


Er virkelig vitenskapen så blind?

Kopiert fra <http://www.perceptions.couk.com/science-today.html>



Let's try some simple examples, and ask what 'science' actually knows



1 Cosmology.

"What one finds, in my view, is that modern cosmology has at best very flimsy observational support. ... Acceptance of the current myth, if myth it is, could likewise hold up progress in cosmology for generations to come." - Source:- [American Scientist](#)

Oct. 2007 - "During the past 15 months, more and more authors of cosmology related papers and articles have directly or indirectly questioned the validity of the Cold Dark Matter hypothesis. Has the 23-year-old Cold Dark Matter hypothesis evolved into the equivalent of a scientific mistake?" - Source:- [Sciy Org](#)

Mar. 2013 - "We are finding planets that are two or three times the size of Jupiter, and Jupiter is the size of a small star so we are finding planets as big as stars... We have found that planets can get bigger by some process and we don't understand that process" he said. "What that tells you is that our concept of how planetary systems, based on how our own Solar System is put together, is probably not applicable for many of these other solar systems" - Source:- [Kepler Mission](#)



2 Rays of light - how do they work?

i) Classicists are forced to say - "angle of incidence = angle of reflection" - giving no cause; or "they take quickest paths"* - again giving no cause.

* 'quickest' = shortest in space-time

ii) Quantum "theorists" - (who pretend lab facts are a "theory") are forced to say - "they must travel all possible paths in advance, then travel a "[superposition path](#)" - but can give no cause - (of how that `time-travel' could be accomplished).


All impressions, sensations and perceptions of the world outside our brain, indeed all energy transfers in the universe, are enabled via photons (including light & harder radiation), which remain a mystery to mainstream science:-

"All these fifty years of conscious brooding have brought me no nearer to the answer to the question, 'What are light quanta?' Nowadays every Tom, Dick and Harry thinks he knows it, but he is mistaken. ... I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, i.e., on continuous structures. In that case, nothing remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation theory included, [and of] the rest of modern physics." - [Albert Einstein 1954](#)

"We still don't have a good idea of how a photon exists in reality" - [Dr. James P. Siepmann, Editor - Journal of Theoretics](#)

Scientists have gotten themselves in a muddle through `quantum' misunderstandings. The real (effective) path of a photon is not limited to the experiment area. It is the total possible future path: from original excitation / movement of electrons all the way to infinity in any one direction.

Some illustrations of this at [`radiation' page](#) for causal explanation. General write-up at [timeprob page](#)



QUOTE

"One of the greatest mysteries in science is the distinction between the past and the future. At a subatomic level, neither the old ideas of classical mechanics nor the modern theory of quantum mechanics distinguish between the past and the future"

UNQUOTE - John Gribbin - `Companion to the Cosmos' ISBN 0-297-81725-6

Here's a recent (2007) [review of the problem](#) - but the report got [one thing](#) wrong.

When a theory can't account for a fact that theory is `incomplete' (plain wrong).

Mainstream physicists don't understand that we, and all things made of matter, are embedded in space-time by the multiple re-clenching, [quadrillions](#) of times* each second, of space-time's [binding energy](#).

And that the real reason for all biological organisms' ability to "age and die" is that constant subtle change in space-time's [energy / matter ratio](#).

* At what `speed'? Try c^2 . Yes, that c .

And what's the shape / form of the field? Try $\sqrt{-1}$. Yes, that's square root of -1 (a complete, but central, mystery to most scientists) which says it's radial, and with incoming and outgoing effect, to create, energize and bind matter.

See:- [RADIATION](#) & [TIME](#)



4 Pendulums are found in clocks like this. Science knows what they do down here on Earth - swing at a rate depending on bob weight, length of suspension etc. But a free pendulum does much more.

If you hang one at the North Pole - at Earth's northern axis point - and start its first swing towards Cassiopeia and back - towards Ursa Major maybe, the pendulum will continue to swing from Cassiopeia to Ursa Major - and back - all day long, although you (and the Earth) are rotating around it;

[the same effect at lower latitudes - [Foucault's pendulum](#)]

The pendulum will move in a 24 hour circle, to follow those stars. Ask a scientist why and he'll say - "Ah, let's see, that's Mach's Principle isn't it" or some such - which means "I don't know why it does that"

A `pendulum' is a semi-gyroscope - Yes? See below

Try [footnotes3#gyro](#) & Coriolis `force' & [earlieruef#Mach](#) (note UEF was once called [CBGR](#))



5 The Gyroscope. Science knows a lot of detail of what it does - on or near the Earth.

But try asking what it does in intergalactic space?, or "how", or "why" it works anywhere? You'll simply be told - "Gyroscopic principle".

[A gyroscope is only a 360° `pendulum' - which gives you a clue as to its shared properties? - RD]

Even the best scientific descriptions lack any real explanation of gyroscope's attributes or its habit of precession.

BTW, here's a precession [quick-explanation](#). You won't find it elsewhere.

Along with gyroscopes is the presently unexplained stability of spinning tops, bicycles etc.. These all demonstrate the same effects.

Try [footnotes3#gyro](#) for background and [footnotes3#know](#) for new discovery (in case of possible N.A.S.A claim).

Also [uef/earlieruef#Gyroscopic](#) (note that UEF was once called [CBGR](#)).



6 "Gravity" - didn't Newton (or maybe Einstein?) define and explain all that? Don't we have a "[Universal Law of Gravity](#)"?

NO - Both Newton and Einstein only attempted to mathematically describe the effects of "gravity" - which is not a `force' but merely a shadow in an `effect'.

Newton always said he couldn't figure out how "gravity" actually [worked](#).

Then [Lord Kelvin](#) flatly stated - "Present science has no right to attempt to explain gravitation. We know nothing about it. We simply know NOTHING about it."

More recently, Feynman [admits](#) "there is no model of the theory of gravitation today ..."

NO - Apparently that gravity effect isn't even "universal" - mainstream science now says it changes between certain size / density thresholds.

I.e. below proton size (and for `light') gravity's "wrong". And if you're much larger than supra-galactic size:- gravity doesn't `attract' - it [repels](#)!

But didn't Einstein prove that light obeyed gravity? No! The math only showed that `moving photons are influenced by [the field](#) that causes `gravity effect' (& inertia) - fairly obviously.

So scientists've gotten no further than Newton (or Einstein). Confusedly clinging to [`magic forces'](#) (really effects), they can't find the [cause of gravity](#) - which anyway is really only a shadow in an effect.

I.e. - in reality, one force pushes matter together and endows it with `inertia' and `mass', so that matter will then create a `shadow' in that force - a shadow which we call `gravity'. Mainstream science hasn't yet realized that's the reason why gravitational mass = inertial mass.

You can [abolish "gravity"](#) - then check those [thresholds](#)..



7 Insect - and bird - navigation. Again lots of detail of tests, of "hopeful" results, with magnets, lights, brain maps etc. etc. . but no real knowledge of how or why.

Here's a 2001 [example](#) of false trails being followed.

2013 - `Science' has another try - see [Telegraph article](#) - maybe a bit chastened and less dogmatic.

Try [footnotes3.html#gyro](#).

Also try [uef/earlieruef#Possible](#) (note that UEF was once called [CBGR](#)).



8 Angular momentum

Wondering what an ice-dancer was doing at top of page?


If that skater starts into a spin, in that attitude, she will spin slowly - then, if she draws that leg and those arms in, straightening her body at the same time, she will spin faster and faster as she pulls more mass towards the "axis" of revolution.

Like - swing a brick on a string then `shorten' the string - by putting a tree in the way? The brick suddenly (& dangerously) accelerates! If you try it - use a plastic brick!

Ask why and you only get a description of what - "conservation of angular momentum" - and lots of [impressive words](#).

Here's your [intro and explanation of Coriolis Force](#) - just angular momentum really.

And there's another common science misunderstanding [about momentum](#).



9 Thresholds Why don't `gases' behave like 'liquids' or 'solids'; why do they all differ from each other?

Indeed why do our bodies hold together instead of vaporising to a thin mist? Introduction [here](#).

Maxwell - perhaps the greatest scientific discoverer - almost partly found out why. But at the last moment he allowed himself to be swayed by the establishment need for a 'kinetic', mechanical, seemingly controllable universe.


Maxwell had actually concluded that gas molecules were repelled from each other as they are in reality, responding to the dynamics of space; however the 'kineticist' ethos of the day - still persisting now - made him abandon the concept.

Since then we've been saddled with imaginary molecular "collisions" - Forcing a mishmash of irregular ad hoc - made-up - `gas laws' with no foundations.

UEF thresholds are intimately linked to `entropy', which mainstream science does not yet understand. Maybe try [search for "UEF thresholds"](#).

Actually R J [Boscovich](#) almost got it right in 1763 (or maybe earlier), only he met the superstitious belief in magic "[forces](#)" (plural), as every physicist since has done.

UEF intro at [footnotes](#), more at [smt](#); result at [topology](#).



10 Crystal formation

Crystals form in a denser, more regular pattern - if far away from Earth's surface. But down here they grow in a looser, less regular pattern.

And, confidentially, if you were to grow crystals at the center of the Earth - protected, & at atmospheric pressure of course - they would grow in a regular pattern again, but even more loosely.

But don't tell a scientist that. They don't really know how crystals form - and that scares them!

Why? - 'Cos some crystal formations demand "[Instantaneous transfer of Information](#)" - Which `blind science' (see below) still says is impossible!

Try also [smt](#) & [crystal](#)

11 "Clockwise" - In the South / "Anti-clockwise" - In the North

What are we talking about, the monsoons?, the Gulf Stream?, the Trade Winds?

No, we're talking about 'planes



Those things [some people](#) go on holiday in. Haven't the scientists told you?

Well, a plane or a ship - or even a cannonball for that matter - will veer off course to the right if moving north from equator, or to the left if moving south from the equator.

[So the winds of identical storm - a "low" - spin clockwise in South, anti-clockwise in North]

This effect increases as you get closer to the poles - but doesn't exist at all at the equator.

Ask the scientist why this happens and s/he'll answer Coriolis Force" - or 'effect' really - possibly adding "Conservation of Angular Momentum" - if s/he's very sharp.

It's really the ice skater again, but Earth sized this time.

Yes, we know what happens - the scientist can't give a "why" or "how".

Here's the real cause of 'Coriolis forces'.



12 Why is "gravitational mass" exactly proportional to "inertial mass"? A big problem for modern physics.

"The notion of mass as gravitational charge is perhaps the best "theoretical" notion of mass we have. Note that this idea of mass is qualitatively different from the idea of "inertial mass": that quantity which makes it difficult to change the velocity of an object. That these two quantities, gravitational charge and inertial mass, are equal, is another of the fundamental mysteries of physics." - www.rwc.uc.edu

Newton and then Einstein couldn't quite figure it out.

"This experience - of the equal falling of all bodies in the gravitational field - is one of the most universal which the observation of nature has yielded; but in spite of that the law has not found any place in the foundations of our edifice of the physical universe." A Einstein, writing in Annalen der Physik,35.

Yes, same problem: inertial mass proportional to gravitational mass. Einstein's math forced him to opt for 'rubber sheet myth' of Relativity but without causes & no explanation.

"The reason why things coast for ever has never been found out. The law of inertia has no known origin" Richard P Feynman in The Character of Physical Law (1965) 1992 ISBN 0-14-017505-9.

"It is a curious and still not fully understood phenomenon that the inertial mass and the gravitational mass are always exactly the same." John Gribbin in Companion to the Cosmos 1996 ISBN 0-297-81725-6.

Today we find mainstream scientists trying to describe a holistic universe while still using 'Newtonian' mind-sets - thinking or claiming, as did Newton, that solid 'particles' make up matter, and that its mass and (inertia) are intrinsic.

Whereas evidence has been accumulating (see [Einstein 1954](#)) that matter is probably not `solid', and that individual elements of `matter' and `energy' are indeed [individuals](#), linked non-locally (i.e over arbitrary distance).

How do we know that? UEF theory says so, and, more obviously, because any radio-active element has a unique (and [variable](#)) `half-life' of decay! That would be impossible if atoms of elements were `identical and self-defined', as our present [Newtonian](#), or atomist, scientists appear to think.

Conclusion - matter's attributes of mass & inertia are [conferred or imposed](#) by one basic universal force - by which matter is entangled with the universe - and so may be changed (instantaneously and non-locally) by that force.

I.e.- individual atoms of a radioactive element are `told' precisely when to decay by their surroundings; that is, by the modulating effects of those surroundings on the basic force - UEF.



13 Anomalous spacecraft [movements](#)

Well, of course scientists should know all about satellite and spacecraft behavior - they built them didn't they?

Even so, scientists don't know why spacecraft behave as they sometimes do.

Try "[verified](#)" and "[latest news](#)"

For more immediate & damaging effects, try [fertility](#).

More experts' misunderstandings & possible dangers here -



planet's [change](#)



Sun [problems](#)



Optical [illusions](#)



soft "[jets](#)"?

14 & 15 two recently admitted "official" astro-phys "Mysteries" acks. to Space.Com's 2002 series

www.space.com/scienceastronomy/astronomy/cosmic_mysteries_series.html



What is Dark Matter?



What is Dark Energy?

"We've known that it exists for more than 25 years," says astronomer Virginia Trimble of the University of California Irvine. "But we don't know what the hell it is"

"Frankly, we just don't understand it," says Craig Hogan, an astronomer at the University of Washington at Seattle. "We know what its effects are," Hogan says, but as to the details of dark energy, "We're completely clueless about that. And everybody's clueless about it"

[Dark Matter / Energy Critique](#)

Update! Finally the establishment - NASA, media etc - have had facts forced down their throats. Check "[Great Woman](#)" and then "[humble pie](#)"



16

[I.x.I](#) - Instantaneous transfer of Information

Surely "blind science" says it's [IMPOSSIBLE](#)?

Yup - all present theories still say that faster-than-light transfer of anything is impossible. However, paired photons can be separated by great distances, and when one is interrogated it will 'instantaneously' reveal the "spin" or "state" of the distant other.

-

- 1) The information travels at many, many times "lightspeed".
- 2) It is unaffected by intervening space (or matter).
- 3) We've known for a while this is also required for atoms in [natural processes](#).

Explanation?

Intro at [UEF Index](#), and brief talk-thru at [smt](#)



17

TEXT BOOK 'LAWS'

Are the text books 'true'? Are modern students taught 'reality' about physical attributes & forces?

NO! - 'Fraid not.

What is taught?

The books contain either :- classical Newtonian - Hamiltonian 'determinist' rules or modernist ([flawed / false](#)) Einsteinian relativity & / or Quantum probability rules or combinations of both.

The rules are false - at best some are close guesses but even so they fail over distance / time / high velocity.

Here Quantum [broke down](#), and Relativity also [breaks down](#) - when faced with just one of many [`impossibilities'](#).

"The discovery of [a new subatomic particle](#) adds to the evidence that physicists' standard model of how matter behaves is seriously incomplete."

"Discovery Of Neutrino Oscillation, Mass - [Upends Standard Model](#)"

2006 - "Standard Model is [going to have be revised or superseded](#)"

Again - explanation?

Intro at [UEF Index](#), and brief talk-thru at [smt](#)



18 And there's a whole lot of other [anomalies](#) and [enigmas](#), [artifacts](#) and other [anachronisms](#) and [out-of-place fossils](#).

`Professionals' seem always in denial, as with these [indications of earlier civilizations](#).

Also - ball lightning, spontaneous human combustion, [falls / flows / oozes](#) and [intrusions \(1\)](#), P-K, SUNDS, [poltergeists](#), and more [intrusions \(2\)](#).

William R. Corliss has made another list - [`A Search for Anomalies'](#) (.pdf).

Brave Princeton investigators have [shown effects](#) that cannot be explained by conventional science.

Why are `establishments' always stuck in arrogant (and fearful) denial mode?

Suggested [reason](#).

Earlier examples of `blind science':-

1st Cent. CE - [Julius Sextus Frontinus](#) - "Inventions have long since reached their limit, and I see no hope for further development"

14th Century - King Philip VI of France asked University of Paris medical faculty for the cause of the 1347 Black Death outbreak (now attributed to the bacterium *Yersinia pestis* arriving from Asia), which killed one-third to one-half of Europeans within two years. The `medical' answer - published and accepted by the intelligentsia - "A triple conjunction in the constellation of Aquarius ([20 March 1345](#)), was the cause of the subsequent pestilence."

18th Century - Lavoisier speaking to the Academy of Sciences (Paris, France) - on peasants' reports of meteorites - "There are no stones in the sky - therefore stones cannot fall from the sky"

19th Century - UK's premier scientific body, the Royal Society, persistently refused papers from [Waterston](#) and Joule (on "oxygen theory"), instead preferring to cling to "[phlogiston theory](#)" until 1848.

19th Century - Lord [Kelvin](#) (doyen of European physics) - "I have not the smallest molecule of faith in aerial navigation other than ballooning or of expectation of good results from any of the trials we hear of." - in response to Major B. F. S. Baden Powell's request to join the Aeronautical Society, December 8, 1896.

19th Century - the Royal Society (London, England) passed a resolution to the effect that - "Man's knowledge of the universe is complete and everything worthwhile has been invented" - 1895 (apocryphal - with similar from US Patent Office boss, c 1899).

20th Century - Ernest Rutherford (Baron, Nobel prizewinner, leading British physicist - see "Royal Society") - "The energy produced by the breaking down of the atom is a very poor kind of thing. Anyone who expects a source of power from the transformation of these atoms is talking moonshine." - 1933.

20th Century - British Under-Secretary of State for Air - "Scientific investigation into the possibilities [of jet propulsion] has given no indication that this method can be a serious competitor to the airscrew-engine combination" - 1934.

20th Century - British 'Astronomer Royal' - "The whole procedure [of shooting rockets into space] . . . presents difficulties of so fundamental a nature, that we are forced to dismiss the notion as essentially impracticable" (R.v.Riet Wooley) - in Nature, 14 March 1936.

TODAY - 2004. Science is still censored and blindfolded - here's censorship reports - [from the UK](#) - [from the USA](#).



19 Science "discoveries"?

NO - most often science MISTAKES.

Almost every 'discovery' was a mistake - and wasn't corrected for many years, sometimes not for generations.

Astro-physics? Check for yourself - almost all names of astronomical phenomena are wrong! Due to scientists thinking they'd discovered something else.

The mistakes are still happening, right now. Here about [tiny particles](#); here science mistakes [birth of new galaxies \(^ quasars'\)](#) for "galactic collisions".

-

You've seen above that physicists were equally wrong to trumpet Einsteinian Relativity and then Quantum Theory as discoveries. Both theories are great near-guesses but are still plain [wrong](#).

And, as forecast, in [genes8](#) - the much-vaunted 'cloning theory' was also wrong.

-

Scientists have yet to learn even 1% of the data, much less the vital knowledge, needed to guarantee safety for even one genetic manipulation or nano-release.

2012 - Confirmation: [Report says: 'Nano-particles already affecting humans, chickens etc - "physiological response was unexpected"'](#) - Science Daily

Science and the corporates have 'power without knowledge or responsibility'. A while ago [analyzed the DNA facts](#) and realized they are not the safe blueprints that our politicians claim, instead they are dangerously variable - like old ammo. An obvious conclusion is that any genetic manipulation will have unintended consequences.

And all genes are capable of being transmitted and absorbed eventually - to a greater or lesser extent - by all organisms. There is no sure, safe insulation - see [reviews & reports](#) and ['2007 / 2008 Gene Transfer Shocks'](#).

2012 - Confirmation: ["Genes transfer between unrelated plants - maybe via pollen contacts over long distances"](#) - Science Daily report

So what happens if G.M profit-seekers force a tiny change of gene structure or position that just happens to kill - insects? As might be [happening to bees right now 2007](#) - (significantly, in countries with high organic pesticide use and most GM on the loose).

LATE UPDATE May 2008 - ["Bee Disease hits Germany"](#) from [`Spiegel.online'](#)

LATER UPDATE July 2008 - ["Bee disease caused by \(Big Pharma\) pesticide"](#) from [`Natural News'](#)

LATER UPDATE Jan 2011 - ["Bees in freefall as study shows sharp US decline"](#) from [`The Guardian'](#)

- We're only now [finding out](#) that most insects are vitally necessary for our eco-system. The fertility of plants, the natural hygiene of countryside and gardens, and the structure of soil itself will be at risk.

But perhaps a GM mutation could upset say - grass? (As this alarming [`wheat-rust' report](#) says may be happening to wheat - April 2007. Also see 2014 [`wheat-rust update'](#).)

- All of us, Earth's humans, and most of the animals, would starve within a year or three, after some really bloodthirsty world wars. All cereal crops - including rice - are 'grasses'. The basis of our human diet would be gone; and with it almost every animal feed.

Or say a change goes on to irritate [bacteria](#)?

- Bacteria are vital living ingredients in our oceans, in our soil, in our air and even in [our bodies](#). Harsh [retribution](#) could be almost immediate! Perhaps a warning sign [is already here](#).

"As we project a future of increasing technological progress, we may face a future that is increasingly hazardous and susceptible to irreversible disaster"

John D [Barrow](#) "Impossibility - the limits of science and the science of limits"

ISBN 0-09-977211-6

-
- "What might be lost? It is a question humanity ignores at its peril" asked [Bill McKibben](#)
-
- `The Hundred-Year Lie, on the prevalence of toxic chemicals' [June '06: interview with Randall Fitzgerald](#)
-
- "Silent pandemic" - plus - `Killer chemicals' [Long suppressed science - held down by rich polluters - Nov 2006.](#)
-
- Mar. 2007 - "[Genetic Roulette: The Documented Health Risks of Genetically Engineered Foods](#)" - backed by (ex)politician
-
- Nov. 2007 - "The research hasn't been done" - from Report - [`Nanotech's Health, Environment Impacts Worry Scientists'](#)
-
- Apr. 2012 - "Nanoparticles May Increase Plant DNA Damage" - from - [National Institute of Standards and Technology \(NIST\) and the University of Massachusetts Amherst \(UMass\)](#)
-
- May 2012 - "Common chemicals harming fertility" & "Pollution = Heart disease" - from - [Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen Universities & from the University of Southern California](#)
-
- May 2012 - "Grandparents' chemo exposure maybe leads to Autism/Bipolar/PTS?" - from - [University of Texas at Austin and Washington State University](#)
-
- Jun. 2012 - "[New report by genetic engineers - the hazards to health and the environment posed by GMOs.](#)" - (text copy)
-
- Oct. 2012 - "[Pesticide poses new danger for bumblebees](#)" [and to us?] - (text copy)
-
- Mar. 2013 - "[Loss of wild pollinators \[thru mono-culture + insecticides\] serious threat to crop yields](#)" - (text copy)

SCIENCE REPORTS ON GM ISSUES AND OUTCOMES



20 Some frank estimates of human `science' - the most impartial we've been able to find.

"Photons, electrons and protons have become about as meaningless to the physicist as `x, y z' are to the child on its first day of learning algebra. The most we hope for at the moment is to discover ways of manipulating `x, y z' without knowing what they are, with the result that the advance of knowledge is at present reduced to what Einstein has described as extracting one incomprehensible from another incomprehensible."

Sir James [Jeans](#) in `The New Background of Science'

"Or one could put it like this: In a reasonable theory there are no dimensionless numbers whose values are only empirically determinable."

Albert Einstein - letter to Rosenthal-Schneider 13 Oct.1945

N.b. - As Einstein implies, present physics is lacking the knowledge needed for calculating the 'Constants of Nature' and is forced to try to "measure" what they might be.

"Whatever economic and human resources were made available to Pythagoras for the purpose of investigating the natural world ... he would not have known what questions to ask, nor could he have known. There is no reason to doubt that the present state of affairs is any different"

John D. Barrow in 'Impossibility - the Limits of Science and the Science of Limits' - ISBN 0-09-977211-6

"There is no way of showing mathematically that a physical conclusion is wrong or inconsistent. If we find that certain mathematical assumptions lead to a logically inconsistent description of Nature, we change the assumptions, not Nature."

Richard P [Feynman](#)

"Even within science, the same set of facts may be interpreted in very different ways. Paradigms provide a framework into which new or old information can be slotted, a coherent structure that helps link different phenomena together. Explanations that depend on paradigms are in that respect a little closer to those of religion: They depend upon a particular world view. The paradigms of science are not true, but they have been tested extremely rigorously against the available evidence, and their consequences have been deduced and tested as well. They are like old religions."

Profs. Ian Stewart & Jack Cohen in '[The Collapse of Chaos](#)' - ISBN 0-670-84983-9

"Of course, what is both wonderful and terrifying is that there is absolutely no reason that nature at its deepest level must have anything to do with mathematics. Like mathematics itself, the faith in this shared mysticism of the mathematical scientist is an invention of human beings ... I have never heard a good a priori argument that the world must be organized according to mathematical principles."

Lee [Smolin](#) in 'The Life of the Cosmos' - ISBN 0-297- 81727-2

"[Gödel's](#) Theorem [which proved [human mathematics is necessarily incomplete](#)] means ... all mathematical models fall inherently short ... physics will remain embedded forever in that deeper level of thinking characterized both by the wisdom and by the haziness of analogies and intuitions."

Stanley Jaki

"We are certainly not at the end of science. Most probably we are just at the beginning!"
[Halton Arp](#) in 'Seeing Red: Redshifts, Cosmology and Academic Science'

"So this implies that there is in a sense a fundamental limitation to theoretical science. But it also shows that there is something irreducible that can be achieved by the passage of time. And it leads to an explanation of how we as humans - even though we may follow definite underlying rules - can still in a meaningful way show free will."

[Stephen Wolfram](#) in 'A New Kind of Science'

[More Mysteries in Science](#)

"Our knowledge is finite, but our ignorance is nearly infinite" - [George Gore - 19th Cent.](#)

"We are going along guessing the laws" - [Richard P. Feynman - 20th Cent.](#)

"Few scientists nowadays seriously believe that their laws are true" - [Profs. Jack Cohen & Ian Stewart - 1994](#)

"What the scientists say now is likely to be false" - [Nigel Calder - '04](#)

"Every cosmology book in the library is out-of-date, in fact, wrong" - Michio Kaku - '05

"We know no more than we did in 1975 - and that's not good" - [Lee Smolin](#) - 07 Mar '07 - [\(BBC: R3\)](#)

"Science fails in Explanation" - [Lorenz, Darwin et al](#)