

## **"WAR OF THE WORLDS." IS SCIENCE PART MYTH, PART HOPE AND PART REALITY?**

### 1) WHAT IS "REAL" IN THIS ARTICLE? ANYTHING YOU DESCRIBE AS "REAL," BACK UP WITH EVIDENCE.

In an environment where we are greatly influenced by authoritative knowledge, it is immensely difficult to state that anything is "real." In this article this is exactly the point. The reader is lead to believe certain so called facts as scientists from the NASA space centre have said them. For example Scientists from NASA announced that "A meteorite contained evidence of past life on mars" The reader is led to understand this as "real" as the information comes from an authoritative source. However, the reader is then confused, as the statement is counter claimed by a number of other scientists. How can we determine anything as "real" when the knowledge in this article is based on the knowledge of other scientists, who are in fact contradicting each other and arguing over facts that are unproven or non-existent?

### 2) WHAT ARE THE "MYTHS" CONNECTED IN THIS ARTICLE?

In this article there are numerous points made by various scientists. A point made by one scientist may be considered as a myth by another. The foremost obvious "myth" being introduced is the ongoing mythology of life on mars. There is a problem of perception though, Everett Gibson may feel that the existence of life on mars is certainly not a "myth" and is "real," But to another scientist, or you and I, this is entirely a "myth" with no actual fact that cannot be counter claimed to support it.

### 3) WHAT METHODS ARE USED TO STOP "MYTHS" BECOMING "REALITY"

In the case given in the article, a "myth" is unable to become "reality" simply because the "myths" are unable to be proven, there are always ways to counter claim them, and there is always another scientist or sceptic with another piece of information that will ruin another scientist's theory/myth. Principally science is used to stop a "myth" from becoming "reality" in this article. For example, with PAHs, the "organic molecules form during the decomposition of living things", whereas a sceptic would say that "they may also form during non-biological reactions; they're common in Antarctic ice, so they may have come from the earth."

### 4) IS IT EASIER TO PROVE SOMETHING "TRUE" OR "NOT TRUE"?

When you are dealing with a subject that has no proof backing it up, such as the existence of life on Mars it is without a doubt easier to prove it to be not true. If there is no proof to back up the myth, a sceptic or another scientist may easily criticise another scientist's claim. "One needn't have a Ph.D. in logic to realise that something is amiss here. The NASA team has tended to answer criticism by saying, 'yes, what you say may be true, but what about...'

and then introduce something extraneous.” It is certainly easier to prove something to be “not true” when one can just shift the argument, so that others have to prove that their observations are true.

5) DO YOU NEED MORE EVIDENCE FOR “MYTH” THAN YOU DO FOR “REALITY”?

My personal opinion would be yes. As reality is reality, we cannot change that, what is real is real, something that is real must have evidence of it being real, otherwise it would not be real. Myths are based on reality but do not necessarily have specific evidence to back them up. But if you were to have more evidence, then the myth may be able to become reality. Therefore, myths require more evidence to allow them to become reality.  
Real is real

6) WHAT IS THE ROLE OF “HOPE” IN SCIENCE?

Hope plays a vital role in science. A scientist has a driving passion to prove their hypothesis to be correct, this is hope. Hope may even lead a scientist to twist their data so that they will be compatible with the hypothesis. A scientist is always hoping that he or she will be the one making that amazing discovery and that is what drives people to altering the truth so that these hopes can be fulfilled