Annals of
Reviews and Research

Juniper Publishers
key to the Researchers

Review Article
Volume 11 Issue 2 - June 2024
DOI: 10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810

Ann Rev Resear

Disadvantages of Science and Overcoming them

Joseph Smulsky J*

Institute of the Earth's Cryosphere, Tyumen Scientific Center SB RAS, Federal Research Center, Tyumen, Russian Federation

Submission: June 03, 2024; **Published:** June 11, 2024

***Corresponding author:** Joseph Smulsky J, Institute of the Earth's Cryosphere, Tyumen Scientific Center SB RAS, Federal Research Center, Tyumen, Russian Federation

Abstract

The ResearchGate portal provides great opportunities for researchers to exchange knowledge between them. Its creators dream of societies based on science. However, to make the world a better place, science must improve itself. In the process of exchanging opinions, researchers come to understand the shortcomings of contemporary fundamental science. By discussing them, they suggest ways to improve science.

Keywords: Knowledge sharing; ResearchGate; Fundamental Science; Shortcomings; Ways to Overcome; Discussions

Introduction

The effectiveness of scientific research largely depends on the exchange of knowledge between researchers. The ResearchGate (RG) portal provides great assistance in this regard. The creators of RG dream of societies based on science [1]. However, to make the world a better place, science must improve itself. The creators of RG believe that science is humanity's most important tool. It is responsible for the great leaps society is making in understanding our Universe, and the best means we have to meet the challenges of our future.

However, contemporary science is not without problems. The systems that support research are too slow and inaccessible to address the global challenges of our time. Complex funding processes and proprietary interests hinder progress towards open science. The creators of RG hope to change that. RG is committed to providing researchers with access to each other and to the resources they need to thrive. RG is committed to making science faster, fairer, and more accessible to learn. No one can solve these problems alone - RG recognizes the need to work with others in this quest. RG strives to evolve with the scientific community, challenging the status quo in the scientific ecosystem and always putting the researcher first [1].

More than 20 million researchers are registered with RG. Each of them receives a weekly report on the acquaintance of other researchers with his works, broken down by country, specialty, qualifications, etc. The researcher also continuously receives information on the publication of the works of other researchers on his field. And he has the opportunity to discuss issues of interest to him with colleagues. There are a number of other operations at RG that are quite useful to the researcher. For example, a researcher may ask a question that other researchers can answer. These answers can provide significant assistance to the researcher, without which he could spend years working on a dead-end problem.

Disadvantages of Contemporary Fundamental Science

Contemporary fundamental science, especially physics, is in a deep crisis. Many researchers are concerned about this. To discuss pressing scientific issues, they ask rhetorical questions. Each question is accompanied by a detailed rationale. Therefore, the essence of the issue is clear to everyone, and its discussion through collective efforts reveals very subtle problems that were not previously known. I shall give several examples of such questions, as well as their authors.

1. Is the modern approach to cosmology fundamentally flawed? - by Michael Peck [2].
2. Am I the only one that is doubtful of LIGO's detection of gravitational wave GW150914? - by Peter Hahn [3].
3. Is Any Effective Refutation of Einstein's Theories of Relativity Possible? - by Abdul Malek [4].
4. Am I the only one that believes the Theory of Relativity is defective and false, and it should be thrown away and forgotten? -by Joseph J. Smulsky [5].
5. Are you aware of the Nobel Prizes awarded for fake scientific results? - by Joseph J. Smulsky [6].

6. "Fundamental Physics is stuck in conceptual crisis and reached a dead end. What exactly is wrong with Fundamental Physics Research?" - by Gurcharn Singh Sandhu [7].

Many of these questions have been debated for years and involve thousands of researchers. For example, as of May 31, 2024, question 1 has been discussed since October 2015, read by 107,602 researchers and contains 12,767 answers; and question 2 has been discussed since February 2016, read by 95,022 researchers and has 8,293 answers.

The main disadvantage of contemporary fundamental science lies in its method. It is accepted that science is based on hypotheses. On their basis, theories are built to explain natural phenomena. These constructions are then perceived as the real world. This method began with the Theory of Relativity. Therefore, many participants in the discussion offer their own constructions based on the hypotheses they put forward. There are also realistically minded researchers who reject the hypothetical constructions of contemporary fundamental science. One of them is independent researcher Gurcharn Singh Sandhu. I shall give a few thoughts from his rationale for question 6 [7]. Here I do not strictly adhere to the text [7], so I do not enclose this text in quotation marks.

Throughout the last century, Physicists have occupied themselves with working out Quantum Mechanics, Relativity, Particle Physics, Astrophysics and Cosmology in all their implications. In the process, Fundamental Physics has absorbed mathematical ideas and notions of increasing sophistication and abstraction. The tragedy of the last century was the gradual shift in our focus from the physical reality to the abstract mathematical formulations, which are supposed to describe physical reality. These words G.S. Sandhu I will comment. He adheres to the traditional ideas of philosophy about the division of knowledge in the form of abstract, phenomenological and other sciences. I believe that knowledge should be classified differently [8,9]. Therefore, my analysis of the shortcomings of contemporary science is expressed in other categories. What G.S. Sandhu calls "abstract mathematical formulations", I call "constructions built on hypotheses".

The words of G.S. Sandhu next come. Now we are stuck in plethora of unfounded Belief Systems which are hindering any real progress in Fundamental Physics Research… Fundamental Physics researchers have inadvertently adopted certain abstract mathematical concepts into their physical worldview. For example, the notions of virtual particles, exchange theory of interaction, probability density representing instantaneous particle location, space-time curvature, Black Holes, Big Bang, metric expansion of Space, etc. are truly abstract mathematical concepts which have been erroneously adopted in our physical worldview as physical realities.

…it is a part of Human Nature that we find ourselves so prone to mass indoctrination by dominant vested interest groups in all fields. Our inherent capacity to use Logic and Reason gets restricted or diminished under such a state of mass indoctrination and we involuntarily join 'Group Thinking'. Fundamental Research is one such area where indoctrination of innocent students and mass hypnosis of general public is inhibiting the use of Reason and Logic for discarding erroneous beliefs like Black Holes, Big Bang, probability waves, space-time curvature etc.

…even if a few researchers do put up valuable research contributions for advancement of Fundamental Physics, we cannot distinguish their voices from the background noise. In my opinion, one possible way to put Fundamental Physics Research back on the Right Track, is to appoint an International Experts Panel for Research Evaluation, by co-opting experts from various specialist and multi-disciplinary fields. This Panel may Evaluate and Grade all published research papers that may be referred to it by various research bodies (like ResearchGate) and academic institutes. Only High-Grade research papers may then be released to public media for wider dissemination.

Discussion of the disadvantages of science and ways to overcome them

I shall give an example of a discussion of these issues in RG. When discussing question 3 G.S. Sandhu marked the following answer on March 1, 2024: "Crucial points highlighting the shortcomings of Astrophysics.

It is fundamentally wrong to assume, implicitly or explicitly, electrons, protons and ions to be non-interacting particles under any circumstances, especially under a high-density environment. It is well-known that electrostatic repulsion between two protons is 1036 times stronger than the gravitational force between them, yet in astrophysics of stellar cores, electrons, protons and ions are often assumed to be non-interacting for invoking the use of Electron Degeneracy Pressure and hydrodynamic Equation of State under high density environment.

Application of Fermi-Dirac Statistics to degenerate electrons, by treating them as non-interacting particles, to accelerate them to high kinetic energies through the action of Pauli's Exclusion Principle is fundamentally wrong. Electrons can never be accelerated to high kinetic energy without electromagnetic interaction in some or other form. The kinetic energy density of degenerate electrons can never be declared as the Electron Degeneracy Pressure just because their dimensions (ML-1T-2) are common, without incorporating a physical mechanism to enable electrons to exchange their momentum with protons and ions through elastic collisions.

Since the Astrophysics textbooks do not cover the theory of elasticity the students of Astrophysics are not prepared to handle the solid state of stellar cores or to work out stresses and strains in solid spherical bodies under self-gravitation. That is why

How to cite this article: Joseph Smulsky J. Disadvantages of Science and Overcoming them. Ann Rev Resear. 2024; 11(2): 555810. DOI:10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810

Astrophysicists make use of invalid Electron Degeneracy Pressure and hydrodynamic Equation of State, by implicitly assuming all electrons, protons and ions to be non-interacting, and wrongly collapse solid iron stellar cores into Neutron Stars and Black Holes.

Article Black Holes are a Mathematical Fantasy, not a Physical Reality.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334468490_Black_Holes_are_a_Mathematical_Fantasy_not_a_Physical_Reality?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InF1ZXN0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InF1ZXN0aW9uIiwicG9zaXRpb24iOiJwYWdlQ29udGVudCJ9fQ

Article Ionic Gravitation and Ionized Solid Iron Stellar Bodies."
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369883985_Ionic_Gravitation_and_Ionized_Solid_Iron_Stellar_Bodies?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InF1ZXN0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InF1ZXN0aW9uIiwicG9zaXRpb24iOiJwYWdlQ29udGVudCJ9fQ

On the same day I answered such way.

Dear Gurcharn Singh Sandhu,

I completely agree with you. Similar to your paper "Black Holes are a Mathematical Fantasy, not a Physical Reality", I have the paper [10].

All modern fundamental science is defective and false. It is built on hypotheses and gives a fantastic world that does not exist in reality. It is necessary to create a new science without the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics [9,11].

To prevent young researchers from wasting their lives on meaningless fantasies, an International Scientific Tribunal must be created [12].

Sincerely yours

Prof. Joseph J. Smulsky

On the same day, G.S. Sandhu responded.

"Dear Prof. Joseph Smulsky,

I too completely agree with you. You say, "To prevent young researchers from wasting their lives on meaningless fantasies, an International Scientific Tribunal must be created." Before creating such a Tribunal, the mainstream scientific community must first get convinced about the need for doing so. On similar lines I have raised a question on ResearchGate, "Fundamental Physics is stuck in conceptual crisis and reached a dead end. What exactly is wrong with Fundamental Physics Research?" [7].

Best Regards, Gurcharn".

After reviewing the rationale behind G.S. Sandhu question 6, as well as some of his works, on March 11 I presented my thoughts in this form.

"Dear Gurcharn Singh Sandhu!

In your comment of March 1, 2024, you note that before creating the International Scientific Tribunal [12], it is necessary to discuss the reasons for the emergence of fake fundamental science. In your analysis "Fundamental Physics is stuck in conceptual crisis and reached a dead end. What exactly is wrong with Fundamental Physics Research?" you put forward three reasons and also propose the creation of the International Experts Panel for Research Evaluation. This Experts Panel could authoritatively declare the fallacy of a number of modern constructions of fundamental science.

I agree with you that such Experts Panel needs to be created. In the future, an International Scientific Tribunal may be created on its basis [12]. Such Experts Panel may be created in the near future. You and I note the same shortcomings of modern science. If five or six more researchers join us, then we can consider this to be the beginning of the creation of the International Experts Panel on Misconceptions of Fundamental Science.

As for the three reasons for the fallacy of fundamental science, I agree with you. I also agree with a number of other researchers who put forward other reasons. But there is a main cause, which is that modern constructions of fundamental sciences are based on hypotheses. Starting with Albert Einstein, instead of studying and understanding the world around us, the method of creating it using hypotheses was adopted.

You offer a broad discussion of the shortcomings of science. I agree that such a discussion needs to be carried out. But that's not the main thing. It is necessary to discard all false constructs of science and explore the world around us, develop this research and implement it into life.

Much has already been done. I mentioned a number of such studies in [12]. The Polish researcher Michał Gryziński did a lot (see for example [13]). I have too done a lot: I created the foundations of a new fundamental science [8,9]. This is science without hypotheses. I have created more than a dozen different theories, for example, the new Astronomical Theory of Climate Change [14,15]. It explains the cause of long-term climate changes such as Ice Ages and definite them. But these are not theories like the Theory of Relativity or the Quantum Mechanics, in which hypotheses are accepted and an explanation of the surrounding world is created on their basis. My theories are like the theory for locksmiths, like the theory of a ship or the theory of an airplane. They describe how to cut out a part, how to build a ship or an airplane. For example, the Theory of Interaction [8] shows how to determine the forces of interaction between bodies and calculate their movements.

How to cite this article: Joseph Smulsky J. Disadvantages of Science and Overcoming them. Ann Rev Resear. 2024; 11(2): 555810.
DOI:10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810

You define yourself as an independent researcher. There are many independent scientists at ResearchGate. Most of them are highly educated and talented researchers. This allows them to delve into the intricacies of the Mainstream's constructions and see their worthlessness. Such researchers, united, could create an Institute for Independent Research. Among independent researchers there are those who, based on their hypotheses, also create an imaginary world. Therefore, it is necessary to distance ourselves from these works by introducing an additional definition, such as, for example, the Institute of Independent and Non-hypothetical Research.

This Institute can, having discarded all the false constructions of Mainstream science, begin to study the world around us. The results of knowledge of the real world will immediately be perceived in society, and the authority of this Institute will quickly grow. Such Institute can remain independent if it provides its own funding. As I already mentioned, independent researchers are talented people. Therefore, each of them has ideas that can be transmitted into products and goods that will be used in society.

There are a lot of other works needed by society that such Institute could carry out. For example, there is the problem of contemporary climate warming. Mainstream science has accepted that climate warming is caused by anthropogenic CO2 emissions. There is a huge number of works that show that there are other causes of climate warming, and the carbon dioxide cause is insignificant. Society could order this Institute to analyze these two scientific directions and issue recommendations in which direction society should develop further.

The second problem: atomic weapons and the danger of their use. Now the leaders of a number of NATO countries speak out without embarrassment in favor of the use of atomic weapons. So, this problem becomes one of the main ones. How can this be solved so that all nations, both those who have atomic weapons and those who do not have them, feel safe? I believe that only the Institute for Independent Research can solve such a problem.

As this Institute matures, its capabilities will increase. It will create its own scientific journals, nominate worthy scientists for Nobel Prizes, submit its proposals to future space research programs [16], train the younger generation of future researchers, etc.

There are 20 million researchers on ResearchGate. If only one out of 100 of these researchers begin to study the world around us, and not fantasize about its structure, our lives will quickly begin to change for the better.

Sincerely yours

Prof. Joseph J Smulsky".

On the same day, independent researcher Dale Fulton, in response to question 6 [7], approved my reasoning in the following form.

"Joseph,

with the abundance and preponderance now of publications of all kinds, we now face the inevitable "needle in the haystack" problem. Even if there were a revolutionary developed idea, it might be lost in the blizzard of quantity, not quality.

Thank you for your contribution.

Dale".

On March 12, I responded to Dale Fulton this way.

"Dear Dale!

Our destiny is in our hands!

What needs to be done so that the Truth, like a needle, does not get lost in a haystack, or, in other words, in a stack of straw?

If you find a needle in a stack of straw, do not lose it and tell everyone about it. If everyone does this, not a single needle will be lost!

On the other hand, never pass straw to others. If everyone does this, then there will be no stacks of straw, and all the needles will be in plain sight!

Our destiny is in our hands!

Sincerely yours, Joseph".

April 21, 2024 Dale Fulton approved of my words as follows.

"Hear, here, Joseph!

Well said. I concur; the future must be built one truth at a time.

Regards."

On the same day G.S. Sandhu posted the following response.

"Dear Dale and Joseph,

Let us attempt to implement the suggestion, "If you find a needle in a stack of straw, do not lose it and tell everyone about it. If everyone does this, not a single needle will be lost!"

I have observed on ResearchGate that almost all researchers are trying their level best to promote their own research work, their own viewpoint. Most often each researcher firmly believes that his own viewpoint is most valuable, and if followed or adopted by others, can solve most of the current problems faced by fundamental physics. Unfortunately, each researcher laments that other researchers do not spare sufficient time to study his research work in depth to fully appreciate it.

To overcome this situation, each researcher must stop promoting his own research work and sincerely start promoting the research of some other researchers which he finds the BEST of all that came to his notice. For this each researcher must spare some time for in-depth study of some research papers that appear promising to him on first look itself…

How to cite this article: Joseph Smulsky J. Disadvantages of Science and Overcoming them. Ann Rev Resear. 2024; 11(2): 555810. DOI:10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810

Best Regards".

Many other researchers also took part in this discussion. Their opinions can be found at the link [7] to question 6. A number of them approved of the opinions presented here, and some did not. It should be noted that other researchers also followed the discussion, and some left their opinions in the "Recommendations" option. In addition, there were researchers who were not interested in the above judgments, and they promoted their works.

On April 23, to one of these researchers, G.S. Sandhu has provided an answer, of which I will only quote the relevant part.

"…In spite of tens of thousands of advanced research papers being published every year, there is hardly any perceptible advancement in Fundamental Physics. One reason is that… when a researcher develops a model of certain aspect of Nature, due to long mental association and efforts put in, psychologically he starts feeling that his model is the best under the sun and other researchers must take note of it.

It is quite possible that many researchers, who continue to repeatedly push their models for wider acceptance, may not be succeeding because their models may be flawed for one or the other reason…

As I have suggested in my last post, if we start promoting the high-quality research work of other researchers, instead of promoting our own work, then many flawed models will get filtered in the very beginning and only good quality research work will come up for wider discussion and further evaluation. Once we start promoting the high-quality research work of other researchers, then sooner or later, our own high quality research work too will get noticed by the wider scientific community.

Regards".

On April 24, 2024, I expressed my approval to the words of G.S. Sandhu.

Dear Gurcharn Singh Sandhu,

Your words is good: "Once we start promoting the high-quality research work of other researchers, then sooner or later, our own high quality research work too will get noticed by the wider scientific community."

I like Indian wisdom. It seems that Krishna said: "No matter what I do, no matter how I act, no one will condemn me in all three worlds. But if I act unrighteously, then others will act unrighteously!"

Joseph.

Conclusion

The above discussion presents judgments about the disadvantages of contemporary fundamental science and ways to overcome them. Much of the discussion not included here represents a heterogeneous range of hypothetical constructs. However, these constructions are not welcomed by the overwhelming majority of researchers. And more and more of them are beginning to take their words responsibly. Over time, all researchers, like Krishna, will realize that everything is allowed to them, but there should be nothing in their works except the Truth. And everyone will do the same. Then science will become a guiding star for society, and society will follow the path of its successful development.

References

1. ResearchGate (2008) About ResearchGate.
2. Peck M (2015) Is the modern approach to cosmology fundamentally flawed?
3. Hahn P (2016) Am I the only one that is doubtful of LIGO's detection of gravitational wave GW150914.
4. Malek A (2018) Is Any Effective Refutation of Einstein's Theories of Relativity Possible?
5. Smulsky JJ (2018) Am I the only one that believes the Theory of Relativity is defective and false, and it should be thrown away and forgotten?
6. Smulsky JJ (2021a) Are you aware of the Nobel Prizes awarded for fake scientific results?
7. Sandhu GS (2023) Fundamental Physics is stuck in conceptual crisis and has reached a dead end. What exactly is wrong with Fundamental Physics Research?
8. Smulsky JJ (2004) The Theory of Interaction. Ekaterinburg: Cultural Information Bank.
9. Smulsky JJ (2019) The Upcoming tasks of Fundamental Science. M: Sputnik+ Publishing House pp. 134.
10. Smulsky JJ (1996) The "Black Hole": Superstition of the 20th Century, Apeiron 3(1): 22-23.
11. Smulsky JJ (2023a) New Understanding in Physics and Astronomy. India, UK: B P Int pp. 1-209.
12. Smulsky JJ (2023b) International Scientific Tribunal. Ann Rev Resear 10(3): 555786.
13. Gryziński M (1987) SpiN Dynamical Theory of the Wave-Corpuscular Duality. Int J Theor Phys 26(10): 967-980.
14. Smulsky JJ (2016) Fundamental Principles and Results of a New Astronomic Theory of Climate Change. Adv Astrophys 1(1): 1-21.
15. Smulsky JJ (2021b) Long-Term Changes in the Earth's Climate. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK pp. 179.
16. Smulsky JJ (2022) The Evolution of the Moon's Orbit Over 100 million Years and Prospects for the Research in the Moon. In: Lunar Science - Habitat and Humans. Edited by Yann-Henri Chemin. London, United Kingdom: IntechOpen p. 18-39.

How to cite this article: Joseph Smulsky J. Disadvantages of Science and Overcoming them. Ann Rev Resear. 2024; 11(2): 555810. DOI:10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810

DOI:10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810

How to cite this article: Joseph Smulsky J. Disadvantages of Science and Overcoming them. Ann Rev Resear. 2024; 11(2): 555810. DOI:10.19080/ARR.2024.11.555810