is the meaning from the 14<sup>th</sup> Century when empirical science was beginning to develop. The meaning came from Middle English word 'scyence', which was borrowed from Old French word 'escience', which was derived from Latin 'scientia', from 'sciens', the present participle stem of 'scire', meaning "to know".<sup>20</sup>

It was because of the meaning of this word that scientific discoveries have been made since the beginning of the scientific revolution. In other words, scientific researchers wanted to know the truth about the world around them. That is, they wanted to know what was real, not what was philosophical, religious or mythical.

*“Scientific Revolution, drastic change in scientific thought that took place during the 16th and 17th centuries. A new view of nature emerged during the Scientific Revolution, replacing the Greek view that had dominated science for almost 2,000 years. Science became an autonomous discipline, distinct from both philosophy and technology, and it came to be regarded as having utilitarian goals.”*<sup>21</sup>

The rejection of the religious understanding of the natural realm which dominated Europe through Roman Catholicism since the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century and the myths of Greco-Roman ideas, began in earnest with The

14 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galileo\\_Galilei](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galileo_Galilei)

15 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kepler%27s\\_laws\\_of\\_planetary\\_motion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kepler%27s_laws_of_planetary_motion)

16 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phlogiston\\_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phlogiston_theory)

17 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spontaneous\\_generation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spontaneous_generation)

18 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloodletting](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloodletting)

19 – English Wiktionary [en.wiktionary.org/wiki/science#English](http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/science#English)

20 – English Wiktionary [en.wiktionary.org/wiki/science#English](http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/science#English)

21 – [www.britannica.com/science/Scientific-Revolution](http://www.britannica.com/science/Scientific-Revolution)

Enlightenment<sup>22</sup> in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century. It has been this naturalistic push to understand the world that led to the Industrial Revolution<sup>23</sup>, the Scientific Age<sup>24</sup>, the Space Race<sup>25</sup> and the Information Age<sup>26</sup>. However, since the 1950s, there has been a slow creeping of philosophy into science so that they have merged and blended together. This has made science a blended endeavour and caused Westerners to be confused because what they hear doesn't match with the empirical science they learnt at school.

For example: Knowledge (AKA 'science') has been rejected on philosophical grounds as being purely 'data and facts', to one that is value-added. This occurred philosophically through the perceived notion that value needed to be added to what knowledge is. As a consequence sciences (especially the humanities) has gone from 'cold, hard facts' which empirical science always dealt with historically to one where emotions, ethics, value, etc. must be included for it to become true knowledge.

For the humanities, and any other branch of study that a researcher considers the philosophy appropriate, here is the formula for knowledge that many subscribe to, whether they know it or not:<sup>27</sup>

### **Knowledge = experience x sensitivity**

That sounds illogical to those of us who have been trained, like myself, as researchers in the biological, physical and chemical sciences, and also to those who enjoyed science at school. If it's news to you, the link below will give you some idea of how philosophy and science are now 'married' in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

**READ:** The reasoning of Steven Pinker (Canadian-American psychologist) on scientific enlightenment today: [www.britannica.com/topic/Enlightenment-Now-The-Case-for-Reason-Science-Humanism-and-Progress](http://www.britannica.com/topic/Enlightenment-Now-The-Case-for-Reason-Science-Humanism-and-Progress)



I expect many people who read this article do not understand that philosophies cause us all, not just scientists, to think radically different. Actually, our different philosophical views causes us not to be able understand others at all. This is why the world is in so much turmoil at the present time – we don't understand why those who disagree with us, disagree so vehemently.

To help understand this difficulty, watch this video on Marxism and Critical Race Theory as the speaker explains to those of us who have no idea how Marx's philosophies have polarised our society. (You'll need to use the Epoch Times app on your phone or subscribe to their news service to get the whole interview.)

*"PART 2: James Lindsay—The Woke War on Reality and a Strange Fusion of Fascism and Communism"*  
[link.theepochtimes.com/mkt\\_app/premiering-700pm-et-part-2-james-lindsay-the-woke-war-on-reality-and-a-strange-fusion-of-fascism-and-communism\\_4289239.html](http://link.theepochtimes.com/mkt_app/premiering-700pm-et-part-2-james-lindsay-the-woke-war-on-reality-and-a-strange-fusion-of-fascism-and-communism_4289239.html)

[WATCH: At the beginning of the interview and then all of it.]

**>>> After watching this you should be able to understand why <<<  
scientists disagree because of their philosophical biases.**

Laurence

10-2-2022

[Updated 11-3-2022]

([www.CanberraForerunners.org](http://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.*

*Free graphics are from [www.clerker.com](http://www.clerker.com) & free photos are from [commons.wikimedia.org](http://commons.wikimedia.org) unless otherwise credited.*

22 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age\\_of\\_Enlightenment](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_Enlightenment)

23 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial\\_Revolution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Revolution)

24 – 16<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries

25 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space\\_Race](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space_Race)

26 – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information\\_Age](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information_Age)

27 – READ: "The Analysis of Knowledge" [plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-analysis](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-analysis) [An academic paper with formulas]