

The Tyranny of Science: The Discovery of Tacit Knowledge

By Jeu-Jenq YUANN



What are the point of our long discussion of the tyranny of science?

- 1. The world is divided by the distinction between what is scientific and what is human.
- 2. Philosophers try with good arguments to show why the distinction should be held.
- 3. The distinction refers to the separation between “*what is*” and “*what should be*”.



What are the point of our long discussion of the tyranny of science?

- 4. Moreover, pain and pleasure are not in the things themselves; they are the way in which people react to their surroundings whose true nature is independent of, and unaffected by, these reactions.
- 5. These are the major chasms that seem to divide our lives.



Where come these chasms?

- The separation between nature and feelings.
- Nature which was once a dwelling place of all sorts of gods, turns out to be nothing but a rather complicated mechanism.
- Why should we accept it and even praise it as an advanced view?



Monod's objectivism with its
“prodigious power of performance”.

- How did objectivism arise?
- What can be the relationship between objectivism and materialism?
- Why a philosophy such as objectivism, which does not produce anything useful turns out to show power of performance?
- We have to explain this by referring to its historical tradition.



Monod's objectivism with its “prodigious power of performance”.

- The point is that we human beings live in an environment in which all things perceived, felt, happened, but why should all these are considered “inferior” to the idea of materialism?
- Christianity is a good example to show the peculiarity of this thinking.
- Despite all obstacles Christianity went through, the idea survives not among the masses, but among the educated people.



Monod's objectivism with its
“prodigious power of performance”.

- We need to explain this by linking Christianity with that of materialism or objectivism.
- Monotheism implied by Christianity refers to an objective point of view which says that whatever human is mundane, and therefore is divergent.
- There should be only one God, according to Christianity, and He is beyond all of us.



Monod's objectivism with its
“prodigious power of performance”.

- So, what is beyond is not only superior to the earthly world, but also consecrated as the only true world.
- The human world is deemed inferior and in a certain way to the divine world.
- The truth of the world beyond lies not in an objective argument, but in a pious faith which accepts beforehand that truth does not exist in the human world.



Monod's objectivism with its
“prodigious power of performance”.

- This idea of cherishing the divine world can be universalized and even objectivized.
- Christianity can be valid and true in every corner of the world.
- This arises objectivism and its fixation turns out to be the only idea matters.
- Taking ONE thing dear is materializing it.



Monod's objectivism with its “prodigious power of performance”.

- If it was not due to the tradition holding objectivism and materialism long before it exerts its power of performance, then the human history would be very different.
- Now, what we have is a dehumanized world in which a total split between subjective events and objective processes is firmly held.



Do we really need to be objectivists to see the human world?

- Not at all!
- Looking at someone's face as an essential part of our relationship on the daily basis does not allow me to draw an objective view concerning our relationship.
- Is it not clear that science and values are intertwined in a complex and not always transparent way?



Do we really need to be objectivists to see the human world?

- Is it not clear that the separation between subjects which exists today cannot simply be removed from by an act of will?
- Experiment decides, why? Because that is what we have been told today.
- We are told that they were successful at finding general laws which in turn led to interesting technologies, but this can not be true!



Do we really need to be objectivists to see the human world?

- The application of the application of the general laws come much later than the idea of cherishing general laws.
- It is this idea rather than any empirical foundation making objectivism prominent.
- Its origin has to be a matter of history and in order to answer the question, we should begin with the history of philosophy.



The sophists.

- The history of Western philosophy begins not with sophists, but “the profession of philosophy” does.
- With criticism of Plato, the sophists have been blamed for teaching virtue of rhetoric as their profession.
- The situation changed in the 5 century BC when the sophists arrived Athens from all around Greece.



The sophists.

- Feyerabend thinks that the sophists should be responsible for the study of arguments which heavily rely on logic.
- 1. The sophists are people who changed their profession in mid-life and became teachers of virtue.
- 2. Their repertory are arguments leading the dialoguers to paradoxical conclusions.



The sophists.

- These conclusions make those confronted “dumb-stuck and do not know what to say” and lead to defeat an opponent in a law court. They are serious things.
- 3. As the yare serious, the sophists need to prepare their arguments in detail and in good logic with its distinction between valid and invalid reasoning.



The sophists.

- 4. The debates are carried out in public with an interested audience who were inclined to accept logic as a technique to win debates with superior reasoning.
- In a direct democracy such as Athens, the art of speech was never new, but the sophists made a science out of this art and examined the nature of language.
- They extended speech on all subjects and this was only a beginning.



Plato vs. the sophists.

- Plato thought the sophists were shallow as he thought that life got to be kinked with some commitments.

