

Consensus in Science is Wrong

David de Hilster

726 W. 28th Street, Long Beach, CA, USA

e-mail: david@dehilster.com

Mainstream science accuses dissident scientists including the Natural Philosophy Alliance of not being able to come to a consensus. The truth is, consensus is not healthy for finding truth nor is it the best philosophy for any part of serious human endeavor. In technology, the corporate world, engineering, law, politics, sports, and many other areas, consensus is a death sentence for progress and the worst way to come up with the best solutions to problems. It is consensus that has created the major problem in physics and cosmology and is the straw man setup by both the mainstream and the Natural Philosophy Alliance that has distracted it from the task which it is doing today: allowing for competing ideas to fight it out.

1. Introduction

Mainstream science accuses dissident scientists, including the Natural Philosophy Alliance, of not being able to come to a consensus. The mainstream claims a lack of consensus among dissident scientists or their theories and therefore cannot be correct simply because of the fact that science has one truth that is independent of theory.

The Natural Philosophy Alliance claims on its website that consensus is an important goal.

2. Consensus in Science Today

It is the unfortunate truth that consensus in science has caused it to become impossibly stuck. Young minds are only allowed into universities if they follow the consensus of that university. The more prestigious the institution, the greater the pressure to adhere to consensus views.

In my making of the documentary, "Einstein Wrong - The Miracle Year" [1], I discovered that gifted high school physics students admitted to me that they would forgo scientific truth in order to enter a prestigious institution. This is consensus by proxy. If you expect to be part of a group, you accept their views even if they are incorrect or you disagree.

Criticizing established ideas results in the opposite of consensus: complete disagreement of an individual or their ideas. Criticizing Einstein, the big bang, etc. results in simply being placed outside the Venn diagram of scientific endeavor that is considered valid and true.

The strength of today's mainstream lies in the fact that they speak with one voice, and that truths have agreed to have been solved, even if scientists have not studied a subject. They "trust" that what each says is the truth and that trust leads to stagnation and dead ends in science as illustrated in by relativity, the big bang, and other follies of consensus. This gives them the power of numbers and therefore how can anyone say that all these brilliant people in brilliant universities can be wrong?

3. Consensus in Other Endeavors

In all other forms of human endeavors, success has consistently relied on the fact that competing ideas are proposed, debated, and used. Often, competing ideas literally live side-by-side and thrive and grow until either one totally overwhelms

another, or the two converge into an even better solution, design, product, or idea.

Engineers know that consensus is death to good design. They realize that no idea or implementation of that idea is ideal. All ideas are flawed implementations and the goal is to minimize failure by choosing the lesser of the evils. If one person in the group has enough clout to sway others away from viable alternatives, catastrophe can happen.

In the commercial world, the best ideas often develop from brainstorming sessions. Prior to their development, these great ideas may initially seem rather absurd. This is exemplified by the fact that good ideas and designs come from looking at many options, not fewer ones. It is from this process that the best ideas and products emerge.

We even encourage variety in other endeavors that live side by side on store shelves for us to choose or not choose. Is a Macintosh computer better than a PC?

Human and computer languages are good examples where completely different symbology and meanings often mean the same or similar things. In many cases, translations between the languages are imperfect. Yet, we still communicate, translate, and function productively in society. If you give a computer programmer a task, no two programmers will write the same code but they can result in the exact same behavior.

4. Examples in the Dissident World

To illustrate this point of consensus in science, let us look at expansion tectonics. Only five years ago, most scientists in the NPA were not aware of the overwhelming evidence for a growing and expanding earth. Today, you can find many people who have theories of atomic and sub-atomic structure addressing this as fact. There was no consensus that the earth is growing. No meetings were held and votes taken. Instead, after a preponderance of evidence was introduced to the collective group, the data for supporting expansion tectonics were simply overwhelming that numerous scientists began to adjust their theories to attempt to explain the cause of the growth or expansion.

Another example of convergence has been terminology. During the last decade, many scientists who have discussed the importance of terminology such as Dr. Glen Borchardt [3] has come up with roadmaps about the meaning of words in our scientific

descriptions, theories, and papers. This has resulted in a convergence of language such as saying that “energy is a concept”, or there is no such thing as a parallel universe, or that space-time is an absurd concept.

In the NPA, there are many different theories and models for Gravity including those based on electric fields [4], gravitons [5], and fluid dynamics [6], to name a few. All of these have merit and can be used in different circumstances to fit the work and ideas of individual scientists and experiments.

5. A Roadmap to Success in Science

By understanding the negative consequences related to consensus opinions (which applies to all human endeavor striving for the best solution), it becomes important to consider how science needs to be conducted. Because the universe is so vast and complex, no one model will ever suffice. Competing technologies, languages, products, laws, and their myriad of variations co-exist and enhance our lives. The same is true with theories of physics and cosmology.

One model can stand beside another, each showing a strong point and each having merit, without having to choose one by consensus. We are in the infancy of trying to understand light, gravity, the sub-atomic world, and cosmology. In the beginning of such an endeavor, there will be many competing ideas.

Eventually, enough people will adopt an idea, and that idea becomes consensus by consumption like in all other endeavors and not by vote or by dictating.

Today, science and the NPA are in the brainstorming phase where all possibilities are considered without judgment as long as they are well thought out and have merit. We are starting to see consensus by consumption and that trend will only continue.

6. Conclusion

Although both the mainstream and the Natural Philosophy Alliance claim that consensus is important to science, this could

not be further from the truth. Consensus can never exist where truth is sought. Agreement can. Even when consensus is dictated, disagreement exists. We humans never find absolute truth because each one of us has a unique perspective of the universe so each of our universes are unique. We all own part of the truth [7] and the practical application of like-ideas among a group of scientists, result in common thinking and common ground that comes naturally. Agreement comes naturally from variety. Thus, consensus has no place in science because consensus requires that we all agree on everything. And this will and should never happen if we are to make progress in science.

The Natural Philosophy Alliance must realize that multiple models for physics and cosmology not only can co-exist, but may be necessary to describe different aspects of the universe. All variations can be used and accepted as all viable views of our complex universe. The only model that is completely correct and acceptable by all is the universe itself. The rest are all valid if they predict the behavior of the universe we see today.

References

- [1] Peter Marquardt, the Natural Philosophy Alliance website, <http://www.worldnpa.org/site/our-minimal-consensus/>.
- [2] David de Hilster, 2012, <http://www.einsteinwrong.com>.
- [3] Glen Borchardt, **The Ten Assumptions of Science** (2005).
- [4] Charles Wm. Lucas, Jr., 2011, “Electrodynamic Origin of Gravitational Force”, Natural Philosophy Alliance 7th Annual Proceedings.
- [5] Robert de Hilster, “A New Equation for Gravity”, Natural Philosophy Alliance 16th Annual Conference, Albuquerque, NM (2009).
- [6] Glen Borchardt, Steven Puetz, **Universal Cycle Theory: Neomechanics of the Hierarchically Infinite Universe** (2012).
- [7] Neal Adams, 2010, 17th Annual Natural Philosophy Alliance, Long Beach, CA.