

HOLIDAY WRITING WITHOUT ALCOHOL NOR PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS

by Tophe M, in the Chalet during late July 2016 (after Jesus number 1)

"This is the most important text for three thousand years (as usual) ..." J

<i>Pages:</i>	<i>Topic:</i>	<i>Following ...:</i>
2- 5	Weather-forecast skepticism	re-encounter of Annick
6-11	True anti-terrorism	France attack of July 14
12-17	Criticism of plots denial	reading the latest "Science & Vie"

French version:

last correction, sending email and putting online: 07/28//2016

English translation:

from Google Translate basis, adapted: 07/30/2016

(for a new meteo0.htm website?)

I DARE DOUBTING OF THE WEATHER FORECAST

by Atonn Hère (sounding as French words for “lightning conductor”), 07/21/2016

Two days ago, my parents received a friend lady, retired climatologist, that was a university teacher, and during random discussions, we talked a bit about climatology. The conversation, during eating, was interrupted by a change of subject, or I had to get up to bring the next meal I don't remember, but now I think back of this conversation unfortunately unfinished, and I would like to complete my objections, into a good argument.

1- Summarizing the global debate

A / I said that the weather forecast is often wrong.

B / She answered that what we call 'weather forecast' is an interpretation by incompetent ones (cheaper than real meteorologists), vaguely trying to tell directions understandable by everyone.

C / She added that when records show a situation identical to the present situation, we know with certainty what will be the future. Of course the climate projection at very long term (years, decades or centuries) is based on models, on assumptions, but weather prediction says what will be.

D / I began to challenge this induction which is logically wrong, in my opinion.

E / She replied as final answer that these laws come from physics that is certain, it is undeniable knowledge.

F / I wanted to challenge this, but the conversation was over.

2- Point by point, on my side, posterior

AB: The weather forecast error

a) I see every day that the weather forecast predicting rain or not for the next day here is often wrong, with a frequency of maybe 20% or 50%, and I'm not sure that the prediction "at random" is much worse. I have certainly not received demonstration in a pharmaceutical way that it works better than a placebo (here: significantly better than the frog test of the old whimsical weather predictors).

b) I note also, with the recent vogue of long predictions "for five days", that these predictions are changing, up to invalidate themselves. Example: Sunday 17th, it was announced that it will rain here on Friday 22nd, this is confirmed on Monday 18th, Tuesday 19th and Wednesday 20th, then Thursday 21st the new prediction is that it will not rain here on Friday 22nd, so it says that were false earlier predictions for Friday 22nd, corrected by the unforeseen developments. And Friday 22nd, it will rain or not here, anyway invalidating predictions that were made (either the one of 21st or the ones of 17th-18th-19th-20th).

c) I have read in articles or books about chaos theory, that (scientists say) meteorology will forever resist the need for certainty, despite the vertiginous growth of calculation power. I think that Hubert Reeves called that the butterfly effect: perhaps an unexpected wing flapping of a small butterfly in Australia (unknowable with our measures) lead little by little to change at local scale then regional and beyond, leading

to a cyclone hitting China unexpectedly. This is called extreme sensitivity to initial conditions, and that is what theoretically limits the predictions to the very short term, a fast growing uncertainty striking at long term. Chaotic phenomena are hardly predictable.

d) The modern weather forecast (in France) shows humility mentioning risks, degrees of confidence, probabilities, and it does not reflect some solid knowledge, but very clearly an approximation admitted to be wrong a little or a lot. Moreover, without this, if weather had claimed the (fallibilist) credibility of a scientific law, it would have been refuted, invalidated, at the first error, which actually happened, and several times.

This is why I doubt very much that the weather error is the result of cheap incompetence: in my opinion, it is intrinsically that the situation is uncertain.

CD: the wrong induction

e) Having found 3 times one distribution of pressures, temperatures and winds (directions and intensities), with the same result, does it imply that if we have once more such a distribution, the result will still be the same? No, it is a logical error, called induction = wrong generalization. As Karl Popper explained, if I observed 100/100 white swans, it does not prove that all swans are white (the 101th may be black – and even if the hypothesis "all white" is supposedly validated with 100/100 other swans, it remains that the 201th may be black). This applies regardless of technical reserves about uncertainty or approximation (knowing that we could improperly classify "equal" close situations being "different at a high level of precision").

f) I personally destroyed induction, in various forms:

- . Absolute certainty by generalization was credible only with the addition (changing all) "until proven otherwise"; the preamble to the general law "We know that" becomes (if honesty is there) "We believe that".

- . Probabilistic certainty is also mathematically false: if we got 3 'like this' results out of 3, it is wrong to claim that the probability / frequency of another result is necessarily $<1/3$ ($<33\%$). If the proportion of another is well higher, e.g. $2/3$ (= 67%), the result could perfectly be 3/3 'like this', obtained without any mystery or abnormality (in 3.6% of cases, says mathematically the binomial law, counting the combinatorial cases, posed as equally probable).

archives	cases	3			2			4		
	like this	3			2			4		
	frequency (like this)	100%	66,7%	33%	100%	50,1%	25%	100%	75,1%	37,5%
	frequency (another)	0%	33,3%	67%	0%	49,9%	75%	0%	24,9%	63%
	proba (like archives)	100,0%	29,7%	3,6%	100,0%	25,1%	6,3%	100,0%	31,8%	2,0%
		estimated	limit	"refused"	estimated	limit	"refused"	estimated	limit	"refused"

- . The binomial certainty is also problematic: with reverse beta law, we calculate the confidence interval according to a freely chosen risk,

archives	cases	3		2		4	
	like this	3		2		4	
confidence interval	95%	0% to 78%	0% to 95%	0% to 63%			
	99%	0% to 90%	0% to 99,0%	0% to 78%			
of another	99,9%	0% to 97%	0% to 99,9%	0% to 90%			
at	99,99%	0% to 99,0%	0% to 99,99%	0% to 95%			

but firstly the choice of this numerical value of risk (or confidence) is arbitrary, questionable, secondly it turns out that the detailed calculation uses an often inadequate model (sampling with replacement, or infinite population). Also, historically, the scientists used a "normal" statistical approximation which led (in my opinion) to obvious aberrations (possibly rain quantity strongly below zero, etc.) but scientists claimed anyway they were controlling the risk, thus their place is more similar to dominant liars than wise convincing brains.

g) We can model how the weather forecast is being wrong, at least possibly. For example, archives employ a pressure measure every 10 miles on the ground and every 100ft altitude; it provides a framework ignoring the details, perhaps capital, located between two steps. In this sense, the exposed aspect is an overview, not a detailed knowledge. The similarity can therefore ignore major elements of causal value deciding the future. The premise "it looks like ..." should lead to the conclusion "it is possible that ..." while is wrong the conclusion "therefore we know that, undoubtedly, the future will be...".

h) In principle, the future is unknown, any past regularities do nothing to prove the future will be the same. Science education, in this sense, is mostly a factory building idiot believers (generalizing like children or animals). Certainly this teaching may be enough to give sociologically glorified statutes but there is no logical value (truth) in this.

EF: wrongly believed physical science

i) It is a special philosophy that results in the alleged certainty: scientism ("truth, the whole truth lies in science"). I think it is now dismissed as a naïve utopia of the 19th century (or 1850-1920?), falsely affirmative. In the early 1980s, at the philosophy exam at the end of scientific high-school, I said to the contrary (not inventing anything personally) that "the so-called scientific laws are theories waiting for experimental refutation (even if one of them was right, eternally, we could not know that for sure)".

j) I have since then discovered (outside school books) new epistemologists as Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend, that explain in detail how change the dominant theories, more sociologically than experimentally / logically. At my work (technical, microbiological), I faced the evidence, unknown externally, that Scientific laws are subjective preferences of "opinion leaders" who take the lead in congresses. Moreover, I had the opportunity to seriously discuss with one of these major international dominants (in English because I do not speak Dutch) and I was scared to conclude he was what I call "a dishonest man", completely indifferent to total mathematical errors, if they are both officials and to the financial benefit of his group. The celebrity / dominance (making law) therefore has little (or nothing) to do with credibility.

k) In biology, it is well known that the supposed eternal truths of the past (as "Staphylococci are susceptible to penicillin") were invalidated, changing with time, microbial generations, etc. Academic lessons that I received with severe control of "knowledge" (on the determination of phenotypic characters by DNA in particular) are now classified as unacceptable faults for new students (they were coming from commercial speech, sensationalist, selling search in human DNA sequencing). Even in pure physics, there is quantity of assumptions that are "admitted but doubtful" with "ad hoc" additions and exceptions, not to admit that experience contradicts the prevailing theory (subjectively judged the best while imperfect).

I) However, among climatologists apparently and among biologists for sure, continues the scientist illusion "math is perfect, physical sciences are their corresponding in material world, other sciences are progressing in certainty to join them". On the contrary, math is relativist with no absolute affirmation, and I have philosophically shown that experimental sciences have abusive pretention, forgetting that they arbitrarily presuppose the realist axiom with rejection of the dream hypothesis (with false demonstration by Cartesians), to hide that scientists are believers (much like the religious, both being compatible). And I broke mathematically the key statistical tools of Science (false calculation of estimated standard deviation, wrong demonstration of normality, false demonstrations by non-significance) – I have not checked the impact on physical science, but it could invalidate thermodynamics thus perhaps climatology.

3- Review

The climatologist I met believes with certainty she hold the knowledge deciding the weather, and I deny that there is unquestionable knowledge there (I think it's rather like knowledge of the Koran, which may be perfect in recitation but on a basis that may be false).

On a personal level, I smile and allows her to be wrong. However, on a more general aspect, it would not be absurd to question the competence of teachers / diplomers and the associated wages, for simple believers that seem to have forgotten to think (with critical intelligence).

(for my website democronde.htm?)

15th? complement: **Consider an anti-terrorism becoming honest** (07/22/2016)

After the attack of July 14th, 2016 (in Nice, here in France), having made 84 dead including 10 children and teenagers, a very loud cry "unanimously" resonates in France to raise drastically the anti-terrorist struggle. The governing politicians redouble their clarion call for complete unity (in the fight, in the war) and opposition politicians accuse the government of not doing enough, militarily against Islamists abroad and / or internally for severe control of people here. However a strong disagreement with them all comes here from the democracyld party (democracy-world, of which I am the only member currently living, according to the realists, because Jesus Christ number 2 and "The Messiah, the true one" are currently classified as non-existent by psychiatrists, usually shooting my brain with antipsychotics, but this time I went on vacation forgetting the pills).

Both political groups in France, called Majority and "Opposition", pretend to compete but they hide at least one pacifist anti-nationalist alternative (anti-nationalist for real, without simply pretending this, against the National Front – mainly fought for his populism Instead of being "normal" against most people without saying it). Since it is claimed that simple speaking is not enough anymore, but there is a need of urgent actual acts, the democracyld party is led to issue practical proposals, effective, extremely serious, to present (theoretically) to UNO for arbitration:

1. Daring to break the French propaganda. (Put in prison Francois Hollande and order an immediate cease-fire in his war against Islamism. Repatriate all soldiers and direct them to defense and no more to attack - which generates counter attacks, declared "terrorist").

2. Daring to recognize us as terrorists, yes ourselves. (Explain that successive French governments in 1945-2016 were / are themselves terrorists militantly, we should present a huge mea culpa going away from several alliances.)

3. Daring to stop the French abuse of dominance. (Stop the aristocratic injustice, armed with mass destruction weapons, which is the basis of the diplomacy in our country.)

4. Daring to challenge religions. (Require equitably that terrorism is also abolished in the other side, but without specifically targeting Islamism: practicing self-accusation too.)

In summary, the principle of this **peaceful solution** to defeat terrorism can be formulated as: **stop being terrorists ourselves.** But outraged howls would arise everywhere, with hatred and / or head-finger-sign (French tradition to say "complete madness is there"), forgetting the 4 points argued above, and it would be better to quietly discuss each. Explanations would prevent misunderstandings, justify accusations and solutions.

1. Break the French propaganda. In 2014, long before the attacks of Charlie Hebdo, Paris-13th-November and Nice-14th-July, the French President Francois Hollande personally declared war on Islamism (when a French tourist was beheaded in Algeria if I remember), on behalf of the whole France. But modern war (since Guernica 1936?) is killing civilians and babies – e.g. the firestorms On Dresden 1944 and Tokyo 1945, classified here as heroic. So that was meaning clearly "Islamists, I will destroy you, and if you're not happy with this: let you murder my population." It is a huge fault, a blood crime against his own people, and this justifies: life imprisonment (forever jail, to discuss). And although dominant media were repeating his propaganda to intoxicate

the population in his way, this socialist man decided war without requiring consent by popular referendum (that may cause a debate), he used republicly, anti-democratically (falsely claiming the contrary), his previously-elected status to command. This is aggravating circumstance. Finally, while the French army engaged in all foreign civil wars where Islamists were present (Mali, Central African Republic, Iraq, Syria), he has done no mea culpa on the French condemnation of the similar Soviet intervention in Afghanistan 1980, which corresponds to an attitude of "do what I say, not what I do", this (killing) inconsistency also deserves severe punishment.

All politicians (French and from foreign allied governments) that had "forgotten" / hidden these obvious opposing elements would be judged for active complicity in poisoning the public. To detoxify the public, it would also be necessary to immediately change the words of the French national anthem (instead of proclaiming it again and again, even by masses of children this July 14th national day): "Get arms citizens !" says that all civilians are soldiers, killers and good to kill, and then "Make impure blood flow" encourages to kill racistly foreigners and their potential babies, pretended of "bad blood". This is atrocious ... (to me only here?).

2. **We are terrorists ourselves.** In 1990-2016 (and even before in other ways), France was / is a warm ally of the UK, USA and Israel. Annual commemorations (May 8th and Judaic CRIF dinner) celebrate the "victory" sealed by babies exterminations in Dresden, Hiroshima, Der Yassin (without mentioning Hanoi later and New England / Far West before): this is not an anti-terrorist position, but approving the winner terrorists, against the vanquished. Instead of yelling that terrorism is bad (meaning secretly: on the other side), we should recognize that we are terrorists ourselves, and we should require from UNO a Nuremberg-II trial against winner terrorism and explicit allies of it (including French politicians, claiming falsely to be representative of the local population, although "in better" they say, with massive support of them to the France-Israel-Friendship while the people is suspected of anti-Semitism). So with these World judgments and possible condemnations would occur a reign of effective equity. On the other side, it would be less easy anymore to recruit suicide revolutionary killers of voting families. Maybe Axis civilian or Native American victims could be declared "to forget" (even if the Jewish Holocaust, that happened before Hiroshima, is proclaimed "Never to forget"), without leading to the status of currently active terrorism, but... what is very present, is that Palestinian families evicted in 1948 (or having run away from racist terrorist massacres in 1948-50) are forbidden to return, under threat of being killed at the border by the strongest, Israelis, and Western leaders approve fully this death threat (terrifying potential returnees), and they boycotted the World Conference Durban 2 about Zionist racism, calling this meeting "anti-Semitic", it is immensely present, and diplomatic / journalistic France is in the stronger camp, terrorizing weak families. [We should also talk honestly about "freedom", alleged supreme value here, attacked by "the heinous terrorist fanaticism": 1 / answer to a despised French-Arabic young girl that asked after Charlie Hebdo affair, with her face blurred by the French TV (as she would be classified as "criminal" for her words), why spitting on Islam is celebrated as undeniable freedom while spitting on Judaism is condemned as intolerable hate; 2 / under usual speeches about freedom magnificently won in 1945, ask how the Algerians / Malagasies / Indochinese / Zulu / Black Americans were free in 1945-48; 3 / answer Buddhists and skeptics complaining (in a secret or suicidal way) to be liable of 2 years in prison under the French Gaysot Act for "crime" of doubt against the official dogma (same dogma as in Israel).]

3. **Stop the French abuse of dominance.** Diplomatic and "intellectual" France should immediately stop pretending to be champion in Human Rights. Indeed, since

"human beings are born equal in dignity and rights" (key article 1), 60 million of French people do not have to count 20 times more at the UN (veto right) than one billion Indians or one billion Muslims.

- Either... colonization must be recognized criminal and effectively abolished: the United Kingdom (23th world population, demographically) must give its UN veto to its former colony India, 2nd world population, and France (21st world population) to its former colony Vietnam, more populous, or better to Muslim Indonesia (formerly Dutch-India), 4th world population. This is to stop crushing by dominant (aristocratic) minority to prevent vigilante uprising opposite. Similarly, we must give back the USA / Canada / West Indies to Native Americans, Australia and New Zealand / Caledonia to Aboriginal / Maori / Canaques, Israel to Palestinians / Canaanites, etc. The true justice would begin, with total ruin of the West, Europe once super-enhanced by the conquering aggression finally being punished for it, in now receiving hundreds of millions returnees. Let us cease "crushing to our profit," which obviously engenders anger or war (logical and not unjustifiable barbaric / evil). And it is false that France has very great universal things to say, since it was / is dishonest for its own benefit. Remember, as this veto is mentioned "for historical reason dated 1945 ": the Second World War happened to prohibit hyper-violently Germany and Japan to expand by conquest as did UK and France claiming to be legitimate in this (and the French were outraged to be treated as despised half-slaves and without freedom of choice, a status they approved for "sub-human" Africans, Asians, Native Americans - racistly, the concept of "sub-humans" was in 1945 declared intolerable only for the Jews) ...

- Or ... completely in the opposite but it could also be envisaged, we could legitimize colonization (of the USA, Australia, Israel, etc.), but then mandatorily (fairly), we should formalize that Germany 1940 and Japan 1941 were punished wrongly, and it would allow for example 500 million Africans to colonize Europe now, 400 million Latinos to colonize USA / Canada, 200 million Asians to colonize Australia, 30 million Arabs to colonize Israel. However, to avoid colonization massacring again, it would be better to abolish the borders peacefully, those borders that rejected the poor foreigners to avoid sharing. Only dishonest people (as we were / are) have "both the cake and the money to buy it" (in this case: have colonized and refuse to be colonized then). The splendid altruistic Humanism moral (certainly not Jewish and even anti "elected race," therefore suspected of alleged anti-Semitism) said "we must treat others as we want to be treated" so it is very normal that the French, after invading foreign countries and rating local ones as half-slaves, are then invaded and treated as half-slaves; and since they glorify the Free French aviators who, with the RAF, massacred German civilians and babies, it is normal that they are now massacred themselves, including babies. Otherwise, one must admit a huge mistake in the domination and war spirit, and logical sanction (preventive of new abuses) seems to me the abolition of borders: as between French departments /counties today, the movement of people would simply be free, no more prohibited (my Filipino niece was denied repeatedly a tourism visa to France, despite official /journalist blah about welcoming foreign tourists, in this super-xenophobic country, including the "moral left" side saying humanist lies).

Before the eventual abolition of borders, the Non-Proliferation Nuclear Treaty should be read again in full: it was signed by the whole world only because it included nuclear disarmament of the already-nuclear (of course without any absurd voluntary act of submission to the dominant countries). The French (and other) atomic warheads should all be given to the UNO, without serving anymore as dominating threat (terrorist anti-civilian anti-babies) to crush the foreign majority, with lies saying this is for the democratic spirit "1 human (adult) = 1 vote".

4. Generalizing honestly religious condemnation. It is conceivable that if we stop being monsters, those opposite (here called "terrorists" and calling themselves "heroes" as our 1945 bombers do) may be awful, even if there is in the future no objective reason anymore to revolt, just the same crushing temptation that guided us. So while doing self-flagellation, we should prevent domination by other monsters than ourselves. For this, there is no reason to condemn specifically / zionistly Islamism (the last remaining enemy of Israel and of the Diaspora still dominating the West), we should find a true coherence, fair. One solution would be to call for immediate and drastic reform of the three great monotheistic religions: Judaism, Christianity, Islam. Indeed, the so-called "moderate Muslims" cannot claim respectability while loving a religious text that calls for murder if opinion is different. This is absolutely the same with Christianity, even if it is little known, hidden: Jesus Christ (number 1, the official, before being rejected by the majority his co-religionists) called for killing the parents driving their children away from his Hebrew God (which then gave logic extermination of Native Americans, Aborigines, potential killing of Buddhists, atheists, agnostics, skeptics, etc.) [I have not the Gospels at hand, on vacation, to quote specific passages, but these are 2 of 3 occurrences of the word "wheel that the donkeys turn", a very heavy stone attached to the neck of "guilty" ones, attached, before taking them at sea and throwing them over edge]. He also said the Non-Jewish are dogs (episode of the Canaanite woman), this could be a proof of Jewish active racism and this is apparently the source of many racisms later (anti-black, anti-Native-American, anti-foreign "impure blood", etc.), with lies saying this is universal love and peace (actually victorious crushing peace, in the slave-making way), this is immensely horrible. And Judaism (fully approved by Jesus Nr 1 until he wanted to be adored personally) venerates a (virtual) racist God that would have commanded slavery and killing of non-Jews (not invited to become Jews, as classified "dirty race") to make Israel the Jewish country. Moreover, as slavery is prohibited altruistically now (because nobody would want to be a slave, or having his / her children sent to slavery), venerating slavery-driven texts as the 3 components Torah / Gospel / Koran should be prohibited, except total disavowal + rewriting. Otherwise, the ones allowed to worship this can be monsters (well known or hidden). Another serious point: the religious legend Flood / Gehenna / Hell seems the invention of terrorism, commanding obedience (ritual / arbitrary) under pressure of terror. Finally, the law of Retaliation "eye for eye, tooth for tooth" is another religious horror. If a man rapes your daughter, does it allow you to rape his daughter?? the poor innocent girl was guilty of nothing... But adored celebrities in the West, like Churchill, have practiced this monstrous aberration, on the principle "the Germans came and killed our babies, so let us go and kill their babies" (as the Israelites plundered racistly by the Nazis were for that allowed to plunder racistly the Palestinians – UNO 1948 should be severely judged too). Certainly if these religions are broken (in their current form), it does not mean that the belief in atheistic materialism is the only possible way. Scientism is just another belief and Cartesian realism is only some illogical choice (with false demonstrations to exclude the hypothesis of dream now). And, of course, it seems quite beneficial to consider rewarding good altruistic actions by a hypothetical (or imaginary) paradise post mortem, as it is possible to consider the relief of suffering ones by Buddhist self-extinguishing (ceasing to eat without begging lie), or falling asleep forever with barbiturate suicide (not killing someone else) – legalizing this is a need (to avoid horrors as German Wings crash or explosion in a stadium of a desperate after migration refusal). But that in no way authorizes to worship a huge terrorist, genocidal (The Flood) and racist pro-Jewish (Old Testament / Torah / Gospel of Matthew).

Everything must be rewritten, stopping to lie at our own advantage (French or Western or Judaic). The Human Rights, called Universal, were self-contradictory where they decreed untouchable freedom of religion: as they should prohibit / reframe Apartheid any Nazi possible religions, they must severely accuse dominant religions (Judeo-Christianity and Islam, and the base of Indian castes), the sacred spirit does not justify immoral anti-altruistic horror. Key point: contrary to what claims the propaganda here (with all the "best" journalists and allowed "intellectuals": Levy, Cohen, Goldstein, Bergmann, etc.), condemning the Jewish religion (as the atheist Zionism of Ben Gurion) is in no way anti-Semitic racism, nor condemning Apartheid is anti-white racism – Jews or white babies are completely innocent in all case. Hitler was completely wrong in anger but this does not legitimate the domination of communitarian jewos hidden behind the innocent jewas (Jewish by ancestry only) like me (the amalgam "Jew" in dictionaries is very bad).

All this is a true conceptual bomb in the political / intellectual landscape of the French and Western worlds. The democracyld party (that is to say, "I ...") dare(s) peacefully thinking over for real. This will obviously not be popular, not spontaneously accepted, because equity at our expense = ruin of the awful Western civilization. Obviously, liars wanting war go a million times less far, being one million times more popular, making their people massacred, and nobody reflects contradictorily. Too bad, maybe (I prefer a sad fatalism than a bloody revolution) but it confirms that we are an Evil camp claiming to be the camp of goodness, without credibility at all. As the few Germans who were anti-Nazis in 1944, burned by the Allies wanting to mass-murder the population of the hated countries (mistaking anger), I could be killed with others by Islamist vigilantes (claiming to be better), and that is unfortunate. For solving the enormous problems, becoming honest was at least possible, although hidden by the ubiquitous propaganda.

Here internally, this presentation is not without personal risk: the French Prime Minister Valls reiterated that: 1 / explaining terrorism is pardoning it, approving it... (that was also said by former French president Sarkozy, claimed to be opposite of the Hollande-Valls camp) [this is a (not even camouflaged) variant of the anti-neutral dictatorial call "all those who are not with me are against me and so I will crush them"]; 2 / not going with our leaders in this war is giving victory to terrorists. So I risk prison for alleged collusion with terrorists. It's totally unfair, as I invented a third completely separate way, condemning Islamism and even Islam, considered as monstrous. There is no hope of justice: I have personal experience (in France 2015) of full judicial dishonesty, lying, in an adoption case. And this is consistent with the Gayssot law (with Gollnish jurisprudence against doubt): behind the rhetoric to the cherished liberty, "Justice" orders prison for crimes of opinion (whenever opinion is not obeying the Jewish dogma "justifying" the conquest of Israel 1948 – the genocide of the Caribbean or Mohicans or Tasmanians being on the contrary freely-deniable). All this confirms my feeling to "be right, which is prohibited, severely condemned (or discreetly murdered)". Alas.

Of course, it is paradoxical (apparently "very stupid") to describe as "pacifist" my proposal that would cause a total war with use of nuclear weapons in mass by Westerners to maintain their domination. But this apocalyptic vision is precisely demonstrative: at the idea of creating equity with actual decolonization (or humanism without border), the West would prove the abominable evil that is already (pretending the opposite, blah). Rather than trying to immediately establish equity (and boom, the world would explode), we have to fix that "in two years from now" with very urgent call to the intelligentsia to find honest ways to soften / develop a fair fall for the ugly

dominants (without mass murders of aristocrats like in France-1789 nor massacre of the World majority). The intelligentsia, becoming just and inventive, then would start deserving its name, without being engaged anymore (in the Western side) in some anti-humanist support to US-Zionist domination (anti-Native American, anti-Arab, anti-Canaanite, anti-Asian, etc.). This call to actually think over, rather than make war (current or future) is actually pacifist, I believe it strongly.

[for my website about philosophy of Sciences (Zetetic-toc.htm)]

The "scientifically" hidden conspiracy, 07/23/2016

In Science & Vie magazine of August 2016 (# 1187), the headline is "*You said conspiracy? (Our brains are programmed to believe it)*". I read this article first since it sounded very surprisingly as a condemnation of doubt, so this seems anti-science: theoretically, mandatory official dogma belief is the principle of anti-heretic medieval theocracy, while this is the doubtful test of other assumptions that is the scientific way (of renaissance and modernity).

*** The problem**

The introductory summary, on page 45, is clear: "*Surely you have heard here or there: the real perpetrators of September 11th are not those which were accused; man never really walked on the moon; and the death of Princess Diana would not be an accident... In fact, our survey illustrates it (see page 60): we are not insensitive to these stories of secret machinations. Psychologists are even now demonstrating that our propensity to believe in not reasonable stories has a perfectly rational explanation. Our brains are programmed to believe in the conspiracy. Here is how, through seven emblematic cases.*" This is a total error in logic, as if this was a blind choice from scientists allied to authorities. Indeed, it is very basic in pure logic, but the writers there are not logicians: for an event A, the main explanatory narrative is A1, and some people say it is the opposite A2; the researchers show that when the clear A1 is the true cause of A, not delusional A2, many ones still believe in A2; but that is not the question: the fact that the error is sometimes possible does not prove there is always error; the opposite proof is obvious, automatic: when authorities affirm the A2 lie, some listeners believe it as well; what we need to find (without knowing the true cause of A) is: which is right between A1 and A2, and usually we do not know, the two of these claiming to be certain, proven, without giving a good way to decide.

The key point in the introductory text, is the subjective judgment "not reasonable stories" for theories that are completely reasonable but perhaps false. Of course, the authorities claim to have the monopoly of reason, but it's a false abuse of power, and their use of lying propaganda, at least here and there, proves they are wrong sometimes. That does not prove they are always wrong, but to know whether they are wrong or not, on this point or another, this article brings strictly nothing, except a support to officials, erroneous in that it claims to be objective when it is subjective, partisan.

*** The public survey**

The survey page 60-61 is revealing. Its conclusions are headlines on previous pages: "*6.5% of the French think that man has never walked on the Moon*", "*33% of the French believe that a secret society leads the global economy*", "*24% of the French believe that the Boeing of Malysia Airlines MH370 did not crash*", "*22% of the French believe airliners bomb chemicals in secret*", "*51% of the French believe that Princess Diana was murdered*", "*31% of the French people think that the real perpetrators of the Charlie Hebdo attack were hidden*", "*17% of the French people think that global warming is an invention*". In fact, the detailed figures indicate that have been accumulated "definitely true" and "probably true." The term "(X% of the French) think that" was actually meaning "think or consider maybe that" what is logically / philosophically very different. And if the text says these cases are "emblematic of the problem" it implicitly asserts that the true answer is "definitely wrong" judgment – corresponding to the respective weight of opinion 74%, 33%, 34%, 45%, 20%, 36%,

56% (therefore sometimes minority, hence the exaggerated response of Science & Vie that has sponsored this survey). As if "daring to consider that the authorities lie" was a criminal rebellion against scientific evidence. But in 50 years from now, maybe publication of archives (under top secret now) will reveal that Science & Vie was wrong on 1 (or up to 7) of these topics. In particular, the story "walking on the moon in 1969", glorifying the triumph of capitalism over communism (which is reason enough to lie), seems very doubtful: around 2002 when President Bush Jr. launched the patriotic idea "back on the Moon!", the NASA replied that it was impossible, probably until 2050 at least, as if wanting to go there "for real" (and returning alive) was aberrant with current technology (or past, of course). Personally, I would chose "no opinion" everywhere, which corresponds to "<1%" opinions on the 7 subjects, and so I will avoid the error in 100% of cases. The logic is on the side of skepticism, totally opposite to Science & Vie believing there totally officials, and also contrary to conspiracist activists (as "supporters of the conspiracy thesis," not in the sense "true actors of conspiracy ") who claim officials are for sure lying. And somehow the moderate skepticism is relatively wise when it concludes "probably true" or "probably false," meaning "I do not know, while I rather prefer this thesis". The "no opinion" choice is the rare variant of neutral skepticism "I do not know and I have no preference for one of the theses". (Indeed, I was once "questioned" electorally by a pollster, and no-answer was actively opposed by the questioner, refusing my blank vote as opinion, this is a very serious bias, according to me, this is completely distorting the counting and therefore the analysis of belief / choice). The total of the 3 skepticisms seems to me reasonably high here: 23%, 58%, 60%, 49%, 59%, 54%, 39%. One could say that "the rebellious Latin temperament" is pushing the French to resist the official claims, and that US journalists revealing scandals (successfully without being murdered) push the Anglo-Saxon to resist official claims.

*** The too small reserve**

Science & Vie is obliged to admit a possible abuse about words against conspiracists: a small pad page 46 is headlined "there are also real conspiracies", and the great conclusion is not to reject any conspiracy theory but to have a good judgment. However, it is a total mistake: the media inundate us with unilateral propaganda proclaimed undeniable truth, we are therefore not in a position to judge contradictorily, and the only possibility is a choice between belief (of religious type) and critical intelligence with the risk of being insulted / condemned / imprisoned-raped. I have a painful preference for the second way, perhaps because I like the position of injustice victim (inherited from my Jewish ancestry or my childhood as crushed little brother). Science & Vie tends to the other side, crushing, and incorrectly asserts that Science and Reason go in this direction. That does not mean I automatically believe conspiracists, but I listen with great interest to them challenging the official line. For September 11th, I heard that, while the aircraft had hit only 2 buildings, three collapsed, the 3rd being the building housing all the archives on political corruption under investigation in the US, ahem, simple chance for US leaders? without pre-installed dynamite? and the firefighter boss that was heard saying "make it blow" would have spoken about something else? and traces of explosives found in the rubble would come from elsewhere? And the alleged aircraft (missile according to conspiracists) that hit the Pentagon that day was filmed by a civilian camera, but this film was immediately seized with any access to it refused, top secret, why as it would break the lies (of the liar side whatever it is)? and if it is finally shown long after, isn't it because it is long to make a credible false film?

Mistrust against both sides seem healthy because liar authorities may strategically generate a false charge of conspiracy, totally aberrant, to amalgamate with those fools the wise individuals that would demonstrate the official lie. This is the ABC of propaganda / manipulation / rhetoric.

For examples of false propaganda, Science & Vie mentions the denials of Watergate affair, and secret civilian oversight revealed by Edward Snowden, military coups secretly supported by the US in Latin America, but I would have preferred other examples in the form of an avalanche. The Chernobyl cloud stopping at the French border (mocking unofficial radio measurements), the benign nature of nuclear tests in Polynesia (putting secret on local cancer statistics), the anti-Semitic proven side in any opposition to Zionism (forgetting racist terrorist killings of 1948), the 100% Russian fault of the war in Ukraine 2015 (forgetting the human right to self-determination), the intolerable violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty by the Iraqi then the Iranian (forgetting the article of this treaty commanding denuclearization of the nuclear countries like us), the outbreak of the Vietnam War with a false US citizen ship attack, the outbreak of the Gulf War 1 with a false report on Iraqi horrors in Kuwait, the outbreak of the Gulf War 2 with a false report on Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. Given these very significant examples, the unanimous media are not credible, the so-called "intellectuals" and experts are idiots or liars, so Reason (or elementary intuition, "you lied to me, okay, but you will not fool me again") argues for suspicion and not for credulity. Certainly, induction would be wrong claiming that "everything is a lie", but "scientifically (for real)" total credibility of the authorities is an invalid theory, proven false. Science & Vie does not think it over but advocates for the established order, the one that gives its will to white coats, even if it is wrong.

A memory also leads me to challenge the authorities and simplification of Science & Vie: I recently saw an illuminating television report (perhaps from a conspiracist journalist, fired out later, or it will soon be the official history) about the murder of the famous president of Renault vehicles by French extreme-left activists in the years 1970-80. The murderers were arrested and "justified" their sincere act as capital punishment after sales of Renault tanks to both sides at war in the Middle East, but... the report said that "we know" now that it was the Islamist Iran that was behind this act: the boss of Renault was previously head of the French Uranium which was involved in the state scandal stealing from the Iranians one billion dollars or francs (not respecting the contract, because the French Government boycotted Iran after its Islamic revolution, and not reimbursing it). Thus, the Iranians became (it seems) allies of the French extremists to provide weapons and information, decisive in the operation. Or it could have happened through a double agent, pretending to belong to extreme left radicals while actually working for the Iranian secret services. I do not know if it is proven or wrong but it seems very possible. Similarly, for September 11th, the conspiracy would not be that that the suicide planes were flown by US militaries in secret mission, but the training of (sincere) suicide Islamists could have been promoted / financed or protected / accepted by the CIA or Mossad, directly or through double-agents, infiltrated into the jihadists environment (such as drug environments are it seems infiltrated by police, with huge success in record seizures). The indirect result would indeed be very positive, "almost great", for Mossad and CIA in the form of strategic triumph: tenfold increase in the Western war against anti-Zionists, police-control highly increased on civilian population, US then Western. Of course this is speculative, false or impossible to say (at short and medium term), but the idea seems

legitimate – common ethical limits are not concerning fanatics and military or para-military (usually covered by state lie in the West).

*** Another explanatory factor**

It is significant that here is a supposed demonstration by psychologists, knowing that the scientific nature of so-called "human sciences" is disputed (also certainly not at Science & Vie). Thus, pages 46-47 comes a psychophysiological explanation, to temper the cry of the authorities "only mentally ill patients can believe in conspiracy theories", the thesis asserted here as truth is that No, at least: it is a mistake but it is a normal error automatically (therefore even harder to fight), generated by 7 specific brain areas (prefrontal / right / ventromedial cortex, amygdala, temporo-parietal crossroads, medial temporal cortex, fronto-left temporal system). It is said that "*for about five years, experimental psychologists and other specialists of human cognition study the phenomenon*". Science & Vie echoes the work of these researchers, without thinking like me that they are crooks with blah stealing their salaries, diverting misunderstood math and forgetting to think over things.

Ultimately, it is a supporter text calling for paying the white coats that serve authorities, almost abandoning any critical intelligence (as Jesus Christ # 1 – I may be the # 2 coming to correct – said we must enter religion with the spirit of a newborn, we must swallow the official science with stupid credulity). It is simply pathetic.

*** More detail**

I take the article again, because I remember more shocking details.

- Pages 48-49: "*The detection bias: for our brain, every detail make sense*" and pages 50-51: "*The bias of intent: we believe locating intentions everywhere*". Obviously the scientists of Science & Vie, materialistically stubborn, cannot conceive there may be wisdom in that, but they are mistaken, because have not been invalidated the thesis of a divine creator (e.g. non-biblical) almighty / governing everything, and the thesis of a dream making an inaccessible part of me decide everything here that seems perceived. When the article, about the alleged Illuminati sect that controls the world, writes "*False and completely false, of course*", the authors are wrong, not because the contrary would be certain, but they refute absolutely nothing, they just believe with certainty, parachuting their claim to hold the Truth. Other clear error: the words "*this comes through even if we know that phenomena happen by accident or by chance*". It is wrong to say that there is a "knowledge" ("we know"): it is a belief, nothing has proved that this world (Including lottery) is not governed by a will that I do not understand and therefore calls Random / chance. I have experience of having "dreamed" I won the lottery (denied gain after awakening – even: denied participation), so experience shows there may be erroneous claims to chance (and the rejection of the dream experience is not credible because no criteria is specific to the alleged Reality – Science & Vie condemned without any argument my book "Against Reality" by saying that these thoughts are dangerous, maybe dangerous for the established order, as lucidity destroys false superiority). Brainwashing was inherent in scientific studies that I experienced, totally devoid of argument, just bestially directing by the stick and the carrot, requiring to idolize Descartes, that I personally refuted point by point, after obtaining my diplomas by answering what was required, without believing it, without losing my free will, without giving up my critical intelligence.

- Pages 52-53: "*The conjunction bias: our minds doubt of coincidences*". The detailed text says "*The mistake is to think that the probability of a combination of two events is greater than the probability of each event taken separately, which contradicts all the laws of mathematics*". Not at all: mathematics are totally consistent with this, it is only with random and independence that apply the claims of the magazine. Example: the

probability that a duck at random is called Donald is less than 1 per billion, and the probability of an animal (not monkey) that it slips on a banana peel in the forthcoming minute is less than 1 per billion; Science & Vie would deduce that the probability of my son seeing in the next minute a duck named Donald slipping on a banana peel is less than 1 per billion of billions (i.e. almost zero), while it is totally false, it can be billions of times higher (very tangible), as Western children are denatured living among entertaining scripted tales. No mathematical law is there contravened: there is simply a need to focus on conditional probability – what is the probability that this duck slips on a banana peel, "knowing that" its name is Donald and Donald is a comic of disaster and trivial catastrophe is the story of the banana peel. This is not minor, it is immensely important because this shoots down scientism committing a lie by claiming extreme mathematical rigor, with incontestability of pure sciences. This way happened a wrong debate between religious and opposed anticlerical, whether life on Earth is an impossible miracle without divine intention, and it has consumed billions of euros / dollars for Research in Astronomy (exoplanets allowing life although inaccessible to us), biochemistry (self-generation of prebiotic molecules), computer (autonomous artificial intelligence) etc. But it is a mistake approach: if the intentionality (divine or dreamy) is the engine, the probability calculation is biased, irrelevant. It disavows Darwin, Mendel, and perhaps every Nobel Prize since inception: this would be a heresy totally unacceptable for Science & Vie, which did not envisage this a single second. They simply forgot reflection upstream, and have launched headlong into the details after their axiom, forgetting completely that it can be rejected, perhaps false (in the usual sense that all would not be unknowable).

- Page 53, " *The social bias: our brain is wary of strangers to excess* " and the text speaks of "normal paranoia, somehow", "hyper-arousal and tendency to see conspiracies more than there are". And what if it was a form of lucidity? What allows them to diagnosis of excess and use of the word paranoia which is classified as mental illness? The sleepy or bestial thought forgets doubt without (critical) intelligence. Philosophically, the Cartesian spirit has asked the right questions, daring radical doubt, destructive of certainty, but its reconstruction part (towards religion and materialism) is totally illogical. Logically, wisdom is self-centered, but it is forbidden to think like that, because dominants force submission to their choice. Daring to doubt is wisdom, not an error in principle (though the French law since the 1990s, intellectually dishonest, punishes doubt with two years in prison, where one dares violating the dogma, and this is in the name of freedom "of course"). Indeed, delusional positive excess is possible ("there is absolute evidence that the two planes of September 11th were each piloted by one thousand aliens pink unicorns with 9 heads, big with gamma bis antimatter"), but on the negative side, I do not agree to qualify harmful the conservative tendency not to believe at first (this trend would benefit also against aberrant conspiracists – at least honest observers could see this).

- Pages 54-55, " *The bias of proportion: we combine great causes to major shocks*". This chapter is for me unreadable, since it pretends the death of an English princess or US president is an absolutely terrible shock for people, which is totally false for me. Anyway, this makes sense (a little) in terms of advertising: conspiracists wishing success are obviously more successful if they focus on hyper-publicized events. Science & Vie and cited researchers simply forgot to consider this aspect. Confirming this idea: I proved many scandalous mathematical mistakes in official International Quality Standards, falsely written for the benefit of industrial lies, but these details do not interest at all the public (or Science & Vie) so this is not subject to conspiracy theory.

- Page 56-57: "*The bias of anxiety: the anxiety-provoking situations alter our perceptions*". I have already said that this is not necessarily a bias but it goes in the right direction in terms of intelligence, the sleepy thought being gullible when the thought awakened by something becomes able to detect fraud. The text is worse further: "*At the risk of distorting reality by connecting independent points or events*". This is only downstream of the realistic choice, imposed dictatorially. With critical intelligence, it is very different: perhaps there is an independent reality (details of which are independent of each other) and I'm an accidental witness, but maybe instead I'm in a dream of mine where nothing is independent, and awareness would be lucid. Between the two options, the intellectual accuracy is honest doubt, skeptical wisdom. This intelligence is totally out of reach for editors of Science & Vie, fanatically realist, treating the wise man (or logician) as mentally ill (or silly victim of Prehistoric neural conditioning selected by Darwinian Nature).

- Pages 58-59: "*Confirmation bias: our cognitive system is locked on its own beliefs*". The Science & Vie authors drama is that they may be good in experimental science but almost zero in pure mathematics: they seem to ignore axiomatic, which build disjointed fortresses from separate bases (Boole Algebra, imaginary numbers, etc.): There is not necessarily only-one wonderful truth surrounded by nonsense all around, no: incompatible theories can stand. Theoretically, the limit is self-contradiction, which may bring down some systems (this way I destroyed the demonstrations by non-significance), but it is unknown in experimental science, with "ad hoc" additions, exceptions, leaving the dominant claim to truth even when experience contradicts the supposed law.

Here, I interrupt this rereading, of a bad text, claiming to be right in forgetting to think, condemning doubt form of intelligence which this magazine is almost missing totally. Their auto congratulation is circular ("I'm right because I'm right"), and it is simply wrong if one perceives their core beliefs are axioms which are questionable. Certainly this decline seems extremely rare, but this does not prove that other ones are puppets and that this world is my dream: doubt is wise.
