

Prolegomenon to
The
Anthropology
of science
by

colin leslie dean

B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

Prolegomenon to The Anthropology of science

by colin leslie dean

B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA
(Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic
studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

List of **free** Erotic Poetry Books by Gamahucher
Press by colin leslie dean Australia's leading erotic
poet free for download

[http://www.scribd.com/doc/35520015/List-of-
Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-Gamahucher-Press](http://www.scribd.com/doc/35520015/List-of-Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-Gamahucher-Press)

Gamahucher press west geelong Victoria Australia

2021

Whether one looks at archaic
monkey-man or modern
monkey-man the anthropologist
sees the same
phenomena/archetype

Now science can in many
ways be treated
anthropologically like religion
—as phenomenologically
science has many
characteristics similar to
religion Take myths

Myths this present age calls those things which are not true. ie religion mythology etc

But

Those things which this present age call myths where once those things that people once thought were true ie religion mythology etc

The past theories of science which are not true now –but were once thought true-thus

can be called myths Thus the present theories of science which are regarded as true can thus be called myths

Anthropologically science can be treated the same way one treats priests myths soothsayers The present attitude towards science is exactly phenomenologically the same as in archaic societies in regard to the way they related to their belief systems

their priests soothsayers
shamans witch doctors etc

Myths are those things people
believe are true The Greeks
Indians Aborigines etc
believed their gods were
true. What we call myths of
other archaic cultures those
cultures at the time believed
them to be true

Now the theories of science in
the past most if not all of them
were believed to be true but
in our times most are now

considered wrong –not true-
thus those theories where
myths Now current theories
which are considered true are
also myths

Some theories/myths which
were considered true in
science

- The transition in [cosmology](#) from a [Ptolemaic cosmology](#) to a [Copernican](#) one.
- The transition in [optics](#) from geometrical optics to [physical optics](#).
- The transition in [mechanics](#) from Aristotelian mechanics to classical mechanics.
- The acceptance of the theory of [biogenesis](#), that [all life comes from life](#), as opposed to the theory of spontaneous generation, which began in the 17th century and was not complete until the 19th century with Pasteur.

- The acceptance of the work of Andreas Vesalius, whose work [*De humani corporis fabrica*](#) corrected the numerous errors in the previously-held system created by [Galen](#).
- The transition between the [Maxwellian Electromagnetic](#) worldview and the [Einsteinian Relativistic](#) worldview.
- The transition between the worldview of Newtonian physics and the [Einsteinian Relativistic](#) worldview.
- The development of quantum mechanics, which replaced classical mechanics at microscopic scales.
- The acceptance of [plate tectonics](#) as the explanation for large-scale geologic changes.
- The development of [absolute dating](#).
- The acceptance of Lavoisier's theory of chemical reactions and combustion in place of [phlogiston theory](#), known as the [Chemical Revolution](#).
- The acceptance of [Mendelian inheritance](#), as opposed to [pangenesis](#) in the early 20th century

The layman's attitude to these scientific myths is exactly the same as a layman in older archaic cultures related to their

myths –they believe them to be true And why do they believe them to be true because their priests shaman soothsayer tells them they are true

Now we have two choices

1) is science at an end-no more to learn no new theories

Or

2) is science still evolving

Most would say science is still evolving

Thus

we will have a 2200 century
theory B evolving out of 2100
century theory A

that means in terms of new
theory B theory A is not true

thus

2100 century theory A is a
myth

thus science is a mythology

Now some say the flat earth
theory is wrong ie not true it is
a myth just like you would say

the Christian creation story is
not true ie a myth

just like the 2100 century
theory A is a myth

just like all these myths of
science shown above

Now some say because science
works then it is true –a
pragmatic theory of truth

But

just because a science theory
works does not mean the

theory/myth behind it is true as seen above in regard to past scientific theories

these theories/ myths worked but were not true ie are myths

Claudius Ptolemy model of the universe worked but it is now considered not "true"/myth

<https://www.ogdentrust.com/assets/general/Earth-and-Space-Research-Cards.pdf>

"Ptolemy's tables were so effective at predicting

positions in the night sky that they were used to prepare astronomical and astrological charts for over 1,500 years"

science is a mythology

take a look at some predictions that came true but the theory behind them was not true

<https://www.quora.com/What-is-an-example-in-science-where-the-prediction-was-right-but-the-theory-was-wrong>

<https://bestlifeonline.com/historical-predictions/>

just because science works
does not mean the theory
behind it is true

thus science is mythology

Some say science is based on
the consensus of experts

But

once pluto was a planet-by
consensus- now it is not a
planet by consensus

science is mythology

Also what is a myth is the

scientific method The

scientific method is a myth

links to scientific method is a
myth

<https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=scientific+method+a+myth>

"The so-called scientific
method is a myth"

<https://www.discovermagazine.com/planet-earth/the-scientific-method-is-a-myth>

or again

"There are too many different fields of science for there to be just one single scientific method that all scientists follow."

<https://www.sciencelearn.org.nz/images/434-no-single-scientific-method>

Thus anthropologically science is a mythology

What is interesting is if one does not accept these facts we get the psychological problem of

"Why Facts Don't Change Our Minds New discoveries about the human mind show the limitations of reason."

"Even after the evidence "for their beliefs has been totally refuted, people fail to make

appropriate revisions in those beliefs,” the researchers noted”

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/02/27/why-facts-dont-change-our-minds>

Now Contemporary laymen have the same attitude to their scientists experts as the members of older archaic cultures had to their priests
Contemporary laymen hang off every word of their

scientists/priests as did those of older archaic cultures. The names theories may be new but the attitude towards them is exactly the same as happened in older archaic cultures towards their beliefs- it is only new wine poured into old bottles.

Scientists anthropologically are no more than the new priests and universities the new temples churches etc.

When scientists predict climate

changes the weather or the outcomes of pandemics they are behaving as no more than soothsayers –

anthropologically- and the laymans attitude towards these scientific soothsayers is exactly how layman did in older archaic cultures to their soothsayers

Anthropologically nothing has change except new names but phenomenologically the attitudes have not changed –

they are the same whether one looks at archaic man or modern man the anthropologist sees the same phenomena

When one strips back the new labels one sees that monkey-man homo-sapien behaves/believes in much the same way whether he is monkey-man in a contemporary culture or monkey-man in an archaic culture-he is still just monkey-man Take archaic monkey-

man response to the sacred
this is exactly the same way
contemporary monkey-man
behaves When archaic man
met the sacred he had in some
cases a numinous experience
Now this is seen
contemporarily. Just listen to
ex graduates of Oxford
Cambridge Yale Harvard gush
in awe over their
universities/temples Just watch
them behave in front of their
professors/priests dons/priests

etc it is like watching a
archaic monkey-man response
to his witch-doctor shaman
temple priest etc Every where
one looks all ones sees is
monkey-man dressed up in
new clothes

but beneath the new clothes it
is just plain old monkey-man
behaving/believing as he has
always done and will always
do Just have a look at the
Nobel prize how they all dress
in costumes/ vestments/regalia

meaning deep seriousness just like priests at say Notre Dame during high mass All sacred theatre in their vestments-the actors love it and so does the layman monkey-man Forget the clothes and you could be at any archaic ceremony say to the god Molach/Mammon or ritual at Stonehenge-behaving/believing as he has always done It can be said that these recurring phenomena are manifestations of what I call

anthropological archetypes

Myths or ideologies are

manifestation the same

anthropological archetype ie

different names but same

archetype

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Archetype>

.An *archetype* can be:

1. a statement, pattern of behavior, [prototype](#), "first" form, or a main model that other statements, patterns of behavior, and objects copy, emulate, or "merge" into. Informal synonyms frequently used for this definition include "standard example," "basic example," and the longer-form "archetypal example;" mathematical archetypes often appear as "[canonical](#) examples."
2. the [Platonic concept](#) of *pure form*, believed to embody the fundamental characteristics of a thing.

3. a collectively-inherited unconscious idea, pattern of thought, image, etc., that is universally present, in individual psyches, as in [Jungian psychology](#)
4. a constantly-recurring symbol or motif [in literature](#), [painting](#), or mythology. This definition refers to the recurrence of characters or ideas sharing similar traits throughout various, seemingly unrelated cases in classic storytelling, media, etc. This usage of the term draws from both [comparative anthropology](#) and from [Jungian archetypal theory](#).

That it why it is said Whether one looks at archaic monkey-man or modern monkey-man the anthologist sees the same phenomena/archetype things whether religious ie ideas or science theories belong to the archetype myths

