



Spell #1:
Science Is Fμ©king Magic!
Fμ©king Magic Forever!

In Profiles of the Future, An Inquiry Into the Limits of the Possible (1962), Arthur C Clarke once wrote that “Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic.” Of course, technology is simply applied scientific understanding of the natural causality of existential reality. We recognize this as technology because we can understand the causality of how it works and pass this on. If we lack this understanding, or if such understanding is beyond present human capacity at the time, then any such real causality would appear unquestionably magical, even though it’s none the less real in spite of appearances.

From this we can derive a hypothetical working definition of magic. Although Arthur C Clarke probably did not intend for this, for the sake of creating a practical working framework for the discussion to follow, I will define what I will call the Arthur C Clarke working definition of magic, as any real causality that is not yet known and understood by humans, or is otherwise beyond human capacity to be known and understood, for whatever reason. Whether something is simply too complex to be humanly comprehended, simply invisible, or otherwise undetectable to current means of human perception, detection, and observation, the result is the same regardless, assigning real causality to the realm of mysterious supernatural superstition, if it is known of at all.

Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle alone guarantees this to some minimal extent. In 1927 Werner Heisenberg first articulated his uncertainty principle, which states that below a certain threshold scale of existence, it is increasingly impossible to know both the position and momentum of any particle, with any notion of certainty with respect to causality of the smallest





possible things completely disappearing to the point of being an absolute impossibility, rendering deterministic classical Newtonian mechanics calculations pointlessly futile. Not necessarily because it doesn't apply, but because the required information is not completely attainable, leaving us with no recourse except to utilize the sophisticated mathematical guesswork of probability and statistics. Thus the Heisenberg's uncertainty principle remains, as an absolutely impenetrable partial veil, where there are absolute limits to what can be known for certain, but within those limits we may peer, peeking and blinking, at the great unavoidably magical mystery, by the working definition of magic. Thus viewed as if in a mirror darkly, we may be able to somewhat understand the magic, all the while never completely dispelling it, fμ©king magic forever!

This working definition of magic could also be considered a stage magicians practical definition of magic, where the audience sees only the magic they don't understand because they don't know the trick, and the magician sees only the trick, because he understands the trick. Thus the magician is deprived of his own magic to some extent, but never completely, as that is impossible, by the uncertainty principle alone, made even further so by the veil of ignorance within the minds of the general human herd, like the audience or the readers.

In this sense, most people already treat science like it is magic anyway, since to them it is all a great incomprehensible mystery, mastered by scientific super geniuses like the fictional Tony Stark, who might as well be the modern wizards and witches, the sorcerers and shamans, as well as the high priests and high priestesses of our time. More and more people will proclaim that they believe the science and demand that others do the same. Anyone who says 'believe the science' doesn't know the meaning of the word science. Science is not something to be believed, it is a practice, a method, and a discipline, not a dogma that must be believed and remain unquestioned.





Science is the process of a sorting mechanism designed to make rationally comprehensible that which is otherwise incomprehensible informational noise of existence all around us. Presumably of a common universal existence for the sake of deriving properly universal facts, laws, or principles, of at least some approximate consistency, and therefore reliability, this provides a means of achieving the closest humanly possible approximation of truth. But it can only ever be an imperfect and incomplete approximation. To believe otherwise is to treat science as a religion, and to adopt it as a cult superstition, helping to create what may fairly be called a cult of scientism, ruled over by the modern high priests and high priestesses of academia.

Of course, what really turns science into this cult, is the combination of the general ignorance and superstitious thinking of the general public, with the desire to exploit this in pursuit of power, by those who should know better but don't care to. This is a function of the pathology of the incorrigible control freak, under the influence, temptation, and corruption of political power, resulting in a scorched earth philosophy, where anything that cannot be controlled must be destroyed. If science cannot be controlled, then science must be destroyed. But who's to know the difference if the general public treats science as a great incomprehensible mystery, because they are entirely dependent on the priestly academic class to tell them what to believe about it. Since the public themselves are ignorant and too lazy or low capacity to do it for themselves.

Only the members of the priestly class themselves are in any position to credibly expose and correct the problem in the eyes of the generally ignorant general public. If they themselves are the control freaks in question, then they have absolutely no reason to do so as it would undermine their control as members of the priestly class. For anyone in the priestly class who would expose, challenge, or correct the issue, they become a threat to the control of their peers





within the priestly class, as well as running afoul of the more powerful enemies within the ranks of the professional control freaks, in the form of lawyers, bureaucrats, and politicians.

But Science is a function and practice of reason and logic, a product of certain philosophical understandings regarding the nature of truth and it's process of discovery and deliberation. Therefore, in order to control science, one must control reason itself. But for reason to be reason, it can only be allowed to be controlled by principles of reason itself, and the empirical observations to which it is applied. This is effectively the definition of reason as such, otherwise it is not reason. Consequently, in order for a control freak to control reason that refuses to be controlled except by it's own principles, the principles that define reason themselves must be confused, corrupted, or otherwise removed and replaced.

This can be tricky, as the general public may not be completely ignorant of the basic principles, and the priestly class their relying upon may stubbornly refuse to give up on the principles that partly lead them to pursue knowledge in the first place. However, with a vast army of allied scorched earth control freaks arrayed against reason, utilizing a combination of politically leveraged institutional authority, bureaucracy, and finances, reason is bound to be slowly corrupted in ever accelerating fashion, fueled by a combination of rewarding compromising conformity while persecuting offensive deviation.

Beduh Beduh Beduh Beduh Beduh Beduh Beduh Beduh...

That's All For Now Folks!

Feel Free To Make Noise Among Yourselves!

And May The Best Noise Win!

