

A CRITIQUE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE



Kristian Riis-Søndergaard, BA in the History of Ideas and Social Science

Fredericia, 03/05/2022

Words: 3294

Index

Preface

Outline of theory and critique of the philosophy of science

Man, the self and the subject

Science, religion and the mystical experience

Theory and method

Towards holism

Abstract

The paper deals with the critique of the philosophy of science, as it has been known since the mid of the last century.

A general outline of the critique is developed, while the paper reflects upon ontological and epistemological questions in regards to the philosophy of science.

We focus on the science of man and the power-knowledge relation of science, as it relates to rendering epistemic visibility to the object of study (the subject and, for us, the mystical experience) and we debate epistemic controversy and paradigmatic science.

The paper attempts to distill theoretical and methodological remarks for the practice of the history of ideas, as this discipline is considered the most suitable for the metaanalysis necessary to grasp epistemic conflict and paradigmatic shifts.

We propose an ontology that is anthropocentric, but holistic, in the tradition of ancient Greek philosophy and inspired by phenomenology, hermeneutics and existentials.

We furthermore propose that sound epistemology is political epistemology.

Preface

This essay represents an early exploration into the philosophy of science from an Aryan, spiritual, and holistic perspective. It is part of the foundational theoretical work for what would later become the metaphysical doctrine of the Aryan Order and the epistemic groundwork for the Aryan Academy. The reflections offered are not meant as absolute conclusions but as contributions to the ongoing discourse on epistemology, ontology, and the nature of science as a human and spiritual endeavor. The essay emphasizes freedom of thought, existential dignity, and transcendental inquiry as central values of science, distinct from reductionist or purely materialistic interpretations of the world.

Outline of theory and critique of the philosophy of science

This paper is a rethinking of the history of ideas, as we know the discipline. The reformulation is inspired by the general conflict in the humanities and social sciences in regards to the ideological critique levied against the academic institutions since the 60's, later commonly known as the post-structuralist and post-modern critique (Lyotard, 1979). Overall, the paper is a reflection on the philosophy of science of the history of ideas and humanities and social sciences in general, as the arts and social sciences are enhanced by these considerations of theoretical and methodological foundation.

In the start of the 60's, Thomas Kuhn released an interesting book on the philosophy and practice of science (Kuhn, 1962), wherein he described the development of science as the struggle between competing and shifting *paradigms*. This was the days of structuralism. In 1966, Foucault released his book *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, where likewise the scientific development of mankind was seen as a result of the shifting from one *episteme* to another.

The French structuralists at the time, Jacques Lacan (psychology), Claude Lévi-Strauss (anthropology), and Roland Barthes (linguistics), were all working to extract the structural foundation for knowledge and science.

Foucault's work was to transgress the structuralists and later became known as post-structuralist theory.

What set Foucault out to the other structuralists was his emphasis on the social construction of reality as a question of a power-knowledge constellation. Later in his work, Foucault would go on to describe knowledge as an instance of the exchangeability of power (Foucault, 1976). This power-knowledge constellation is where the subject arises. The knowledge of self is given as an instance of a struggle for power.

The same holds true for science. That is, to understand why a scientific episteme gains ground and becomes dominant, we have to study power-relations. Knowledge is always situated in regards to a power practice. There is no neutral science.

Science was critiqued as being ideological.

Later the positivists of science would go on to defend the philosophy of science as characterized by validity and explainability and other notions of how to evaluate scientific theories in regards to empirical verification.

While there might be much said about life as being a struggle and the battle for scientific prevalence, it is a dangerous notion to propose that the subject is without core, socially-constructed, nominally by a given power-relation. We can accept that what counts as true in regards to a power-constellation is defined by power-relations, but the essence of man is non-negotiable – we are free, for we are men and women of spirit. There is an existentials to life.

In truth, we will not let the subject become a prisoner of a power-discourse such as science. We demand freedom from discursive oppression and tyranny.

Man, the self and the subject

We propose that man has a core – a core-being. That is the truth of man and the existentiality of man. Man is not cast adrift, but a proud and honorable being. The pride and honor of man is himself, his consort, his family, his fellows, his volk and his nation. Now, multiple allegiances can exist, but what is common to mankind is the respect for family and nation – nativity. We are rooted beings with identity and history. Identity is not some social fabric without any root in metaphysics and history.

Likewise, creation, the universe and man are true. We have a responsibility – we have a call.

So science must accustom that truth of man – the existentiality of man and the call of life. There is a demand.

We must ask the fundamental question of understanding – the question of the nature of man and nature of existence – the question of being (Heidegger, 1927).

This is the task of science. Therefore science is called to reflect upon theory, idealism and normative propositions of truth.

We should see this call as a gift – a given that is in our nature and in creation. It is the question of man.

Man is central. We are against the suspicion of post-structuralism of Western anthropocentrism. The question *is* of man. Rather than anthropocentrism, the problem is reductionism. We should be proud of life and valor the heroism and poetics of man and being.

So what is central to man? Man is given by an existientiale and an ethics. Man is a sentient being – self-conscious and asks the fundamental question of being. This is the first clue. The reflective characteristic of man is important as the the most essential experience of the subject. In asking the fundamental question of being, man is free. Freedom is the realization that we are men and women of spirit.

Next is the relation to the opposite gender. This is the second clue to the nature of man and the existientiale of life. We are relational beings.

We are reflective and relational.

From these two facts of life, we gain a lot insights. The relational characteristic of man entails duality, dynamics and vitality – force. That is life: being together. That is how we were born and that is how we live. Love is another essential experience of man.

So there is an existientiale to life. We are given to reflect upon being and existence, as well as our shared relation of love.

This is the subject in the most essential and bare form.

Now, next we can debate power-relations, but what is important to note from the discourse is that what we propose is an existentiality of freedom. Man is a spiritual being, free and of the transcendental and eternal.

Science, religion and the mystical experience

Man is spirited. We are standing in a existential relation to the transcendental and the metaphysics of the universe. In a phenomenology of spirit we interpret the mystical experience to be a natural expression of man's innate capacity and existential relation to cosmos.

How will science deal with and evaluate the mystical experience?

Are there sole empirics, theory-independent, for observation or does it depend on what theory one would apply, the school of thought, the scientific paradigm and the episteme that is given to consider?

Much could be said about the fruitfulness of theoretical dialogue, critique, and this is obviously important from the point of view of the history of ideas. History of ideas is ideally suited to perform those metaanalytics of theory, episteme and paradigm.

The metaphysics is usually considered in regards to analytical propositions - *a priori* sentences of fundamental truth, deductive logic, though we must consider the validity of the transcendental and mystical experience and consider that experience in the light of a phenomenology of spirit. There is a transcendence in life and it is equally true for science that science, the sciences of man, must be able to grasp this transcendent quality of life, if it is to be a science of understanding.

Therefore we must turn to phenomenology (the science of experience) and hermeneutics (interpretation and understanding). Our philosophy of science is therefore rooted in the continental tradition that throughout modernity has kept open to reflect upon the fundamental question of being – ontology.

Rather than the rather cold stare of a science that has been caught up in a lonely epistemology, what is needed is a full-blooded pursuit of science that takes into account the metaphysics and the existentials of man in its theoretical foundation of ontology.

There is a call to life – and the same is true for science – there is a call for science.

In existence, we are given to reflect upon ontology. The scientist therefore cannot escape having to explain his ontology – the ontological assumptions, that guides and motivates his enterprise. It is a question of intention.

We return to the question of the mystical experience. In religion, in music, in arts and in poetry, there is still room to talk about the spiritual and mystical experience. How is science going to relate the mystical experience of Kundalini, trance, visions and ecstasy?¹ We should not let a reductionist, anti-existential worldview, such as is prevalent in the medicinal discourse, describe visions as hallucinations, where after the subject of such experiences is deemed irrational, mad and in a state of psychosis.

The discourse of medicine is fine example on what Foucault describes as 'the gaze' of a science – a power-knowledge constellation that circumscribes the subject and renders the subject visible as an object for power-practice (Foucault, 1961; 1963)

¹ For a description of the mystical experience and the Kundalini see: Riis-Søndergaard, *Rise of the Mystics – A Revival of Mysticism as a Natural Companion to Recent Metapolitics*, 2022

It is time to confront the medicinal science that has undermined so much of religious thought and experience in the last few centuries, since the 'age of reason', the 'enlightenment', and the inception of the psychiatric episteme.

The theory and explanations of medicine fail to grasp any ontology or metaphysics, let alone an existentielle, and we should therefore be very aware of the reductionist and atheist nature of most of modern day medical science.

How is medicine going to approach the nature of the Kundalini-experience? Hardly could they know anything about such a divine force of energy if they had no experience or practice thereof themselves.

Not to appreciate the trance as a mystical state is almost not considered worthwhile to mention as an naive and ignorant state of mind in regards to the transcendental and the innate spiritual capacity of man.

Not to appreciate the ecstasy as one the highest attainable states of man, pure bliss and tranquility, is hardly something that inspires a lot of sympathy among the religious people and the mystics.

Not to speak of the more everyday practices and experiences of prayers, chants, meditation and yoga that are so fundamental to the good life.

How are all these practices viewed by modern day science? The religious experience and the religious life.

Science cannot deny the mystical experience and since the mystical experience is the highest attainable and only given to an elect few and not as some mass phenomena, few serious studies have been carried out in regards to mystics and mysticism.

This fact has to be redeemed if science is to have any legitimate claim to knowledge about man and the experience of man.

This proves that there is still controversy in not only the human and social sciences on the mystical experience, but likewise in the natural sciences, where the standard theory is challenged to incorporate an explanation of the Kundalini-force.

Similar explanations are needed to account for the energies and characteristics of the chakras.

We are therefore proponents for a close interaction of religion and science in regards to ontological foundation and epistemic strategies.

Wiser on the present controversy of science, we will now return to consider the more general outline of the philosophy of science, as we continue to describe our theory and method.

Theory and method

Informed by critical science studies, history of ideas is better suited to theorize and analyze the activity of man in regards to religion, philosophy, politics, art, culture and science – all the spheres of activity, where mankind reflects, creates and interacts.

We are better able to grasp the moments of struggle in history, as the epistemic warfare has been ongoing, and where competing narratives of truth, science and knowledge were combating each other.

As we traverse the history of science, we are able to see how ideology is central to the argument of science. Science is always coupled with a power practice and networks of signifiers render the subject visible as an object for intervention in power-relations.

We want to bring ontology to the forefront. The ontology and foundation for thinking about being has to be made clear before any explanation can commence. This is what we know about the foundation and philosophy of science. There is a demand for ontology. We must debate the view of man, the worldview and the existentials – the call of life that informs man's status in and engagement with the world.

The debate on ontology find its historical expression as the debate between competing ideologies and in philosophy as the divide between continental philosophy and Anglo-american analytical philosophy.

This debate on ontology has its equal bearing in epistemology. That is to say: the ontological foundation and premises grant epistemic visibility and formation. Without ontology, science would not be able to see anything. The different branches of philosophy must be thought together, and ontology, together with metaphysics, is the major branch of philosophy, crowning the other branches (logic, epistemology, aesthetics, ethics). 'Know thyself' as it was written at the temple of Delphi.

With all this in mind, the political epistemology and epistemic warfare, we know it is our duty to debate the ontology of man, metaphysics and the ideological foundation for scientific pursuits.

This is the path to freedom. This is the call.

But to ask this question of being entails a hermeneutics of understanding that is an interpretive approach, since the subject and object of knowing is the same. This is the hermeneutics of the self.

When we consider the hermeneutics of the self, we first of consider the existentials. In the existentials, in heeding the call of life, we find the first ontological clues that will enable us to unveil the esoterics of ontology.

We have mentioned the fact of reflection and relationality, as the most bare subject experiences.

The second level of the experience of the subject is in regards to the existentials. From the basic premises we construe the existentials as given in regards to reflection and relation. The existentials is authentic, a natural inclination of man and a natural expression of life.

Man becomes self-aware, man sees the other and man is called to the existentials. These are the three core aspects of the experience of being.

The existentielle is the *call of life* and has to do with pride, honor and valor.

From this threefold experience (reflectivity, relationality and the existentielle) we can reflect upon our view of man, our worldview, and view on life and livelihood (the existentielle).

In this authenticity and in the reflection upon being, we are free to explore what are the essential characteristics of man, what are our abilities and what are the values essential to man.

This is the ideological debate on ontology and it should be ongoing. What will be debated is the ontological claims of competing theories and schools.

From the discussion, we will be able to extrapolate an episteme made visible in a power-knowledge constellation that we unveiled when the different valences (valuations) of the players/schools came to be known.

This is a confrontative strategy for knowledge gathering and this is how we propose to perform the history of ideas.

The epistemology is a political epistemology, as we are informed by ontology and existentielle for engagement with the world and world politics. We cannot deny being involved. We have a stake in the fight for scientific prevalence according to our valence.

It is not to say there is no truth of man or existence. There is, but the hermeneutics of the self, as an interpretive mode of understanding, is naturally confronted the other, when it comes to the intersubjectivity of interpretation – there is disagreement. The relational experience is not only love. There is animosity.

We therefore return to politics and we find it necessary to cast the epistemology as a political epistemology.

There will be debate as to the valences of the existentielle and the epistemological criterion for validating experience, though what is clear is that we are positive towards establishing an ontological sound foundation for debating those valences and validations.

Towards holism

The ontology we seek is an ontology that has man at its center. Man is of a transcendental consciousness and therefore stands in a categorical relation to existence. We are solely responsible for representing spirit in creation. We reject all attempts at decentering man in the equation of life.

At the same time, we find that the right approach is one of holism. We consider the Greek contemplation of cosmos, man embedded.

We have no trouble claiming the divinity of this constellation.

We have mentioned the transcendent quality of the mystical experience. This transcendence will have to be accounted for in the ontology, before we can say we are on the right track towards a science of understanding – a holistic science.

The ontology is one of love and animosity, harmony and conflict, cosmos and chaos – beauty, poetry and music – and war.

The epistemology is inspired by the existentials. It is a hermeneutic of life, so we probe existence for clues to the existentials and other existential questions that are given and have risen during our experience.

It is an epistemology of struggle, competing narratives and conflict of interest.

We have a claim to life and we are in the fight for ontological and epistemological prevalence. With competing narratives, epistemic controversy and a paradigmatic scientific culture, we are bound to invest ourselves in the fields of investigation with ontological, ideological and epistemological clarity.

It is not to say that truth cant be found. It can, but we still have to fight for it.

Bibliography

- Foucault, Michel, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, 1964 (1961)
- Foucault, Michel, *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, 1973 (1963)
- Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*, Pantheon Books, 1970 (1966)
- Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: The Will to Knowledge*, London: Allen Lane, 1979 (1976)
- Heidegger, Martin, *Sein und zeit*, 1927
- Kuhn, Thomas S., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962
- Lyotard, Jean-François, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press, 1984 (1979)
- Riis-Søndergaard, Kristian, *Rise of the Mystics – A Revival of Mysticism as a Natural Companion to Recent Metapolitics*, 2022