

Review of: "[Commentary] The Zeroth Law of Science"

Miloš Milovanović¹

¹ Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is not clear actually what the author implies under the term "science." One might contextually infer that he talks about secular modernism, which was dominating in the nineteenth century. This is significant for the methodology applied and the conclusions that followed. The same holds for other terms such as consciousness, free will, identity, etc. If he should mean the God will, it implies participation in a communion of Orthodoxy. On the other hand, the postulation of the human will to be free leads one straight into the Roman Catholic doctrine of filioque, which is a fundament of modernist science. In that regard, I suggest the author explore a link between the Law and heliocentric cosmology, which was a major conflict within Roman Catholicism. Such an exploration might disclose how modern science came about in the first place.

A general reference to quantum theory is quite a slippery slope. The evolution of a quantum state by the Schrodinger equation is a deterministic one, and the problem occurs when considering that it does not involve a measurement procedure that has remained out of the theory. In that manner, randomness appears to be one more term without clarification, which makes it subject to interpretation. The concept of probability waves resembles potentia in Aristotle's philosophy, which is not a mere randomness but maybe much more. There is also the exclusion principle by Pauli, which is a strong identity in terms of quantum theory.

In that respect, I am not sure that the Law is an empirical hypothesis that might be tested at all. The main problem is an absence of efficacious definitions that should refer to basic concepts. At the end of the day, I'm not aware of what the gain is, except a bit of parapsychology and parascientology.