## Bacon’s Scathing Report

###### 

1. Introduction

That which is deserving of existence is deserving of knowledge

Let’s face it - Sir Francis Bacon was nothing if not pithy. His work is full of these kinds of quotes. He was even the knowledge is power guy. There was a rumour going around that he was Shakespeare. I, for one, never saw them in same room. The dates for Francis Bacon, are 1561-1626, lived in and died in England, involved in all kinds of capers, lived in times or rubulence. Secretary to Lord Shaftsbury. A man of the world in an Elizabethan world of intrigue, worst. Elizabethen times, monarchy lunatic bosses running the worst company every. Died of a cold, after a frozen chicken incident.

In the following paragraphs I wanted to get into his most known work, his Novum Organum, or “New Instrument”. The first thing that one might say of this work times of fancy philosophy and complicated, Bacon is a joy. He is such a fun writer from a different time, so bold, It is like an all night party that starts railing and then becomes more serene, turns out to be a great read, fascinating, deeply inspiring. And like most great literature, it lives a far simplified existence.

The structure of the Novum? Two essays, dense slow read, Notoriously short lots of long sentences a touch 120 pages or so. Two main sections, the first part on critique and hope. One might say the Not because it is difficult to undesrant In new instrument he lays out a pretty scathing critique on the human being to acquire knowledge in organised way and use it. And this is really scathing. But then he turns to look more deeply, he believes in the human ability. And then the rest is all science, (kind of).

But what is it that perplexes me is given his critique on how hopeless humans actually are in in doing science, why would it work? Where does it lead. We make an assumption that Bacon presents a new method, but he presents a human as a flawed veiew, and there a science itself, is, well, not strictly a science.

2.

The first book of aphrosims I want to focus on the first 92 aphorisms, what strikes me is just how hopeless all of us. It is worth dwelling on this – why does he go any further. This to mie is the critical question for Bacon – maybe Science is not really our thing, natural philosophy. Because from this, humans not good at much but one thing they are really bad at is science. Think of any old ridiculous activity. Say I thow a leaf in the air and run around it trying to make it stay off the ground by blowing on it. Now this is something I could probably get better at. Maybe does it really matter. This almost reads as if someone, somewhere has hired Bacon, being not quite sure what to make of human beings. Get Bacon to commission a report. What to make of them. And what does he come back with. It’s the first 92 aphorisms that raise some pretty major issues.

So what extactly does Bacon lay out. Well it turns out human beings just suck on every level that logic is bad, it is too resrictice. Ans Empiriscm is bad. Because we do a few experiments, kerblam. We are lazy superstition, Supersitition is bad, we tend to become enamoured. We don’t don’t ask what verses where, human being don’t look at processes

They are skeptical – but wait, maybe this is a good thing right? But no, this turns out to bew bad, because it turns into sspectivishm. Everything becomes untruth and that just cannot be board.

He eventually starts to catogorise it – complaining humans categorise, is this a ironic compliment? It is hard to say. He comes up with the idols, all leading no where. The first, the idols of the tribe, just being man in the world, is bad news. Then there is the idols of the den or idols of the cave. This is local context. There is a local context to our stupidity. Then there is idols of the market – tendency to corrupt, problem with power, and language, don’t forget how bad language is. It will never work. Finally, there is idol of the theatre, tendency of spectacle. The picture this all paints of is of a being who is probably fun to hang out with, will probably do cool things, stupid things, but interesting, but that is about it.

There is a moment, in Aphorism 63, it starts to feel like he is out of puff. XVIII when it looks like he is done. But oh no, he doubles down.

But no, turns out he is still going: our processs are fallacious and complete, our senses deceive this, we abstract badly, we don’t look at proof, we induct when we should deduct. There is this really cool, moment in 70 when he says, like you know who is a great sciencitst like why can’t we be more like God? I mean, this God character is the bees knees when it comes to science. If we were him, we would have created light, forgotten where we were at, gotten confused, He spent a whole day, worked on light first, ironed out the problems, got it working all hooked up, before heading off to something else. This is a such a strange thing to say.

And no one has ever gotten this write – things start to let up a little, maybe experience is ok with caveatues (though we will probably screw it up) again to quick. He has a go at the greeks, professorial disputation, confuation at the exense of truth, too much theory and philosophically problematic, to abstract. He also raises problem that we have seen more and hard to say if we are better. We have no plan, we just to magic and he starts to hint in 74 that maybe there is a 3rd way, if we can get past the experts From around 70 things get a little more upbeat, but it takes about 20 or so more aphorisms to work it out of his system.

This leads ato a weird discussion on who is the child parent around 84– world gets older, ancuiencts younger. we are have more experience, we look back at the greeks as children, or do we see them as our ancestors – not sure, and that place in the conversation with Bacon might excuse to go the bathroom and sneak out the window. What is time? There is a point in most philosophy texts where the bartender reachers over and politely asks for the keys. This happens in 84. He makes the point 25 centuries and only 6 favourable to science, even when literature/wit is good, natural phislolopy seem to be ad, and broth down and still today is just a hobby.

The big problem – there is no fixed plan. We want “new inventions and riches” we need Leads to a problem of scope, doing prenet science and seeing it as a sense of empy promising, ignoring the objeuct on its own terms, stop mingling pphiloslopy and relisious. Note this is religious guy. God is his favourite sciencetist (yes, I actually just said that). Oh, and education is bad.

So if there is a plan, there needs to be delineation. There needs to be organisation. At XC things get interesting. Civil vs art vs science, what the the scope, may does not think he can do science (maybe man has gotten stuck with Bacon at a party)

And then he lays out. And this is where the history starts and Bacon is the father of science. But this is something of a misrepresentation. And if you were the investor of this caper, all you would see is red flags. So the first thing, maybe we should not do science. Or not do what Bacon is telling us to at least. Has something fundamental being missed. Why are we so bad at this? Further how much of this has stopped? Tendency to porpupine science. Is is the case that science has been cordoned off enoughso we can. How much of this critique is still very valid today. Can we get away weith saying that the establishment of science gives us know Bacon sense, or is that just not going to work?

2.

Asking human beings to do science is like asking the local theatre group to build a nuclear reactor. Like it will probably be a disaster and a ton of people will die horribly, but it will be a fun ride.

So assuming that following Bacon’s report back to HQ we get the contract, and human beings are in the business of doing science, what are the next steps. This is what the bacom method is. And it’s a little vague. Something are important. The good news is that the big problem is human error and we need go get past this issue (this ignores the ontology here: human beings are error prone by nature). But he has a neat analogy: ant bad, spider bad – we want to be the bee, collaborative. This eearly throughts give off a bit of a Newton vibe too. He kind of does this, with care, so its possible. Its like Bacon is giving birth newton in these paragraphs

So the first thing we do is storage: A store of facts. A database. It’s a win for IT crowd. We need a plan, write up, table of disucvery. We need to categorise what is and what is not of value. We need to go from particular to general. There is a focus on induction, and falsification, scope. And a sense in which it is a everything needs to come into the one concern. There is not multiple disciplines, they all all fall into one another, into natural philsosophy.

And Bacon, finds human beings, well, plucky. Because we just seem to get lucky. We create ethings like cannons, silk the compass. We come up with all this crazy stuff. So human mind can create something it can’t imageine this is powerful. And CXI, we spend our time in crazy stuff answay. And sometimes, not all the time, but sometimes we tend to work togetner. What if we had a theory, then tested it, a metnod

And then it is into book 2 – this is in action, uses heat as a methofar. Introduces idea of form – attempt, to bodies in motion – method is precarious, this feels precarious. Manmy poins

QQ But the latent process of which we speak, is far from being ovvious to men’s minds, beset as they now are. For we mean not the measures, symptoms, or degrees of any process which cn be exhibited in the bodies themselves, but simply a continued processes which, for the most part, escapes the obversation of the senses. P. 47

2.

So there is the uncomfortable point we need to address. Is science just not going to work. And if it does not work, what do we do? How do we be? Do we need to get out of the business of science.

Consider the following scenarios – we get out of science now. Turn everything off. Heidegger, standing reserve problem. The fracturing the disciplines is an aissue. What do we do? Till the fields, grow things? Commune with nature? That does not really sound like fun? Or do we sunset science so we don’t have to work? But does this mean that we become ontologically different – is man an impossible situation. Is he impossible, between the finite and the infinite – he is a side effect of this? How does a side effedt to philosophy Is this the final moment of madness when it simply becomes impossible? Is that what is really what is underneath the rage of Bacon, screaming.

And why are we lucky – these rushes of knowledge, are we already a time traveller, so this impossible way to live. this the time travel thing JG? Thinking about being differently – what if life is not different bio, but different ontologies – like we have time and space, others have different things

What kind of being is a human being. In the balance between finite and infinite what can it do. It makes one consider, we have assume that look for life forms, but we have missed the point. It is not about the life signs of life, we should be searching for ontologies. Kant describes a being who perceives the infinite in terms of time and space, causalkity, limited storage, limited states, reason and idea. Is this the only type of life. Are there other beings, maybe they are so radically different from us, we would not expect to see humans exactly like us, so msaybe the different species are to do with different, so we would expect to find a different from tiem and space, or state and storage. And this context, what is the human way of life. We are seeing, causality,

The overwhelming reason humans do things, is that, they arew cool. Build that huge thing, go to the moon. Artists, but our art gets so crazy it destroyes us. We can’t do anything, humans love to do things because they are cool. We write s

So what is the purpose of the human of another onology. Are we Comic relief. I am going to make a suggestion here – Are we time travel, a way of moving through time and space. Or are we needing just to make connections.

So we will all fail science, all the time. There are not moments. Newton? So who wouldn’t fail his course? Maybe Newton? Maybe Darwin? Hannah Arrendt?

Also other beings, time and space – is bilolgoy example not sensible