

Science in Postmodern America

Postmodernism: “A general wide ranging term which is applied to literature, art, philosophy, architecture, fiction, and cultural literary criticism, among others. Postmodernism is largely a reaction to the assumed certainty of scientific, or objective, efforts to explain reality...denies the existence of any ultimate principles, and it lacks the optimism of there being a scientific, philosophical, or religious truth which will explain everything for everybody.”¹

Postmodernism is a difficult term to define. Above, you will see one abbreviated description of how one source defines postmodernism. It is a philosophy, or lack thereof, that questions modern methods of defining truth. Even though the above description includes philosophy and religion as ideological constructs that it brings into question. Truth be told, these two disciplines have always been questioned with the sort of scrutiny that postmodernists employ. What makes postmodernism postmodern is that it questions modern processes that have been used to discover various truths, namely the *Scientific Method*.

The Scientific Method duplicates variables, conditions, and results in a lab setting for the purpose of arriving at conclusions. It makes use of empirical methods (measurements) to explain why different natural events happen. In the *Modern Era*, most people bent to the reality that “numbers don’t lie.” The *Postmodern Era* responds, “Numbers don’t mean anything.”

To those who have roots in the modern era, the idea that numbers don’t mean anything sounds heretical. The generation that we call the *Millennials* are, perhaps, the first fully immersed postmodernists. Previous generations become frustrated with them because of their never ending rebellion against tradition, common sense, and conventional wisdom. What the modernist fails to recognize, however, is that the millennial has come to realize that numbers don’t lie, but people lie about numbers.

Just a few short years ago the *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* was caught red handed in publishing false scientific results. Fifty out of one hundred of their peer reviewed articles featured results that were impossible to duplicate. Despite the fact that the source cited in this essay documents this incident, in passing, it is difficult to find reputable sources that expose the scandal that this reputable scientific journal was taking part in.² Scientific journals have a leg-up on dissenters because their information is compiled by “scientists” who reach their “conclusions” by conducting “scientific research.”

Postmodernists have started questioning the value of scientific research. It’s not that they question the intentions of scientists, but even before mass quantities of fudged results had been exposed another phenomenon started casting doubt on the meaningfulness of scientific research. Old researched started to be proven incorrect. One of the most prominent examples of this would be the various foods that were once classified as unhealthy being declared healthy, once again. Eggs, chocolate, red meat, and butter all

¹ www.pbs.org/faithandreason/gengloss/postm-body.html

² <https://news.stanford.edu/2015/11/16/fraud-science-papers-111615/>

used to be cautioned against as they were “killers” of human health. Lo and behold, all of these foods are now deemed *healthy* and a hearty apology has been issued by some in the scientific community.³ How is it that science can get things so horribly wrong?

The greatest myth about science is that it is unbiased. Numbers are unbiased, but those who create the numbers ravenously want to see certain results. One of the drawbacks of the scientific method would be the *Hypothesis* that precedes any given experiment. The Hypothesis is more or less a prediction made before experimentation occurs. If you want to appear to be exceptional in your field, it is profitable to work toward results that agree with your hypothesis.

Aside from the Hypothesis bias, there is a funding bias. A Young Earth Creationist will never receive a research grant...ever. If your field of interest is Climate Change alarmism, on the other hand, there are branches of the federal government that have a vested interest in funding your efforts. But if you want to perform research disproving the hysteria that goes along with man-made climate change, you are out of luck. Research costs money and somebody needs to provide such funds.⁴ Never fear, unbiased politicians (if ever a thing could even be fathomed) have taken up the noble cause to determine what sort of research will most effectively benefit their campaigns. When you discover that there are no peer revealed articles proposing contrary viewpoints to any given scientific research, ask yourself, “Who benefits from the conclusions of this research?” Or, in other words, “Beware of the sound of one hand clapping.”⁵

In the case of Creationism, some scientists claim that its movement is propelled by postmodernist thought. This is a gross misinterpretation of what postmodernism is. Postmodernism rejects the possibility that conclusions can be reached through empirical data. Creationism does not hang its hat on a relativistic line of reasoning, “I want to believe it, therefore I will believe it,” rather, it carefully examines factual information to find errors with modern interpretations of what is available. From there, the information is reinterpreted to better suit the implications of the reinterpreted data. Certainly there is bias but, so long as we think, there will always be bias.

Claiming that paradigms that contradict the “consensus” models are postmodern is a way to discredit dissenters. Instead of addressing legitimate concerns, the paradigm is ostracized and laughed out of the scholarly hall. This practice is worse than postmodernism because it states, “I want to believe this, thus, you must believe it too!” This is not is not modernism, it’s not postmodernism, it’s authoritarianism. This is what has ultimately turned off postmodernists as they have equated authoritarianism to traditional concepts of authority, thus discrediting trust in people employing either. Think about it.

If someone tells you that you must believe in something, do you believe that, “Why?” is a legitimate response? If you were to ask why and the answer you received was something akin to, “Because you must,” would you not be suspicious? And yet, there are multiple fields of study where the “consensus” paradigms are considered the only ones allowed to be discussed. You are assured that you may practice your science freely so long as the differences in your conclusions only go as far to propose an alternate

³ <http://www.foxnews.com/leisure/2014/03/13/those-bad-old-foods-are-good-for-now/>

⁴ <http://www.foxnews.com/leisure/2014/03/13/those-bad-old-foods-are-good-for-now/>

⁵ <http://bevets.com/expelled.htm>

explanation concerning how the “consensus” paradigm operates. An example would be how Ptolemy’s model of the universe improved upon Aristotle’s model by proposing that there were 55 spheres of the universe opposed to the lighter number Aristotle proposed.

The scientists become the holders of authority, but they do not allow for dissent. This makes them authoritarian, requiring that all people accept their beliefs as fact. After so many authoritarians are proven wrong on a variety of proposals they have forced upon their listeners, their pleas for trust begin to fall upon deaf ears. Fortunately for many authoritarians today, the majority of millennials have already been conditioned to accept what scientists say as their conclusions typically reject God and permit sensuous pleasure of all sorts.

Postmodernists have become an interesting predicament for both the scientist and the sage. Scientists want to woo their followers through scientific data that means nothing to them. Sages want to declare their authority through holy books that claim to contain ultimate truth. If numbers can be lied about and authority can’t be trusted, how does a person win over a postmodernist? It all starts with earning one’s trust.

More information may be added in the future. Feel free to submit questions concerning science in postmodern America to preacherbill174@gmail.com.