

Scientific Idiots

One of the major challenges to the Roman Catholic world-view came from scientists who, ironically, argued with the Church on completely irrelevant and useless topics such as geocentricism and the origin of homo sapiens. Most Renaissance scientists who challenged the Church's various holy superstitions were still Christians, and yet they were censored, censured, and sometimes, like Giordano Bruno, burned on the stake.

Da Vinci

Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) is primarily celebrated as an artist with an uncanny ability to *copy* Nature ... but he was also quite a scientist. Not only did he copy, with exceptional accuracy, what surgeons and butchers like himself exposed under dead human and animal skin, fur, and flesh, but he was a skilled observer of water flow and as a surveyor he must be credited with mapping parts of Italy so that his rulers could more effectively control their dominions.

Do any other illusions deserve my time? Shouldn't I grant that da Vinci demonstrated superb creativity with his scientific inventions? Does inventing war machines benefit humanity? How many innocent lives were ruined by his inventions? Perhaps da Vinci was the enemy of life?

Of course, da Vinci also invented portable bridges designed to help armies invade and occupy otherwise safe and protected areas.

And what of his drawings of flying machines? I'm sure these were intended for military purposes, too. At best, such drawings were the products of a dreamer who had long ago lost touch with Earth and Nature.

Is the Mona Lisa a work of genius? The barren landscape in the background represents the destruction of Nature over which the Mona Lisa is calmly smiling with all the indifference towards Nature that I expect from a wealthy Christian person.

But at least this man, who was paid to entertain kings with his voice and strings, and who did not love human beings, at least he was a vegetarian and a lover of animals. But so were Hitler and Goebbels.

Copernicus

Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543) was the clown who upset the Church by offering proof that the geocentric model is wrong. Geocentricism was the belief held by the Church that Earth was the center of the universe. Does any sane person really care about such matters? I see no harm or benefit to thinking whatever I wish on this subject. I don't care whether Earth occupies the center or the corner, and I don't care whether it is spherical or triangular. But the Church cared and the Church took grievous offense to any challenges to its belief in geocentricism because it cannot tolerate changing any belief, and this belief was 'supported' by the Bible's first page, in which it describes the creation of the universe. So, the Church was in a quandary. It had to defend the first page of the Bible – *especially because by then the Bible was published and circulating outside of its reach, so it could no longer revise the Bible.*

Copernicus also dabbled in economics and fathered the quantity theory of money (QTM). This idiotic theory has been quite influential in keeping economists ignorant about the *central*

problem of economics. To this day, hardly any economists know that Slavery and Ruin are the fathers of gold currencies or other materials requiring slavery and environmental ruin, while Fraud and Ruin are the fathers of any money made of paper, plastic, or digital entries.

Descartes

According to experts, Rene Descartes (1594-1650) is the father of modern philosophy and of the scientific method. This sounds impressive. I wonder, did Rene think about how to improve human life for himself and especially for the lower classes? Of course not. Rene was born into an upper class family, so he never wrote about class injustice and never thanked the lower classes for supporting his sedentary lifestyle.

But Rene's life wasn't quite lucky. His mother died in his first year of life, and he was deprived of his father, who sent him away to be raised by his grandmother, and his grandmother died when he was eight. After that, his daddy sent him to a lovely castle to be educated by Jesuit priests for seven magical years. What a charming childhood. Now you understand why Rene did not have a warm and curious mind.

I don't mean to slander the Jesuits. The truth is that Rene attended a Jesuit school that taught subjects similar to the ones taught in modern universities, subjects that of course leave children feeling profoundly dissatisfied, as they are "being cheated out of something." So, the poor boy dabbled in useless theology, and later in life his impoverished and neglected imagination produced visions he mistook for reality. But, before Rene became a full-fledged visionary and prophet, he helped the Dutch States Army in 1618 expel Spain from Holland. He did this for money, and of course he avoided combat duty and worked as a military engineer who probably worked to design weapons that can kill more effectively.

Rene was always determined to live a comfortable life in a world where everyone else suffered. So, after impregnating a maid in Holland, Rene went to Sweden to work with its royal family. He left the mother to raise his child alone. I suppose he never thought of mother or child afterwards, for, to paraphrase his famous dictum, "What I do not think about does not exist."

Rene never wrote the truth about anything. If you think that's an unfair assessment, please meditate for a moment on Rene's most famous philosophical insight: "I think; therefore I am." To paraphrase: "I think; therefore I exist." It's beautiful! Think of it! So much wisdom in so few words! Well, replies the Devil, it's all fine and well for *Rene* to claim that *he* thinks, but what proof do *we* have? Judging from his many written works, he did little else but think and write. But did he think *well*? If I think about crap all day, perhaps I exist, but I probably exist as an idiot.

Of course, I beg your pardon, Rene was a philosopher: he did not think about crap, not literally, but he certainly devoted plenty of time to thinking about the formation of the solar system and rainbows. In fact, he spent so much time studying optics, and so much time with his face pressed against telescopes, that he might have written, "I see the world; therefore it exists!"

But you're probably wondering, why was Rene so I-centric? Well, he never could treat the existence of other people seriously. That's just an upper class thing.

Rene is also famous for this magical mantra: "Because I have the ability to *imagine* a perfect being like God, that perfect being must exist." Infinite genius! Well, I *imagine* that Rene was a purple unicorn famous for doing head-stands and catching bullets with his teeth – therefore that Rene exists.

Newton

Sir Isaac Newton (1643-1727) famously formulated the laws of gravity, thanks to which we now walk upright, launch angels to the moon, and calculate the precise trajectories of intercontinental comets before we ride them into Hell.

Sir Isaac wasn't only a starry-eyed physicist. Sometimes he dabbled in alchemy, that ancient pseudo-science obsessed with counterfeiting gold. Alchemy consumed half of Newton's life, making him a good match for Einstein, the genius who wasted a few decades trying to formulate the Grand Unified Nothingness. Luckily, London rewarded Newton for his interest in counterfeiting gold with the job of stopping London's counterfeiters of paper money. Isaac took the job and the blessed fool never figured out that counterfeiting is actually legal and happening constantly in commercial and central banks. Today, the alchemy of instant money creation has flooded the world with credit and debt. If Isaac saw this, perhaps he would simply conclude, in awe, that our mega banks defy the laws of gravity.

We honor Newton as a giant among scientists, but what use has he been to humanity? He spent his time making formulas that only interested military engineers while, just outside of his vision, 90% of England toiled to produce food and lived in poorly heated homes that did not use free solar heat, were nearly impossible to keep warm, and were heated with dangerous hearths that wasted much of the wood and manure burned in them.

How did he learn to waste time so spectacularly and take no interest in women, children, comedy, food, physical work, the great outdoors, art, and all the things that make life worth living? How did civilization kill Newton's spirit and turn him into a calculator? I'll tell you how that transformation happened: priests filled his head with empty talk of the Fall and the Resurrection, and private schools filled his head with triangles and numbers.

My apologies if I disrespect the scholar's law of gravity.

Darwin

Charles Darwin (1809-1892), after decades of studying animals, concluded that humans evolved from apes and that we must adapt to our environment or starve.

Charley somehow overlooked the fact that humans create their environment and excel at creating environments that cause starvation and scarcity.

Religious people took great offense to the idea that humans are descended from apes. Their trouble for them was that the first page of the Bible expressly claims that God created humans and animals separately, so animals and humans are not related to each other, but are related to God. This conflicts with Charley's theory that humans were descended from animals, and it makes no sense to say that animals are our ancestors because we eat animals and we turn them into cartoons for children's entertainment. Obviously, we wouldn't do that to our ancestors, would we?

What do our science-loving schools think of Darwin's theory of evolution? Like the Church, they don't touch it. Apparently, it's not a safe and profitable theory. Thus far the ruling elite only enjoy using Darwin's theory as a support for their belief that they are more highly evolved. That's not something teachers want to teach the masses. Better keep them ignorant of that.

Besides, no teacher I know really wants to use Darwinism to strengthen our connection to the animal world. Animals are for eating and entertainment, and that is all.

If Charley had studied humans instead of worms for decades, perhaps he might have concluded that humans behave *less* intelligently than apes, and perhaps he would have concluded that there's more justice in an African jungle than in a British city. But, to give credit where credit is due, Charles was not entirely oblivious to the human world around him. In fact, his biological theories are strongly influenced by British culture. His theory that all life evolves by competing for survival in a changing environment reflects the harsh economic reality in Britain during the Industrial Revolution. I guess Charles didn't know that for a million years prior to the Industrial Revolution, humans mostly cooperated and shared and that only in very civilized nations are humans forced to *compete* for resources, wealth, and survival.

Additionally, like a good citizen of the British Empire, Charley somehow overlooked the fact that evolution in the non-human world involves *cooperation* among species and within species. Nectar, for example, didn't evolve competitively; it co-evolved with the honeybees that adapted to eating nectar. The relationship is mutually beneficial, for nectar feeds the bees who accidentally provide the service of pollinating plants in a way that is more efficient than wind-borne pollination.

Fruits represents another example of natural cooperation. Brightly colored, sweet tasting fruit evolved *in order* to attract the monkeys, apes and other creatures that eat them and excrete their seeds over wide areas. Many fruits actually evolved to become delicious and nutritious *so that* they would be eaten and *so that* their seeds would be spread by the creatures that ate them.

But Charles overlooked cooperation and focused on competition, which is why he's popular with ruthless sociopaths like Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and other empire builders. Fortunately, Charles did do some good in his life. After all, he taught us that worms, not gods and governors, can save humanity, for worms perform the miracle of soil creation, and soil is a source of life. I also thank Charles for transforming Ascension Island from a barren acropolis into a flourishing forest environment. Perhaps, in the future, Britons can replicate his success at home, on the quite barren British Isles.