

# A wake-up call for politicians : regulate the sciences.

Johan Noldus\*

June 5, 2016

## Abstract

This is a short manifest aimed towards politicians to properly regulate the sciences in the interest of society.

## 1 Delusional “sciences”.

Proper science is a hard, responsible job; the scientist is simply confronted with data or coincidences and tries to find a rule or law behind them. We know that there exist coincidences for which no such law will ever be found, not even a statistical one, which makes the task even harder. Mathematics is the only exception since it is the creation of a free spirit, it is not constrained by nature and in principle one can start from any axiomatic system one likes. Of course, the kind of mathematics which is practised has been put on diet since the basic rules express our most primitive observations. As such, this dietary mathematics is extremely well suited to describe a large portion of nature, an occupation which we call physics. Physics, as it is practised today is the ultimate mixture of mathematics and philosophy and a more proper name is natural philosophy. In the chain of reasoning philosophy comes first, it is the most primitive one, then comes mathematics followed by physics. Now, it is not because philosophy is the most primitive one that it is the most important for society: mathematics and physics have proven to be much more useful regarding technology and engineering while philosophy combined with some *derived* sciences such as medicine have been important for justice. By derived I mean that ultimately every reasoning in medicine must be reducible to one in physics which is reducible to a reasoning in mathematics and philosophy. In other words, every decent scientist in the derived sciences should know and understand the current accepted wisdom in physics; by this, I do not intend to say that he should know all mathematical aspects behind it because that would turn him into a professional physicist but he should know and understand the basic principles. In particular, the laws of quantum mechanics and Einstein’s relativity theory even if those are currently not reconciled yet in the mesoscopic domain.

Sciences which do not operate from the rules of physics and mathematics are

---

\*Relativity group, department of mathematical analysis, university of Gent, email: johan.noldus@gmail.com

delusional and potentially dangerous. Medicine, for example, has done an immense effort to become a science which resulted in several specializations based upon highly advanced measurement apparatus. Physicists and engineers have played an immensely important and crucial role in this process and the state of the art is that these sciences are almost self regulating now in the sense that the rules of physics and mathematics, in particular statistics, are properly applied. A remaining gap however is that quantum mechanics is not yet on the curriculum. Therefore, I can have a discussion with medical doctors to some extend albeit I do notice in several cases a severe lack of reflection as well as an inability regarding proper statistical reasoning and hypothesis filtering. By this, I do not want to say that medical sciences contains cranky beliefs but that its practitioners are not sufficiently trained to eliminate wrong hypothesis based upon statistical evidence.

By this, I do not want to say that everything is bright and undisputed in physics either; on the contrary, the fights about *causality* are huge and often dirty tactics are used to eliminate or suppress deviant opinions. However, nobody really doubts that we correctly interpret the data because people are highly skilled, trained and cautious about making a statement. Indeed, making a wrong interpretation of the data can cost your reputation or even your job; as said before, the mudslinging and dirty fights are about the *reasons* for this interpretation and this quest is as holy as the search for God.

Another example of an art which is slowly becoming a science is biology; progress is steep since the advent of modern genetics and it seems there is an end to the purely descriptive stage of observations of plants and animals. Something which is not in the scientific stage yet and might never get there, are psychiatry and psychology. These two fields are to a large extend delusional and prone to erroneous reasoning and basic errors regarding statistical inference. Psychiatrists nor psychologists have the proper skills, nor training to investigate the human mind and therefore most of their hypotheses are simply wrong, unsubstantiated and dangerous. I go even that far as to say that they do not even properly interpret the data because the most important part of data is in the mind of the patient, something which they cannot observe and is hidden for them.

## 2 What is the political problem exactly?

In spite of this bad state of the “sciences” of the mind, accredited practitioners have gotten a substantial judiciary power of the legislator. A psychiatrist is *the* reference person for a judge albeit a judge has in principle the power to rely solely upon his own judgement, often he prefers otherwise. A psychiatrist can under the condition of collocation *enforce* a totally wrong “treatment” upon the patient as well as to severely restrict his freedom. To state that someone is dangerous for society or himself is an almost impossible task and common sense dictates that the psychiatrist is by no means a preferred observer in the matter. On the contrary, his delusional science will often dictate him to make the wrong conclusions resulting in a huge cost to society and a deprivation of basic rights for the patient. The impact of a collocation on the life of a person is

huge; not only does it affect the self confidence, not only is the patients freedom restricted for the rest of his life since his freedom is conditional, the gap in his CV and the employers standard reaction to this makes sure that he has almost no chance of finding employment afterwards. This alone constitutes a huge cost for society since it has to pay for the maintanance of the patient, at least this is so in the civilized countries, moreover the social life of the person is virtually ruined. There has to come an end to this growing injustice since psychiatric institutions are swelling like a cancer and the problem is yours, gentlemen.

Indeed, I cannot legally hold the psychiatrist responsible since he is accredited and mostly follows the standard practise; morally, I curse them because of their incompetence and blindness. Alas, this doesn't really help the situation. Legally, I cannot blame the universities either for allowing these "idiots" to pass, given that the universities are accredited by the governement, albeit academia carries a huge responsibility; the only thing I can do is to prosecute the state for not respecting my basic laws but as you know, this is an almost impossible thing to do. So, the problem is political, important from a human and economical point of view since it concerns around five percent of society.

### 3 A suggestion of potential solutions.

A substantial solution consists in my opinion in many debates and measures, some of which are easy to implement, others of which are more difficult. By far the easiest and important measure is to demand that every definition of DSM V, the psychiatrists book of deseases, is supplemented with an indicator wether a desease has a potential legal impact or not conformal to the constitution. For example, if a syndrom contains the sentence "has strange opinions" then it is possible that strange opinions are highly correlated with other factors in the description of the desease but by itself it cannot have any legal impact since I have the freedom to have any opinion I like; classifying this as a desease which *demands* treatment eliminates this freedom. Specifying this legal aspect on the definitions, done by a team of legal specialists, should be easy to impose and is justified given that the psychiatrists opinion has legal power. These people have to go that far as to ask the psychiatrist to define "delusional image" and to question as to why they think it is delusional; moreover, in case of Schizophrenia (which is a misunderstood syndrom), they have to demand *legal evidence* from the psychiatrists as to why they conclude that such images are dangerous. In my opinion, this measure taken together with the fact that the psychiatrist has to concretely motivate his diagnosis by adding the facts behind his *observations* would by itself cut a substantial part of the cancer away. For example, if a psychiatrist is of the opinion that someone has intentions to harm someone else, the judge needs to ask him what made him come to such conclusion. In other words, the law needs to make it much harder for a psychiatrist to submit a collocation request.

So far the "audit" of justice on one of its advisory institutions, psychiatry. To remove the other part, the root, of the cancer and justify the mind sciences from a sociological point of view requires more substantial measures; the root resides of course in the education at every level. High school, college and university;

here, the law should impose certain restrictions upon academia and politicians should revise the educational program on all levels (from high school on). On the level of high school, I would advise to impose a modern physics and mathematics education in every section and substitute a course like geography, which is virtually meaningless, by a course in law. The latter is useful and strengthens ones position in society. Regarding the university, I foresee two kinds of measures: (a) in all scientific (in the broad sense) university directions, it is mandatory to teach one or several courses in *modern* physics, statistics and philosophy so that the student is left with a solid grasp upon our most up to date understanding of nature (b) for all *derived* sciences it is mandatory to hire a certain percentage of staff coming from the mother sciences physics and mathematics. This last measure is intended to serve as a regulatory measure as to avoid to the maximal extend the production of dangerous *bullshit*; these special team members should get special statutes as to ensure that they can fulfill this “auditing” and regulating function. I see very few other measures one can take instead of (b) to ensure that those weak sciences eventually evolve into a proper science; medicine serves as a great example that this principle of “dopage” really works. I do not think that (a) and (b) are very complicated either from the legislative point of view but they will undoubtedly erupt more discussion. Not many people in academia do really hold the opinion that psychiatrists and psychologists operate on a proper level so the first measure is therefore easier to implement from that point of view.

#### **4 Final word.**

For more detailed information, I am always available on my email address and I am certainly willing to discuss these matters in private.