

# The Age Of Transition And Scientific Fraud

By [Jay Dyer](#)

Global Research, August 21, 2015

[Activist Post](#) 15 August 2015

Region: [Europe](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

*Ours is the great transition age. For the masses, the glowing assumption is that the transition and transformation age we are undergoing is the work of a long, evolutionary process of “natural” “progress.” Wandering about their bubbles, these presuppositions never go challenged or examined, having dobed their cafeteria plate lives from a long string of newsbite phrases and empty slogans overheard in establishment schooling. “We are evolving,” and “We live in an era of change,” and numerous other advertising blurbs that underlie modernity’s plastic ideology actually form the basis for most of humanity’s worldview. Yet are any of these assumptions actually true? Are we in living in an era of “progress” and “human ascent”?*

I answer in the negative and the reasons for my dark assessment are many. [Listening to a recent interview between someone of a truly skeptical bent with a figure in the scientism/skeptical crowd](#), I was irked to hear a bevy of fallacies and incongruences and unexamined assumptions that will here be analyzed with scalpel-like precision. As mentioned above, what precisely is meant by the terms “evolution,” “change,” “progress” and “Nature”? According to those in the ranks of establishment scientism, these are givens, terms of brute factuality and reason, all of which mystically coalesce to give us the “best possible model” of the world under the new grand narrative mythos of “science.”

What is meant by “evolution”? According to modern scientism, the observation of small-scale changes in a species that appear to aid in the species’ extension into the future through reproduction is the basic understanding of evolutionary adaptation. Thus, because certain breeds of animals can be bred with fitter members of the species, we can extrapolate that large-scale aeons of time resulted in the origins of all life from a single amoeba. When it is pointed out that aeons – millions of years – of adaptation and change are not observed, the reply is that bacteria purportedly adapt under conditions of pressure. Thus, it follows that all life mutated under conditions of pressure to “evolve” into what we see today.

On the surface, this has an appearance of being reasonable. Almost no one denies micro-evolutionary adaptation and change, that within the mechanics of various organisms there resides the DNA programming to adapt to environmental circumstances. Where the bait and switch comes is the dogmatic assertion that from this observation, it is certain that all life originated from a single cell millions of years ago, following billions of years of “Big Bang” expansion. The evidence for these theories nowadays is, of course, taken as dogmatic fact, with any dissension on these matters scorned and mocked. Why? Because religion is irrational and “unscientific” and cannot be tested. Yet can these assertions be tested as scientific?

The reply is that they are proven by carbon dating and observing various UV rays that

appear to “expand” from the presumed “singularity” point. There are numerous problems with these claims, but the most glaring will suffice in illustration. First, carbon dating is notoriously unreliable, with examples of testing on recent artifacts showing outrageous time stamps for items that are manifestly not ancient. Further, the carbon dating itself works on the assumption of millions of years of evolutionary, chaotic flux, which begs the question. In other words, if your testing methods already operate on the assumption that matter is aeons in age, then the results of the tests are obviously predetermined.

Second, the appearance of light expanding from some locale is only as coherent as the assumption that it comes from some point of singularity, of which there is absolutely no observable evidence. As you point these facts out to those enmeshed in the religion of scientism, many will admit these are “theories,” but they are “the best models we have.” Says whom? Why does the scientism crowd never admit they are subject to biases and greed (for grants)? How is it that science or the lab is magically averse to the failings of the rest of human endeavors? “Ah, well, yes, it is subject to those things, but that is the beauty of science, we are always changing and adapting our theories to fit the evidence,” the general response comes.

To a degree, this is true. Science does posit new theories and does refine its previous analyses as new data emerges. Yet as I’ve pointed out many times, for this methodology to be consistent, they would have to also conduct scientific experiments into the question of the empirical scientific method itself, as well as its governing assumptions. This is never, ever done, aside from one establishment-funded study that tried to implicate lab bias into a ridiculous Marxist framework. On the contrary, there is a motivating impetus to not conduct this kind of investigation, because it would expose much of scientism’s fraud and deception, where we would discover the scientific establishment is the servant of the same master as the banking, economic and entertainment fields, all of which operate under the (fallacious) umbrella of consensus reality.

The scientific establishment is a hierarchy that operates just like any other corporation of government entity, where knowledge is apportioned on a need-to-know basis. Biologists are afraid, for example, to speak on the matter of physics because they aren’t “physicists,” while mathematicians are afraid to speak on the matter of astronomy because they aren’t “astronomers.” This ridiculous segmentation of knowledge (and there is nothing wrong with specialization) is itself also predicated on the presupposition of scientism, that reality is not a meaningful, coherent universe, but a random, chaotic mutation of accidental consequence. “It just is,” becomes the scientistic refrain, and if you don’t accept that premise and consider any other options, you are a fool.

What begins to become clear is that this is a weighted game that has nothing to do with discovering what is true, objective and “factual” in the “natural world,” but rather a realm of gatekeepers that demand adherence to a predefined set of orthodoxies that determine who is a “scientist” and who is worthy of “peer review.” Furthermore, scientism is entirely grounded in an old, outdated epistemology known as empiricism which has been dissected, refuted and annihilated so many times by cogent philosophers and logicians its continued existence is ironically miraculous. Of all the persons who ought to adhere to their much-touted “logic” and “reason,” these fools are the most irrational, incoherent and nonsensical of all, as they perpetually melt under the 100 degree flame of foundational presuppositional inquiry (and that’s a lab test I’ve done many times that appears to always hold true).



Scientism is your friend!

Arrogantly assuming they know, when in fact they do not (having a gadfly appearance of knowledge), scientism likes logic when it suits, quickly to discard and dispense with such rigors when the heat comes. "All human knowledge comes through sense experience" begins their assumptions, yet when pressed as to whether this proposition itself is a fact of sense data (which it obviously is not), universal claims suddenly dissipate and this great commandment is hailed as an obvious given. It's a new maxim, a new commandment from the gods of the Enlightenment, and you daren't ask such questions. Yet if science is so groundbreaking and revolutionary in character, why is it so afraid of these basic questions of epistemology?

The general reply at this stage is that science cannot, should not and will not answer such absurd "metaphysical" questions. Now wait a minute here - on what basis did this suddenly get shelved into the "metaphysical" category? Says whom? By what standard does the individual scientist know that asking questions of this nature are "metaphysical," as opposed to questions concerning lab data? You begin to see how many and multifaceted the mere assumptions are for scientism to operate. Despite the fact that their starting point is a foundational contradiction, the rest of the world is expected to gaze in awe upon the entire edifices that are constructed upon these fallacies, with rational inquiry unwelcomed. This, you see, is the role of philosophy, and is quite clearly the reason true philosophical inquiry it

is hated by scientism (as [Tyson recently demonstrated](#)).

Also crucial to note is the structure of scientism and the establishment, whose fraudulent bases are continuously exposed openly, with the public becoming none the wiser. This year alone papers were produced from peer review that give the appearance of black holes being both impossible and non-existent, as well as existing. “Dark matter” pervades our universe, yet, wait, no it’s back to ancient conceptions of *aether*. Quantum physics is real, yet wait, it is pseudo-science theory. In other words, “science,” like all the other industries, operates under the public’s naïve assumption that it is a unified, governing body of non-biased, neutral geniuses, engaged in the noble endeavor of furthering the “progress” of human “knowledge.” Again we see those amorphous, undefined, inchoate terms.



Simple philosophical questions should come to bear on these multitudes of theories, and were “scientists” better trained in logic and metaphysics(which they are not), we might avoid many of these ridiculous pitfalls. For example, if Einstein’s relativity is true, there is no fixed point of reference from which to determine which stellar bodies are orbiting which, nor the theory that the universe expanded from a single, compressed atomic mass. This preposterous notion is a clear signpost of the irrationality of scientism, as is the popular theory of how planets formed – that random chunks of space dust got caught in orbits, started spinning, and over billions of years, like bellybutton lint, congealed into a sphere from which life happened to spring forth from primal sludge. Truly it is the case that only academics could believe such fairy tales which are far more laughable than religious creation narratives.

And so the age of transition is not the transition into the era of utopian scientific progress, transhumanism, technological immortality and United Nations kumbaya most think, it is the age of transitioning away from all traditional forms of culture. It is the age of transition into a new global mythology that is created and manufactured in the same way the culture industry creates cultures in various regions and nations. It is a scientific dictatorship that is not scientific, but dogmatic, fascist and hierarchically structured on a need-to-know basis that blatantly hides, obfuscates and rejects actual data and information about human origins and life, only to be replaced by the most preposterous theories of primal sludge, lint ball planets and imagined aeons of unobserved billions of years, meaninglessly exploding forth from the universe’s (Fantasia level) singularity point.

This is not progress, these retarded theories are a regress into explanatory models with no explanatory power. They need to be called out for what they are – replacement mythologies – that are rehashed forms of ancient atomism, dressed up in scientistic garb. It is time to reject these phonies, liars, dupes and establishment hacks, and recognize they suppress



real science and inquiry for the purpose of control. Their control is not about human progress, but the Orwellian opposite, the dysgenics plan of destroying man. We need only think of the *Lancet*, Oxford's most prestigious medical journal, whose editor recently stated in a matter-of-fact tone that [half the world's scientific literature is fraudulent](#):

Dr. Horton recently published a statement declaring that a lot of published research is in fact unreliable at best, if not completely false.

"The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness." ([source](#))

This is quite disturbing, given the fact that all of these studies (which are industry sponsored) are used to develop drugs/vaccines to supposedly help people, train medical staff, educate medical students and more.

It's common for many to dismiss a lot of great work by experts and researchers at various institutions around the globe which isn't "peer-reviewed" and doesn't appear in a "credible" medical journal, but as we can see, "peer-reviewed" doesn't really mean much anymore. "Credible" medical journals continue to lose their tenability in the eyes of experts and employees of the journals themselves, like Dr. Horton.

He also went on to call himself out in a sense, stating that journal editors aid and abet the worst behaviours, that the amount of bad research is alarming, that data is sculpted to fit a preferred theory. He goes on to observe that important confirmations are often rejected and little is done to correct bad practices. What's worse, much of what goes on could even be considered borderline misconduct.

Dr. Marcia Angell, a physician and longtime Editor in Chief of the New England Medical Journal (NEMJ), which is considered to another one of the most prestigious peer-reviewed medical journals in the world, makes her view of the subject quite plain:

"It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as an editor of the New England Journal of Medicine" ([source](#))

The original source of this article is [Activist Post](#)  
Copyright © [Jay Dyer](#), [Activist Post](#), 2015

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Jay Dyer](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)