

Modern Science Was the Biggest Illusion of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

Chapter 2, *Universal Man*, by Norberto R. Keppe

The very beginning of positivistic science can be found in the England of the seventeenth century with Hobbes' synthesis of Bacon's empiricism with the mathematical deduction of Descartes—a synthesis that was actually nothing more than a combination of the *a priori* induction of Francis Bacon and the French philosopher's ideas. Hobbes' fundamental principle is, "Every being is corporeal and everything that happens can be explained by movement."¹ As we can see, this is a repetition of the old pre-Socratic ideas from the Ionian School (600 to 500 BC) that Aristotle saw as a sensory solution, which, as we've discussed, is based on sensorial data. The Stagirite then went on to use this idea in his metaphysics when he called movement the builder of the act. That idea has invaded modern physics and produced an enormous number of explanations based on opinions. But as we know, the being is not only corporeal; man is also immaterial (thoughts and emotions), these actually constituting his most essential aspect.

August Comte (the number one spokesman for modern positivism) presented a number of *a priori* ideas that were immediately accepted by every inverted person—including academics looking for a new orientation. Comte seems in every way to be the key figure representing the mentality of the time. In his book, *Discourse on the Positive Spirit*, he clearly states at the very beginning that humanity has passed through three different theoretical stages: theological, metaphysical and finally positivistic. He considered the first and second to be transitory states, while the last he saw as representing the definitive victory of human reason. As it's written in the book this seems impressive, but in analyzing it from a true scientific perspective, we arrive at exactly the opposite conclusion.

Comte reasoned invertedly when he stated that both philosophy and theology were old fashioned, and that finally human imagination has been found to be ahead of everything, dethroning God and the wise men of the past. This inverted idea led Comte to a mental crisis and forced him to cancel his *Cours de Philosophie Positive*. The simple fact that he was schizophrenic proves that he suffered from a deep envy of all goodness. And since the structure of modern society is also inverted, writers like him have always been more accepted.

Modern science was the only field that tried to be totally independent of the others. In ancient times, the philosophers considered philosophy and "theology" to be together, to the point where Pythagoras created a political and religious association (alongside the philosophical); in the Middle Ages, Augustine was quick to show the relationship between neo-Platonic philosophy and Christian theology, and his work inaugurated a long period of dialectics between the two. In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas did the same thing with Christianity and Aristotle's philosophy, and this only lost strength in the twentieth century because of the introduction of the *a priori* process in science.

¹ François-Joseph Thonnard, Précis D'Histoire de La Philosophie, pg 536

All my work is being considered from the point of view of a union of science (starting with psychopathology) with philosophy and theology, and this is providing the means to correct the fundamental mistakes made in all three sectors. In this, I am also respecting the dogmas of theology, which are above but not against reason. I am not saying that experimentation in itself is wrong but that it has followed an incorrect orientation, which is a process that practically doesn't exist. The enormous value of science lies in its ability to confirm if what we think is correct or not. To do this, there is the necessity to experience the idea itself and avoid the disturbances of the pathologies that can distort the real thought (the universal).

The great value of experimentation, then, is found in how it confirms a scientific researcher's idea or not, and therefore its function is to prove or disprove a mental concept. Let's say that its value is derived and not beforehand. On its own, it cannot survive, just as a thought without supporting experience is insecure.

Modern science, then, became more or less like mathematics, which is an *a priori* deductive process because it abandoned philosophical thought and based itself on superficial opinions about external facts. In a broad sense, Aristotle's (erroneous) metaphysics led modern scientists to introduce the possibility of having an entirely positivistic science where all conclusions are taken from experiments. Stanley Hall put this inverted idea well when he said that "Nothing passes through consciousness, which does not have its sensorial basis"—which is exactly what Aristotle's fundamental principle says: there is nothing in the intellect that was not previously in the senses.

The so-called modern sciences are generally built on a sensorial (positivistic) base that has lost the sense of reality, and this has happened precisely because modern scientists have despised exactly the first (and higher) element that occurs in any and every human manifestation: the universal. Working from that incorrect basis, modern science has elaborated an enormous field full of mistakes in interpretation because of the fantasy of its creators.