

“The undiscerning public ... considers scientists to be some sort of high priest of our society, paragons of objectivity who have no philosophical axes to grind. Hence, the public is often fed a diet of philosophy under the guise of science.”

Martin Lubenow, “Bones of Contention”, Baker Book House Co: Michigan, 1992 p:18

From a study of scientists:-

“The myth of science being a passionless enterprise, carried out by objective detached men, does not hold.”

American Sociological Review, Vol. 39, 1974

From the same study of scientists:-

“The image of the objective emotionally disinterested scientist is taken seriously only by the layman or the young science student.”

American Sociological Review, Vol. 39, 1974

The Geologic Column Circular Reasoning

“The intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date fossils and fossils to date rocks. The geologist has never bothered to think of a good reply, feeling the explanations are not worth the trouble as long as the work brings results.”

J.E. O'Rourke, *American Journal of Science*, Vol. 276, January 1976 p:47

Natural Selection Circular Reasoning

**“The fittest individuals in a population
(defined as those who leave the most offspring)
will leave the most offspring.”**

Ian T. Taylor, “In the Minds of Men” (3rd edition), TFE Publishing: Toronto (Canada), 1991 p:80

Also outlined in:- [The 1966 Wistar Institute symposium](#)

Murray Eden, ‘Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution’, (P. Moorhead & M. Kaplan eds.), Wistar Institute Press: Philadelphia (USA), 1967

A scientist's philosophy colours their theory proposal.

“Perceptions, prejudices and preconceptions are as much a part of science as they are of other aspects of life. The donning of a white lab coat does not endow the wearer with supernatural powers of objectivity.”

[David Kavanagh, Faculty of Psychology, University of Sydney]
R. Simms, “Subjectivity Entrenched in Science”, *Lab News*, April 1995 p:10

Scientists interpret data according to their own philosophies, not by a set of scientific rules.

“People can torture their data until it confesses, and go far beyond the notion of objective enquiry in the attempt to confirm a hypothesis.”

David Kavanagh (Faculty of Psychology, Sydney University)
quoted by R. Simms, “Subjectivity Entrenched in Science”, *Lab News*, April 1995 p:10

Scientists reject data that doesn't fit their preconceived ideas.

"If a C-14 date supports our theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. And if it is completely 'out of date', we just drop it."

[Professor Brew] quoted by T. Save-Soderbergh (Egyptologist) & Ingrid Olsson (Physicist) in
"C-14 Dating and Egyptian Chronology" in
Proceedings of the Twelfth Nobel Symposium, John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1970 p:35

Scientists repeat experiments until they get the desired results

“..... if a piece of thighbone is found and it is felt to be Australopithecine, then as many potassium-argon dating trials as can be afforded are made, until a result of about two million years is obtained.”

Ian T. Taylor, “In the Minds of Men” (3rd edition), TFE Publishing: Toronto (Canada), 1991 p:252

Scientists continue their beliefs long after being shown to be in error.

“So far as Haeckel was concerned, he refused to believe that the *Monera* were nonexistent and went to his grave still convinced that a new *Bathybius* was out there on the seabed waiting to be discovered.”

Ian T. Taylor, “In the Minds of Men” (3rd edition), TFE Publishing: Toronto (Canada), 1991 p:190

Groups of scientists conspire to control the scientific world. - eg The X-Club

“..... was formed by T.H. Huxley in 1864 and consisted of nine men top in their profession, handpicked for their views, and holding personal influence on almost every famous scientist in the world By this means, British science was literally ‘governed’ from 1864 until 1884”

Ian T. Taylor, “In the Minds of Men” (3rd edition), TFE Publishing: Toronto (Canada), 1991 p:189

Scientists don't question the statements of scientists in other fields. Example #1

“Each specialist may question matters of evidence for evolution in his own field but remain confident in overall evolutionary theory, on the assumption that the other fields have all the really solid evidence.”

Ian T. Taylor, “In the Minds of Men” (3rd edition), TFE Publishing: Toronto (Canada), 1991 p:280

Scientists don't question the statements of scientists in other fields. Example #2

"The self-correcting aspect of science implies a self-policing action by scientists, a checking up on one another. In actuality, scientists have demonstrated an incredible faith and trust in the work of their fellow scientists. They tend to accept that work at face value without much investigation at all."

M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Michigan: Baker Book House Co., 1992 p:35

Scientists reject work that differs radically from their own.

#1 “Science today is locked into paradigms Every avenue is blocked by beliefs that are wrong, and if you try to get anything published by a journal today, you will run up against a paradigm, and the editors will turn it down.”

[Quote: Sir Fred Hoyle]

J. Horgan, “The Return of the Maverick”, *Scientific American*, 272(3), 1995 p:25

Scientists reject work that differs radically from their own.

#2 “Geologists and astronomers were so virulently opposed to Velikovsky’s book that they threatened to boycott the scientific textbooks of his publisher, Macmillan, forcing the firm to turn Velikovsky’s work over to another publisher, not involved in textbook publishing (Doubleday).”

Richard Milton, “The Facts of Life: Shattering the Myths of Darwinism”, Corgi Books: London, 1992
(1994 edition) p:107

[See — Immanuel Velikovsky, “Worlds in Collision”, Sphere: London, 1950 (1973 edition)]

Why do all these errors persist in science?

“It might be asked why these unscientific illusions persist in spite of exposure within the scientific community, and why they have been maintained at the level of the general public, in some cases, for half a century. The underlying reason is not rooted in the plain facts of science but, rather, in unproved and unprovable philosophical beliefs and sociological views.”

Ian T. Taylor, “In the Minds of Men” (3rd edition), TFE Publishing: Toronto (Canada), 1991 p:279