

MILITARIZATION OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: EUGENICIZING THE THOUGHT OF KNOWLEDGE

By : ZIDANE LOTFI

To my family

To B.Imene & B.Rayane

Introduction:

This paper aims to shed enough light on the scientific research methodology that we have observed, and this opinion remains non-binding, that it needs revision to reach a good quality of research in line with the requirements of the period and establishes a new scientific spirit. We must stand at the correct understanding of the terms before going through the review and laying modern foundations for researchers to rely on. The problem does not lie in plagiarism, intellectual property and organizing the form of research to be published in scientific journals. The problem, too, is not the spread of improper and paid publishing journals. The problem lies in the spirit of the research and in the researcher's thought. We expect the present expose to explain our view of the subject.

Problems of current methodology orientations:

We were anxious from the start, because as much as we rejoiced at our good misfortune, we felt some apprehension that we would not become. Because in the beginning, if every theorist felt a duty to suffice that he had to do, he did what he could and what his circumstances and competencies allowed him, and there is no doubt that there may be some neglect; After the epidemic, we have reached a historical stage in which we must lay the foundations for unifying work to achieve the interest of unity and ward off the corruption of division. Because unity lies in our strength. As for the band spoiler, it maintains the status quo that has destroyed scientific research and prompted us to praise failure and empty scientific research of its content. Any success that becomes an educational success that the professor brags about in his lab in front of his students, or the satisfaction of an economic need. It is time to re-theorize scientific research and come up with a research methodology that is in line with the changes that have occurred in the basic components of human nature.

When completing any research or presenting any scientific article, critics critique the presentation and methodology in general and then discuss the results obtained. Perhaps, there is a good reason for that. However, it is better for these critics to agree on a method of research that starts from the emergence of the idea to the stage of confirmation or denial, rather than spreading different methods of marginalization, intellectual property and combating scientific theft.

Any written research is in its origin an idea that appeared in the researcher's mind or, at the latest, in the mind of the research supervisor. It must also be said that the research is an embodiment of the mental behavior of the researcher, so that any methodological problem in the presentation indicates an imbalance in the researcher's thinking behavior.

My own and non-binding view of the concept of research (applied research) is as follows: The researcher in his laboratory is like a hen incubating eggs. This hen, during the incubation period, is optimistic that the eggs will hatch. But when hatching, all the eggs may hatch, some of them may hatch, but also, no egg may hatch. That is the case with the idea. Upon completion of the experiment, he finds himself, perhaps, facing success or failure. The hen returns to incubation after a while, and he also returns to search again. The only divergence between them (in

the eyes of current theorists and not in my view) is that the researcher can value failure and consider it an outcome in itself, and this is not a mistake, but rather a crime.

Some would say that hypotheses arise for confirmation or denial, as well as the spirit of science. But a hypothesis is a vehicle that takes us from theory to experiment. It is like scientific Viagra that revives our scientific spirit. Let's do an experiment to discuss the original idea. At first, we may encounter a single hypothesis or group of hypotheses, which opens the way for us to ask "How can we be sure?" and "What does it take to be sure?" After the answer by application and the end of the experiment, either the hypothesis succeeds in becoming a supported idea, or it fails to do so and is destroyed.

Supervising research is not a profession. Also, scientific research is not a profession that we occupy. The real problem behind the growth of the phenomenon of failed success" (by which we mean achieving success and producing results that do not reflect on the ground and do not provide an addition to human life. For example, in the conditions of the recent pandemic, not all laboratories containing researchers classified as seniors were able to produce a vaccine) lies in : the researcher either got the idea of the research from his supervisor or, in the best of

expectations, he spent a period of time searching for an original idea. In my view:

the idea arises by itself in the imagination and is described, no one gives us the idea

and we do not search for it.

Militarization of scientific research :

The research idea must be described. Before any research adventure, the researcher must examine the seeds of his idea and the extent of its temporal and spatial efficacy. Then search for and interrogate previous literature and verify the ground, because any intellectual construction on an improper ground exposes it to earthquakes of criticism. This interrogation should be armed with impartiality and without standing at the attribution of the idea. The literature presented. Then comes the work stage, which consists in collecting all the information about the location of the operation, inventorying all the necessary means to carry it out and listing the potential risks while always expecting the worst. Then do the latter to configure a command center.

The militarization of scientific research is the most effective scheme for maintaining this mental act. This scheme is characterized by the discipline of empirical movement and rhetorical movement. The movements in it, in a more precise sense, are controlled, short and balanced in a way that allows you to move forward correctly, safely withdraw and maneuver. The researcher's performance

must be consistent with the performance of the research elements and in a prescribed manner. Also, each research component must be attached to a research command center consisting of research pillars and means and an intelligence apparatus that provides proactive perceptions of obstacles and critical audience opinion. The Command Center also consists of a force that primarily ensures a pre-modified interim assessment and evaluation of performance. This center is headed by the mind of the researcher who must have unconditional respect for the idea of search and selflessness.

Any research has a center of gravity. The center of gravity stems from the research and rhetorical moves on which the entire research depends. This term refers to the original idea on which the research is based, an interim evaluation of all research and rhetorical moves. It charts the course of the search and prepares rescue and withdrawal plans, as well as making sure that the researcher does not fall into research 'Haram' by going beyond the limits of other ideas. It is also the reference image that we evoke when comparing the results obtained with the theoretical results presented in the hypotheses.

The most important is the movement of the patterns towards the targets in a quick manner and with a short movement governed by partial results that, when all the results are combined, constitute the would be research result. The movement of the formats is based on intelligence information and has an effect on the mind of the reader. The way to move is offensive-defensive. Calculating the cost helps in the evaluation stages, but the evaluation is not from outside the center of the operational command.

The critics' attack is mostly represented in the rhetorical method of marketing the idea, because getting the result in itself is considered a defensive system. Based on this, we must direct the attacks to the center of conviction in the reader by drawing a rhetorical picture that answers a supposed question for the reader. In the course of the offensive moves, we plan in advance to escalate at a specific point and then retreat with a certain tactic to ensure passage to a certain research stage.

Observation and taking notes with recording all the details of the research is the essence of evaluation in the militarization of the scientific research scheme. The researcher must do this task and give it the attention it deserves and bring it to his mind because the latter is considered the chief executive officer of the research command center. After that, the stage is discussed and refined, and the extent of its relationship and conformity with the idea of research, research expenses and time spent, and a report on the means of achieving these results is recorded. At the end of the evaluation stage, the results are purified, while keeping the result related to the research and directing the rest of the results to those who are interested without neglect. Two important points must be remembered. The first point is that all the results obtained at each end of a stage are important, even if they seem insignificant. As for the second point, it is necessary to move to a rhetorical envelope through which we transform the applied results into rhetorical sentences to market to the reader.

It must be said that communicating the research to the reader is just as important as the research. The harmony between the research components and the rhetorical sentences shows the reader the extent of the researcher's success. The researcher's research may be important, but if the researcher fails to obtain a

rhetorical vehicle to convey it to the reader or to the critic, makes the research without importance. The value of research derives from its role in human life and its development, but also from its hijacking of the minds of critics.

It should also be noted that the final results in any research will be the basis for future research, so the researcher must take care of mastering his research industry and also in being able to convey a beautiful picture of his rhetorical faculty.

The rhetorical faculty does not necessarily mean speaking or writing, but it means choosing the appropriate timing for the idea and presenting it, and then in the last place comes the rhetorical vehicle that opens the appetites of critics and readers to discuss the research in all its details.

Respect for the mind of the reader is the basis for choosing the rhetorical instrument. What the researcher sees as a beautiful sentence or a wonderful sentence makes him care about rhetoric and forget thought. Thought and rhetoric must be proportionate and the correct sentence and the correct term express the right thing. Since we mentioned the shortcomings of the research stages, it is necessary to mention the short steps of the rhetorical moves. There must be rigor in the use of correct words, rhetorical preservation of sentences, and coordination of the movement of intellectual particles within the published text, in order to finally

embrace the intellectual seeds similar to them in the mind of the reader. We should anticipate and eloquently address the reader's questions and concerns.

Conclusion

We conclude by saying that the militarization scheme of scientific research is based mainly on "the thought of knowledge". All moves are based on intelligence operations obtained from reliable sources: previous literature, studied and recorded experiences, open society intelligence, but most importantly an understanding of the marketplace of thought. Building the idea is an individual act as a result of dealing with field transactions and moving according to the requirements of the stage and the basic and secondary research requirements. It is worth noting that only the military practice can select a specific research plan, and the Operational Command Center for Research remains responsible for the emergence of the idea, its experimentation, its refinement, its marketing and its defense.