

# THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF SCIENCE

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published January 20, 2021*

I have discussed this topic many times in my science papers, but I decided to collect and extend my comments here, in one paper. By “epistemology” I mean how science is done, the way of science, and how scientific knowledge is achieved. This includes what science is and what a scientist is, so it transcends epistemology, becoming definitional.

My career over the past twenty years in physics has forced a reassessment of science, pushing all these questions to the fore. Modern science has tacitly and sometimes explicitly defined itself in one direction, while I have defined myself in the exact opposite direction. Mainstream science is a bureaucratic and institutional science, composed of ever larger groups, ever larger funding, and a reliance on technology, especially computers. This science perches proudly on lingo and mathematical formulae, namely operators and fancy new terminology. Conversely, my science is a solo project, with zero funding, zero institutional support—in fact with high levels of institutional hostility—and almost no reliance on technology, especially computers. I use my computer mainly as a typewriter: any computing I do is either done in my head or on a Sharp calculator I have had since highschool (an EL 506S from about 1980). I eschew lingo and operators, using math only as a numerical representation of real mechanics. Compared to Modern science, my science is almost Amish in its distaste for anything unnecessary. I have proved that one man with a pencil and a piece of paper can delve far deeper into the mysteries of the universe than thousands of government-funded people and rooms of computers. I have proved that science is not about being bigger or faster, it is about being clearer and more direct. Borrowing from mainstream's own promotional patter, I say it is about being *smarter*. It is about solving on a post-it note in an afternoon what millions of others could not solve with a shelf of books in centuries.

Many or most have not understood how I have done this, though the question has been asked and will be asked with more urgency in the future. Some have concluded I must be a secret government project myself, a front for a hidden consortium of geniuses paid to test and vex the mainstream. But since only I know exactly how I have done it, I will be direct as usual and just tell you. Then you will know.

I have done it by first realizing that everything to do with Modernism in all its forms is false. This is why it matters that I came to the field of science from the field of art. I was an artist before I became a physicist, and as a realist artist I had already come up against the worst expressions and examples of Modernism. And I hadn't just witnessed them, I had studied them closely to understand exactly how and why they were wrong. I had already been involved in the agon against Modernism for a decade before I began my physical career in earnest in early 2000. So I knew the beast and his faults from the inside out, so to speak. I had discovered that to become a real artist, I had to ignore all the advice from the mainstream and go the opposite direction. I had discovered that Modern art wasn't about art at all, but was about anti-art. It was about the purposeful destruction of art and the artist, in order to replace both with something more useful to the capitalists.

To be honest, I had no idea I would find the same thing in physics. When I began working on the first problems, I didn't see myself moving my agon against Modernism into another field. I have always

been a problem-solver, and at first this was just another case of that. I saw something interesting to do, and started doing it. But pretty quickly I began to see the parallels. I saw that if I wished to be a real scientist, I would have to go my own way, ignoring all mainstream advice, warnings, shaming, and other coercion. I found I must apply what I had learned about life from the field of art to my new field of physics.

To be more specific, what I found is that like mainstream artists, mainstream physicists had decided to accept the current definitions and programs in order to advance within the given system. Both had come through academia, and academia had taught them how to get on in the Modern world. That “getting on” had been the most important thing in their education, far more important than any facts or texts. They had quickly intuited that getting on was not done by questioning anything or making any waves. Like anything else, it was mostly done by following orders from above.

Sounds pretty obvious, so I can understand someone new here not seeing why I didn't do the same. If I wanted to do science, why didn't I just play by the rules? Because my time in art had shown me that playing by the rules actually prevented what it was supposed to promote. The rules of Modernism had completely inverted all logic and sense, so that real art and real science were actually being prevented. All the definitions had become perverse and corrupted, all the methods likewise, all the forms likewise, all the rules—stated and unstated—likewise. I could see that this was precisely why physics had crashed and burned after about 1920: both its epistemology and its metaphysics had become unhinged, so that it was—wittingly or unwittingly—doing everything wrong. It was getting up on the wrong side of the bed, putting on the wrong clothes, eating the wrong breakfast, going to the wrong building, and hammering on all the wrong nails. To get back on the right track, it would have to start over from the beginning.

You will say that explains why I knew physics was corrupt: I had already witnessed a similar corruption in art. But why had I seen this as corruption to start with? Why hadn't I just gone along in art, doing what everyone else who wanted to make it was doing? How did I know Modernism was a mistake the first time I saw it? That's a more difficult question, having to do with who I am and always have been. I could just say I was born this way and beg off, but I think it has a lot to do with trusting my own eyes and responses. I assume most people have an instinctive recoil and aversion when they first encounter Modernism, especially Modern art or literature or music, but most people don't trust their own responses enough to stick to them. They allow themselves to be convinced Modernism is progressive in some way, and that they should learn to appreciate it on some level. If they can't do that, they just admit Modernism is ascendant and that they can't do anything about it. If they wish to advance in almost any field, they have to bow to it to some extent or another, and they soon do so.

But for whatever reason, I couldn't do that. Not only was I absolutely certain Modernism was a terrible conjob, I had no intention of ever bowing to it for any reason. I decided very early on that I would rather be dumped in a shallow grave than to ever say I respected something I didn't respect, liked something I didn't like, or believed something I didn't believe. I vowed to fight it to my last breath, and fight it I have, like no one before me.

And that is what has allowed me to advance so far and so fast in physics. Because I was not tied to any false ideas, programs, rules, budgets, forms, or bureaucracies, I was able to jettison all that as a nuisance and get on with it, following only my own eyes and judgments.

I call that a theory of knowledge or epistemology, because it really does explain how science or anything else gets done, more than any epistemology I have ever seen. In the first instance, it gets done

because it is free to get done: it is not *prevented* by a long list of mistaken human ideas. Humans have a natural ability to figure things out, provided they are not first confused by a lifetime of false definitions, forms, philosophies, methods, and prescriptions. Free of mountains of bad advice and pressures and shamings, a person can do amazing things. Unfortunately, the institutional lives most people live, especially scientists, make it almost impossible to do any decent work. They are so bound by visible and invisible expectations, they can do nothing but turn themselves into some level of mandarin, some brick higher or lower on the wall.

You will say that isn't really an epistemology, since it isn't a theory of how ideas form or how they are verified. I find the question of verification supremely oversold and ultimately uninteresting, so we will skip that. But this does play into the question of how ideas form, as you are about to see. I have shown you how ideas *fail* to form: they are squelched by irrational or illogical sets of rules, flabby or inverted definitions, ill-defined or undefined maths, over-socialization, peer pressure, pressure from superiors, family pressures, money pressures, and by expectations of conformity—both personal and theoretical. They are also now squelched by what I call computer pressure: the pressure to come up with an idea that can fit a computer program, be understood by computers, and be verified by computers. Computers have become the new taskmasters of science, towering over their fawning colleagues like great eyeless and lidless sphinxes, demanding supplication and reward. We are within a few years of the Nobel Prize being awarded to a computer.

But even if you rid yourself of all those constraints upon creativity, you are still not guaranteed to come up with any new or good ideas. This is because, in order to free your mind, you not only have to have the right ideas about science, you have to have the right ideas about life. And those ideas are just a distillation in words of your *relationship to Nature*.

We can take the magazine *Nature* as the perfect example. The name of the magazine is another inversion and corruption, since its authors and editors don't care about Nature at all. As regards physics, they don't even believe in Nature. For them it is just a word. What they believe in is complex operators that have no connection to Nature at all. These operators are a world unto themselves, a world of intellectual isolation, confusion, and hubris. The real world for them is just an illusion, something that decoheres out of their equations to present them a Nobel Prize. Not only do they have no love or respect for Nature, they think of her only as an unnecessary residue of their own nasty thoughts.

Which is precisely why Nature refuses to give them any good ideas. To be blunt, she doesn't like working with assholes.

You may think I am joking, but I am deadly earnest. Yes, epistemology is not a theory, it is a relationship. Good ideas arise or don't arise for a reason, like everything else, and that reason has nothing to do with the brain working like a machine, synapses firing, information being collated, and conclusions being spit out like ticker tape. Good ideas come when you develop a proper attitude toward and relationship with the world around you, and by that world I mean not academia, but Nature with a capital N. There *is* a real world, Nature, and you are but a tiny part of it, though connected to it in every possible way. If you recognize and respect those connections, you can use them, but if you don't they are as good as closed. All knowledge comes through those connections, and arrives via those connections, which is what makes this an epistemology. You may think it is a religion, but it is just as much an epistemology, since it explains where good ideas come from and why they are true. They aren't true because some stuffed shirt sitting in some chair has verified them, they are true because Nature has verified them.

Yes, I am telling you that if you want to do good work in any field, you have to realize that you are not the master of Nature, but her servant. She speaks only to lovers or devotees, not to skeptics, agnostics, or infidels. Again, I learned this first in the field of art, where I found Nature gave her secrets up to me immediately. Looking at my subject matter you can see why: I was in love with her creations. I loved Nature so she loved me back. This is the way it works.

You will say this smacks of religion, having nothing to do with science. But if you say so, it is again your misunderstanding, since there is no real separation of the two. Everything could be called science, and everything could be called religion, since they are just two names for the same things, stressing different facets of existence. This is science because, specifically, my charge field gives us a physical mechanism for the transfer of information from Nature to the individual. PHOTONS. Ideas don't arise spontaneously, they are caused by interaction with your environment—Nature. Nature literally speaks to you via photons, and this is not just with visible light through your eyes. It is full-spectrum, as photons of all wavelengths arrive directly at every cell in your body.

You will say I am giving Nature agency, though, by making it look like she can refuse participation because you didn't love her. Well, I am not giving Nature agency, she is giving me agency, so again you are upside down. But I think it is likely that the channels are usually closed from our end, not hers. In other words, your lack of belief in Nature and in all these connections closes them from your end. If you don't seek inspiration, of course you will not find it.

So, as you now see, the failure of Modern science is a failure of idea, attitude, and relationship, at all levels. It isn't just a failure of math or diagrams or institutions. It isn't only a failure of specific theories or interpretations or rules or equations. It is a failure of the Modern person, and his understanding of his place in the world. It is a purposeful disconnect between man and Nature, which has short-circuited any possibility of good ideas or theories.

I avoided this failure by refusing this Modern regimen in any form or level, and I am showing you how to do the same. You start by loving Nature, believing in her reality, and admitting your own limitations. You recognize your place in the hierarchy. You believe in inspiration and remain open to it. That is the first level of preparation. Next you refuse all the requirements of Modern science, including the required bows to academia, authority, money, peers, famous people, publishers, computers, and prize committees. In art, my only concern was creating a beautiful painting. Whether anyone liked it or bought it or understood it didn't concern me. That was up to them and so was beyond my control. Just so in physics, where my only concern is solving the problem at hand. Whether anyone likes it or publishes it or understands it doesn't concern me. I can only explain it to the best of my abilities: the rest is up to the audience. The painting is what it is, whether it sells or not, whether it makes me famous or not, whether it wins me friends or not. Just so the physics paper. It is what it is, and all the nameless slurs on the internet have no effect on it, or upon me. That is because I trust my own eye and my own opinion over that of anyone else in the world. My eye and opinion are informed by Nature, whose advice I trust above any person I have ever met.

That is how I did what I did. So now you know.