A new approach to the philosophy of science: LFAF and 11 NCR. Part 5.

Vernon M. Neppe MD, PhD, FRSSAf, DPCP(ECAO), DSPE
and Edward R. Close PhD, PE, DF(ECAO), DSPE

Falsification versus feasibility

Conventional science argues that current science is based on the 'Popperian theory of Falsification'. [83; 172] This requires rejecting the false results, till true results are discovered. We need to add pieces of the jigsaw puzzle within 3S-1t. This way the open-minded appropriate skeptic can examine the data logically. Importantly, some paradigmatic models are incorrect and not feasible. If they were falsifiable, they could then be falsified using the correct approaches. But, most times, they are not falsifiable. What is new, is not necessarily better, so we must seek feasibility.

The introduction of our concept of 'Lower Dimensional Feasibility Absent Falsification' [163] incorporates *feasibility* and therefore *pivotally provides* scientific method in extending consciousness [34]. This is so important because we can now extend the concepts of science beyond the purely limited falsifiability.

LFAF raises issues about interpreting evolution in a purely mechanistic way. It allows incorporation of the feasibility of Consciousness Research, concepts of theism with impact, higher dimensionality; [87] and psi into science not as pseudo-science [123; 173; 174]; and it also facilitates studies of cosmology and even Medicine and Psychology. [99; 175; 176]

Circumstances are rarely replicable—they cannot be repeated again and again at different places and times, failing the condition of repeatability in the realm of the modern science. Many psi phenomena fall in this category. [167; 173] They cannot be treated as 'scientific' in the current Popperian definition of the modern science based on falsifiability from the framework of 3S-1t. [150; 163; 177] *TDVP results in an extension of the modern science because it recognizes higher dimensions and that is where the major part of spirituality and likely consciousness exists impacting 3S-1t.* These can be impacted by altered states of consciousness, such as through deep meditation or near-death experiences. [99; 175; 176] That might allow events to occur more regularly.

There might be no (totally) satisfactory definition of "science" as it does not always apply "the scientific method". Even the quantitative "hard science" may be applied to an ostensible non-science because it is highly quantitative and technical. Additionally, mathematics appears to be a metalevel above science because mathematical proof is so definitive: Is it part of science? In a way, it is above science, removing all debates from what is true.

Kuhn's scientific revolutions and the Neppe-Close 11 NCR

Thomas Kuhn's theory of on the Scientific Revolutions of change encompasses a repetitive and ongoing cyclical transition that involves three stages, [178, 179] namely:

- normal science;
- crises when paradigm shifts are contemplated or recognized with new assumptions; and
- scientific revolutions when the paradigm alters after a qualitative transformation in theory.

Actually, it was not Kuhn, but the German philosopher, Arthur Schopenhauer [180], who first articulated this central idea: *"All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Secondly, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident."*

We have extended the stages of the Kuhn model. [178] We have proposed the "11 Neppe-Close Revolutions model (11-NCR)" of change—the reshaping of science—by adding several more paths along the way. That makes these stages more comprehensible as the detail otherwise has been missing with all but the three Kuhn stages.

Table 1: The eleven phases of denial and acceptance of Neppe and Close ("the 11NC revolutions" or "11-NCR")

1. Initially there is *"it's too wrong to be wrong"*, often accompanied with a condescending smile or chuckle; the alternative phrase is the derisive *"it's too false to be false";*
2. then there is abject rejection, often accompanied by ridicule and name-calling: *"the insults are deserved. I know, I'm an expert";*
3. then *"that's a good try, but it's simply not true"*;
4. then the consensus rejects it: *"it's definitely incorrect"*;
5. then it is unlikely, but it may be mentioned as a hypothetical for completeness: *"it's an unlikely outlier that we mention just to cover all our bases";*
6. there is the stage of *"I'm opting out: This is outside my discipline, so I don't understand it or haven't studied it. Let me suspend judgment";*
7. then *"maybe there is something there, but I need more";*
8. then *"there is some evidence… interesting"*;
9. then *"it appears to be proven: the evidence is cogent; but most scientist don't accept that"*;
10. then it is hailed as *"it's a new breakthrough"* (even though it may have been proven much earlier);
11. then "*it's obvious: we all know that".*

This results in eleven phases of denial and acceptance of Neppe and Close ("the 11NC revolutions" or "11- NCR") highlighted by stage 1 *"Not even wrong"*. [177; 179]

For example, in general, Kuhn's normal science incorporates the first 6 stages of 11 NCR.

Then Kuhn's crisis stage could roughly incorporate stages 7 to 9 of 11 NCR.

Then Kuhn's paradigm alterations related to stages 10 (when new) and 11 (when accepted) of

the 11 NCR. The spectrum ranges from individual utter rejection to complete acceptance. [179]

We exemplify this 11-NCR model applying 11 new sequences of discovery, and point to the prejudices of the scoffers. [177; 179] (Table 1) Of the 11 legitimate phases, individual scientists might be somewhat arbitrary as to which level of classification they would apply. Even attaining a consensus of scientists might not imply they are correct.

Metaphysical and 9D science

So how, then, can we apply consensus and peer review, and maintain a paradigm or specific knowledge as science? We, surely, must be careful that when using current consensus ideas, and rejecting feasibility, we regard the greatest contributions to science as "metaphysical" — implying they are not scientific, or simply philosophical, or sometimes involve creativity. We might then recognize, too, the irony. LFAF becomes an impetus for change to redefine experience in the context of identifying different levels of acceptance in this new science. Without applying LFAF, this might not even be perceived as a science at all and still simply remain metaphysical speculation or a philosophical standpoint, because we are then not going beyond 4D to 9D+ science. Yet, consciousness alone forces that option of 9D+ as we move out of the 4D science of 3S-1t alone).

Where do we stand? In our opinion, when so-called scientists write that *"it's too false to be false",* they're saying a great deal. But this is not usually about the science behind the work they're critiquing. Instead, it may reflect themselves, because with the speakers' ignorance, or their unswerving rigidity, flows forth their character.

Evaluating the TDVP findings in sequence: Grading each milestone applying 11 NCR?

Let's apply the 11-NCR classification to the example of the following sequences:

1. Close and Neppe developed their detailed TDVP [i] model of the finite and the infinite. [11]
2. They then recognized in their TDVP model that there had to be a multidimensional finite reality. [27; 28]
3. They then postulated in their TDVP model that there had to be specifically a 9-dimensional finite reality. [11; 28]
4. They then demonstrated theoretically why there should be 9 finite dimensions. [11 103; 104]
5. They then mathematically derived the Cabibbo angle which required 9-dimensional spin. [106 105]
6. They then replicated this mathematical derivation by a thought experiment. [181]
7. They then extended this work to other areas such as angular momentum and electron spin. [182]
8. They then extended several other related phenomena such as the non-spherical

[i] TDVP or TDdVP: The Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm

electron and the electron cloud. [99]

9. They then postulated that each higher dimension is an extension of the previous ones: The lower dimensions are embedded within the others. [183]
10. They then developed a model of the third property, gimmel, which shows that we need a 9-dimensional reality. [12; 14]
11. The applied Triadic rotational units of Equivalence —TRUE units including quarks, electrons and gimmel. [14; 62]
12. They showed correlations of gimmel, both sub-atomically as well as at the cosmological level, and that these relate to a particular way of measuring reality. (Triadic rotational units of Equivalence —TRUE units). [14; 62]
13. They recognized that all these findings are heavily correlated with the commonality being a finite 9-dimensional spin model. [88 87 99 177; 179]
14. They further pointed out that none of the 9D spin findings in any way compromised the experiential empirical findings that we have in 3S-1t. [3; 101; 128]
15. They then moved from the mathematical and empirical scientific model to the creative exploratory model for the future. They realized that there are many more ways to solve the many conundrums in our current world view by applying this knowledge:
    a. Through understanding there needs to be a spinning multidimensional reality (which also would refute [29] the String Theories [18] which involve folding or curling, not spinning)
    b. That certain other dimensional contradictions or conundrums of physics might be potentially solved in the future. [12 184 185]
    c. That mechanisms for psi phenomena can be solved without contradicting our current experiential reality. [186 167]
    d. That the reality might need to be 9-dimensions or a related exponent: 9 is 3 squared, and it could possibly be 9 cubed = 81, 9 quadrupled = 729, or possibly even 3 cubed =27. [88]
16. They then definitively demonstrated the Mass-energy equivalence of TRUE in the normalized data in the CERN Large Hadron Collider. [22; 72; 187]

Let's look at some of these 16 options including the four subdivisions of option #15. [177; 179] How does the conventional 4D-scientist, very used to life being only 3 dimensions of space (length, breadth, height) experienced in a moment in time (3S-1t), regard such findings? First, he could regard each of the sixteen findings individually— #1 to #16, being perceived independently of any others.

Alternatively, he could build on the 16. Knowing that e. g. #5 likely implies that #1 to #4 is also correct.

Therefore, possibly there should be 3 rankings when we classify these 16 statements in the context of the 11 Neppe-Close Revolutions model (11 NCR). The rankings of the statement should lead to a particular level ranking which would be different for each scientist [177; 179]:

A. independent of any other statement;
B. taking all the other previous statements into account yielding a composite;

C. rank the ranker's individual attitude for the above, not based on information delivered but attitude toward the areas (independent, composite, other). This ranking might say much more about the findings or the background (personality, training, ignorance) of the scientist involved than the actual findings.

We briefly go ahead and this may be particularly relevant for C. above.

- Level 1 would refer to the pseudo-skeptic, denier, or scoffer, of "too false to be false"?
- The mid-range may involve the considered opinion of Level 5, "unlikely outlier" because we're concerned about all other 3S-1t science, despite knowing that it does not contradict any of 3S-1t, just extends it—so that still requires some denial of the data?
- Or is it Level 6, the honest "*I don't understand it: This is outside my discipline".*
- Or is it Level 9 *"proven? But most won't accept it?"*
- Or is it Level 10 *("a new breakthrough")*?
- And what would it take to be Level 11? Would it require the Planckian funerals [44] or has massive, rapid electronic communications changed that ethos?

Of course, adding "feasibility" to the mix might paradoxically lead to being stuck on Level 1 of 11-NCR for longer. Before it could just be rejected but not as science, so maybe as a Level 3 (*"good try, but this is not science")* but now, for some, it might be classifiable initially as *"not even feasible, because of its ostensible Bayesian impossibility."* [167] [11]. That may be why the Planckian Funerals [44], pointing out why advancements occur only over generations, are important. Scientists have difficulty with *"unthinking"*!

These 11 stages are not easy to negotiate because they are so threatening, and we can see this in areas where, for many, the evidence is cogent, such as in psi research [173], and yet for others the data is completely rejected, often out of ignorance.

Scientists might not easily admit variants of the following sentences: *"I'm too threatened by this. I want to stay with what I know. In any event, I must not need to unthink what I've learnt. And I'm an academic and my job is at stake."* Instead, ironically, often those who shout the most about maintaining the status quo, are *ignorant of their own ignorance* about a proposed new paradigm. They've not studied the paradigm in detail, and likely might not even have the requisite training and experience even to make judgments.

We have seen this ignorant ignorance repeatedly in the disciplines of Psi and Consciousness Research, for example. [123; 167; 173; 174; 188; 189] This is, at times, particularly ironic because with respect, we suggest a feasible unstudied conjecture:

Consciousness Research is so multidisciplinary that few scientists have been able to allocate even as much time to study this area as they would to a regular bachelor's degree in a recognized university discipline like physics.

Science is now subject to anonymous peer-review, yet this *"does not shield people from being jealous, opportunistic, self-serving, incredulous, or harboring idiosyncratic beliefs, nor does it ensure competence or ethical behavior."* [190] We could add 'ignorance of ignorance.'

Objective interpretation is indeed, a problem for all these reasons:
Acceptance of the new, may result in threats to current thought, and rejection may even result in misappropriation of ideas—we've seen referees publish data instead.
Also, acceptance of radical ideas might lead to rejection of the current University paradigm. Even in science, the new is dangerous and the expectation is to 'toe the line'. Recognition in science, like all endeavors today, frequently has significant political innuendoes.

These considerations certainly do not make conventional 'science' as a subject, necessarily into 'hard science'. Henry Bauer's parallel with economic data also being hard science [190] is exemplified here, as we see it: *Peer-review is a soft approach, often implying limitations that may be tantamount to the data being judged by a jury who are not really peers*—in most instances, different so-called peers will reach very different conclusions. [177] Some reviewers can back in their anonymity with unfair prejudices. As an important aside, Dr. Bauer's insights into the limitations of the scientific method and consequently, on Philosophy of Science, are extraordinarily important. Many have not considered them, and they might be at Level 1 through 3 of 11 NCR, when possibly they should be at Level 6 for some, and Levels 10 or 11 for others. [190; 191] Yet, Dr. Henry Bauer might be an example of those who will have only contributed after the Planckian funerals in the Philosophy of Science. [45] His wisdom has been ignored, possibly because he has been prepared to be controversial in his views, as well.

Still peer review with appropriate reviewers generally makes papers much better. Neppe points out that every single one of his 700 plus publications have gone through rigorous review, and have been read sometimes by as many as 11 peers. This includes journals, such as this one, that usually does not have stringent peer review, but allows exposure to several peer reviewers, more than most peer-reviewed journals. The consequent improvements in the quality of the articles pays off dramatically—this particular has gone through 25+ revisions.

Additionally, when change occurs, even after first electronic publication, some editors allow further clarifications to make what we regard as extremely important, even paradigm shifting work, even better. We regard this method as the future of peer-review. Anonymous reviewers have advantages, but they can create significant bias or rigidity or even prejudice and result in sticking at Level 1 or 2 of 11-NCR or can accept papers that are poor. Every so often we encounter someone who admits their lack of expertise and is at Level 6 of 11-NCR. [177; 179; 178]

Conclusion

What do we conclude? In our humble opinion, the data is cogent that 4D scientists applying the reductionist model of physics should extend their studies to the whole picture including details about 9D science or even 9D+ science. TDVP has been a game-changer.
We should be at the stage of Level 10 of 11 NCR of Neppe and Close. This should correspond with Kuhn's Stage 3 of Scientific Revolutions. [177; 179; 178]
The 4D scientists should apply 9D science particularly in the quantal and cosmological

disciplines where there are many insoluble 4D level conundrums, but they will not need to reject the great findings of our 4D physical macroworld. 4D remains an extraordinarily important part of the 9D picture, but not the whole terrain. Extending conventional scientific materialism from 3S-1t to learning about 9D+ science is very logical and should not be controversial: 9D is not a speculation, but is based on cogent and reproducible and empirically relevant mathematics.

The availability of 9D science allows scientists to progress more rapidly in their research because there are many new or unexplored areas to discover or investigate. This implies incorporating multidimensionality, the infinite and consciousness: TDVP certainly significantly advances the landscape, and so does the LFAF and 11-NCR models. Through 9D+ science, we also have unified the laws of nature, and that unification, too, might provide new areas for exploration or philosophical debate. As we envisage it, old ideas must be overridden and buried. However, the scientific method requires logic, common-sense, and applying LFAF. We examine the scientifically feasible without even 4D science falsification.

Derision based on ignorance, and lack of training, results in scoffers who might ultimately embarrass themselves, and be disrespected. They might reflect the mediocre failures who will never achieve, and instead remain at the lower rungs of 11-NCR. We welcome *open-minded* skeptics coherently communicating and demonstrating the cogency of their argument. These skeptics on 9D and 9D+ science would have studied the material prior to disparaging the legitimate. It's excellent to exhibit appropriate open-minded skepticism about any research: Even Einstein was a skeptic about quantum theory with its illogical paradoxes, spending his last 20 years investigating extra dimensions (but sadly, not including consciousness.) [192-194]

Our model will, no doubt, be wrong in some respects. Time will tell how. Yet TDVP, based on 7+ years of 'pivotal, earth-shaking, all-important' results, with international, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary recognition, such as the Whiting Memorial Award [j] [195; 196], deserves a careful, comprehensive, educated analysis by teams of *qualified* mathematical scientists familiar with DBP who can thoroughly objectively approach this metaparadigm. There will be areas of dispute, components for debate, and necessary corrections needed. Possible amplifications of secondary hypotheses are required, with full-blown open-minded skepticism, and applications of current scientific and mathematical logic.

All these factors are not new: It was already a significant problem as long ago as 1943. This was pointed out by Erwin Schrödinger [197] in a lecture given in Dublin, Ireland. *"We feel clearly that we are only now beginning to acquire reliable material for welding together the sum total of all that is known into a whole. But, on the other hand, it has become next to impossible for a single mind fully to command more than a small specialized portion of it."*

[j] E.g., please see https://www.thethousand.com/2016_dr_vernon_neppe_and_dr.php, and http://tddvp.com/