

# THE *SCIENCE* DELUSION



# The *Science* Delusion

Why God is real and  
Science is Religious Myth

Peter Wilberg

First Published by New Gnosis Publications  
www.newgnosis.co.uk

© 2008 Peter Wilberg  
All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations.

British Library Cataloguing - in - Publication Data

ISBN 978-1-904519-06-5

Cover images:  
Bishop George Berkeley, Einstein's blackboard, Edmund Husserl

**Science *is* the new religion.**

*Martin Heidegger*



# CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	10
Introduction.....	13
Myth 1: Science is ‘materialistic’. Religion is ‘idealistic’. .....	17
Myth 2: Science ‘explains’ things. religion accepts them on faith. ....	25
Myth 3: Science is mathematically precise. Religion is full of imprecise terms. ....	29
Myth 4: Science is not based on belief in supernatural beings or forces. Religion is. ....	33
Myth 5: Science is supported by hard facts. Religion is undone by hard facts. ....	37
Myth 6: Science is about reality ‘out there’. Religion is ‘all in the mind’. ....	41
Myth 7: Science rests on ‘empirical’ evidence. Religion rests on dogmatic belief. ....	45
Myth 8: Science can ultimately explain everything with its theories. Religion can explain nothing with its myths and dogmas. ....	53

Myth 9: Science asks questions. Religion does not question its dogmatic creeds. ....	57
Myth 10: Science has a logical foundation. Religion does not. ....	61
Myth 11: Science takes us beyond the superstitious beliefs and ritual practices of ‘pre-modern’ and ‘pre-scientific’ ages and cultures. Religion sticks to them. ....	67
Myth 12: Science can fully explain the origin of the universe on the foundation of physics. Religion needs metaphysical speculations and philosophies to support its beliefs. ....	71
Myth 13: Science is based on objective observations of nature. Religion projects subjective human feelings and phantasy onto nature. ....	75
Myth 14: Science shows that everything is ‘energy’. Religion believes that behind everything is ‘god’. ....	83
Myth 15: Science was a progressive revolution in our human understanding of nature. Religion is reactionary, because it resisted and still resists this ‘revolution’. ....	89
Myth 16: Science has overcome ‘The God Delusion’. Religion still holds to it. ....	95



Myth 17:	
Science does not believe in miracles. Religion does. ....	101
Myth 18:	
Science has proved its truth through modern technology and medicine. Religion has not. ....	107
Myth 19:	
Science can create instruments of war and genocide but does not cause them.	
Religion has caused and justified war and genocide. ....	113
Myth 20:	
Science frees us from superstitions.	
Religion binds us to them. ....	117
Myth 21:	
Science is rational. Religion is irrational. ....	121
Myth 22:	
Science does not persecute 'heretics'. Religion does. ....	125
Myth 23:	
Science frees thought.	
Religion restricts freedom of thought. ....	131
Myth 24:	
Science has to do with facts alone.	
Religion has to do with values. ....	135
Postscript.....	143
Note on the author .....	146
Bibliography.....	147

## PREFACE

The aim of this work is not to defend any specific religious doctrines or dogmas, but rather to offer a timely counterpart to the new wave of aggressive anti-religionism exemplified by Richard Dawkins' 'scientific' critique of *The God Delusion*.

It does so by critically examining the supposed rationality of 'science' itself, showing that it is as much based on unquestioned assumptions and dogmatic beliefs – accepted entirely on faith – as the most 'fundamentalist' of religions.

The words 'science', 'conscience' and 'consciousness' all stem from the Latin *scire* – 'to know' - a verb whose root meaning is 'to cut through'.

By 'cutting through' the countless common myths and delusions that make up our idea of 'science', as well as those that science itself fosters and is founded upon, I offer a 'heretical' challenge to the quasi-religious authority and almost totalitarian hegemony that the scientific world-view wields in today's globalised Western media and culture - a culture in which deference to 'The Science' has become as automatic as deference to 'The Church' used to be in medieval Europe.

In contrast to the sterile Eurocentric and Western debate between religionists and anti-religionists, religious ‘theists’ and secular or scientific ‘a-theists’, I argue also that *God’s* reality is not a question of the ‘existence’ or ‘non-existence’ of some sort of supreme being ‘with’ consciousness. Instead the essential reality of God *is* consciousness, a supreme or universal consciousness of the sort recognised in Indian philosophy - one that cannot be reduced to the property of any thing or being that comes to stand out or ‘ex-ist’ within it.

Whatever your standpoint on God however, *The Science Delusion* raises two important questions:

(1) why is it politically and culturally acceptable to question the rationality of religious belief in the existence of an invisible God, a belief shared by both Newton and Einstein, but politically and culturally ‘incorrect’ to question - as did both Newton and Einstein - scientific belief in an invisible force called Gravity?

(2) what are the new waves of religious fundamentalism a reaction *to*? Is it that religious fundamentalists are just mad or bad, or are they just unconsciously reacting to the rise of a new religion – ‘science’? For despite its global authority - and in the absence of anyone to play the role of ‘God’s Galileo’ - this is a religion whose own fundamentalist

dogmas remain invisible and wholly unchallenged in 'secular' educational institutions - leaving large numbers of people to blindly accept what I call the 'Science Delusion'.

## INTRODUCTION

For the time being we have to admit that we do not possess any general theoretical basis for physics which can be regarded as its logical foundation.

*Albert Einstein*

Imagine someone holding forth on biology whose only knowledge of the subject is 'The Book of British Birds', and you have a rough idea of what it is to read Richard Dawkins on theology.

*Terry Eagleton*

Is the study of philosophy and theology a waste of time? Hawking, a notorious atheist, looks at his screen, and grimaces ... 'Yes', he says, finally. 'Most of it is based on a complete disregard of observational evidence...'

... more than one scientist suggests that it is only when the LHC, the world's largest particle accelerator, is up and running that Hawking's most famous theories - particularly those that pertain to black holes - might be [observationally] proven. Does he think this is likely? '...I'm not holding my breath.'

*Interview with Stephen Hawking (Rachel Cooke, Guardian)*

A typical news article of the sort that can be found almost everyday in the press today begins by announcing that **“Researchers at the University of Oxford will spend 1.9 million pounds investigating why people believe in God. Academics have been given a grant to find out whether belief in a deity is a matter of nature or nurture.”** In other words, belief in a deity is no longer even considered to be a theological or philosophical question at all – that is to say, a question of *thought* - but is instead reduced to a matter for ‘scientific’ investigation to be determined by ‘research’ (and that within the parameters of a wholly unquestioned, unthinking and superficial dualism of ‘nature’ and ‘nurture’). More frightening than this is the fact that *not a single critical eyebrow is raised* at the new, wholly unquestioned faith in ‘science’ of the sort that this type of ‘news’ reveals. That is why, in the context of the controversy surrounding the role of religion in today’s world - and the ever more aggressive attacks on it exemplified by Dawkins’ book on *The God Delusion* – it is well worth remembering the words of the German philosopher Martin Heidegger, namely that “Science *is* the new religion.” He pointed out also that science is “...to a quite unimaginable degree, through and through dogmatic; dealing with un-thought-through conceptions and preconceptions.”

The identification of rational thinking with ‘scientific’ thinking opens us to the danger that Heidegger warned of. This was the danger of *thinking* as such *disappearing entirely* – to be replaced by a wholly unthinking science or a wholly *unthought* opposition of ‘science’ and ‘religion’. For the fact is that most people remain literally ‘blinded by science’, unable to see or to see through its quasi-religious nature and the unquestioned dogmatic foundations on which it is based. The reason why faith in this “new religion” of science should be so blind is that it is based on a completely mythical understanding of the true history and nature of modern science and of scientific ‘explanations’ of the universe – which actually have the character of *mythical* explanations themselves. *The Science Delusion* offers a brief description and critique of twenty-four commonly accepted myths concerning the nature of science - each of which points to a mythical dimension of scientific ‘explanation’ itself.

Though there is considerable overlap between these myths (both the myths surrounding science and the myths it fosters) what follows is (1) an attempt to raise the reader’s consciousness of these myths *as* myths, and (2) to subject them to *rational and ethical critique* in a way that philosophically undercuts and ‘cuts through’ them. To begin with I draw

upon and describe the early philosophical roots of modern science. This is significant in itself. For whilst scientists such as Stephen Hawking may dismiss philosophy and theology out of hand as outmoded pre- or pseudo-scientific approaches to knowledge, they forget that modern science had its roots in 'natural philosophy' - and that its earliest pioneers did not call themselves 'scientists' but 'natural philosophers'. It is high time then, to rescue Philosophy, the *mother* of Science, from the arrogance of its child. For even a cursory examination of the language used by leading physicists such as himself reveals the most imprecise use of language, the grossest of logical contradictions - and the crassest forms of *pseudo-philosophising*.



**MYTH 1:**

**SCIENCE IS 'MATERIALISTIC'.**

**RELIGION IS 'IDEALISTIC'.**



The terms ‘materialist’ and ‘idealistic’ are here used in a *philosophical* sense which will be explained and returned to in the course of this work. And though part of the ‘delusion’ of science is its belief that it has successfully replaced all previous *philosophies* (which indeed it has done as today’s dominant and *de facto* global world-view) it was an English *philosopher* - John Locke – who first set out the basis of what was to become known as ‘The Scientific Revolution’. What is extraordinary however, is that even today Locke is still seen as an ‘empirical’ philosopher - one who believes that knowledge should be grounded in verifiable experience. In actuality he laid the basis for what, in philosophical terms, is a wholly ‘idealistic’ concept of scientific ‘knowledge’. For Locke’s main claim to fame lay in affirming *Galileo’s* most basic claim - namely that what was ultimately ‘real’ was only the *measurable properties* of things. This implied that behind all the tangibly experienced *qualities* of natural phenomena lay nothing but abstract or ‘ideal’ *quantities*.

It took an Irish philosopher – Bishop George Berkeley – to undermine Locke’s untenable separation between the so-called ‘primary qualities’ of things (in reality nothing but measurable *quantities* such as density or weight) and the tangible *qualities* (such as hardness and heaviness) that they offer a measure of. And it took a German thinker - Edmund

Husserl - to offer a wholly different conception of science. What Husserl called 'phenomenological science' followed Berkeley in totally rejecting the whole notion of 'explaining' experienced phenomena as mere subjective 'effects' of abstract physico-mathematical *quantities*.

What is regarded as the scientific 'revolution' then, did indeed turn common sense notions of reality on their head. Far from being 'materialistic' the essence of this revolution lay in treating the 'immaterial' or 'ideal' mathematical abstractions, conceptions and formulae of science *as more real than the very phenomena they were supposed to explain*. Thus, as Husserl argued in his ground-breaking work on 'The Crisis in the European Sciences' the idea that natural science is 'materialist' or 'empirical' is a con. For in actuality it substitutes "...a world of idealities for the only real world, the one that is actually given through perception, that is ever experienced and experienceable – our everyday lifeworld". Husserl here follows in the footsteps of Bishop Berkeley, who first saw through the myth that science offers us a more 'solid' account than religion of our actual sensory experience of phenomena. Which is why Heidegger insisted that: "Phenomenology is more of a science than natural science is." Phenomenology is that science which explores our direct experience of phenomena.

Yet whilst we experience the sensory qualities of ‘natura’ or ‘material’ phenomena – qualities such as heaviness or lightness, hardness and softness, shape and texture, colour and sound - we never experience or perceive ‘matter’ *as such*. As Samuel Avery notes: “We experience visual and tactile perceptions that *suggest* a material substance existing independently, but its acceptance as ultimately real is *an act of faith*.” [my stress] The myth that science is ‘materialistic’ is thus also connected to the long-standing but now entirely redundant idea of ‘matter itself’ - the *myth of matter*. For whilst science still faithfully clings to the *idea* of matter, both relativity and quantum physics no longer see it as *possessing even those most basic and measurable ‘primary qualities’ that Galileo and Locke first associated with it* - admitting instead that on a quantum level, such ‘things’ as mass, momentum, energy, space and time cease to be separately quantifiable or even definable realities, and that even ‘particles’ such as electrons turn out to have the same non-localised *wave* character as light. In this sense, science has, in effect, become, like religion, an *immaterialistic* world-view. The scientific ‘accusation’ leveled against the ‘God-concept’ of religion – namely that God cannot be actually seen, has no sensory qualities or definable location apply equally to the Matter-concept of science.

Both the God-concept and the Matter-concept can be seen as substitutes or ‘placeholders’ for the recognition of a womb-like dimension of *potentiality* – one that is no less *real* than anything we actually experience. For not only do all actual experiences begin as potential experiences. They are all the *more* ‘actual’ to the extent that - like the actual experience of seeing a ball coming towards us, they are accompanied by an awareness of *potential* experiences in a different sensory dimension - such as moving to catch the ball and feeling it in our hands. In Samuel Avery’s words: “It is the potential for tactile sensation that makes a visual image ‘physical.’” And more generally “The concept of material substance ... is derived from *potential* perceptions in each sensory realm.” [my stress].

What we think of as ‘matter’ is real only in the root sense of the word - being the divine ‘mother’ [*mater*] of all things - a womb or matrix of potential patterns or *matrices* of sensory experiencing. This is not a new thought but one long recognised by philosophers and theologians alike. Aristotle defined what we call matter (Greek *hylē*) as potentiality and its form (*morphe*) as actuality. Similarly, St. Thomas Aquinas understand ‘primary matter’ (*Prima Materia*) as nothing actual or ‘substantial’ but as pure potentiality - a type of formless and ‘passive potentiality’ inseparable from

God as 'active potentiality'. 'Matter' can be seen as the very 'mind' of God - understood as a universal or divine *awareness* of every *potential experiential* pattern or 'idea-shape' of experienced phenomena. This being the case who should 'mind' and why should it 'matter' if we call this primordial awareness of potentiality 'Mind' or 'Matter', 'The Mind of God' or 'The Great Mother', 'The Matrix' or the 'Prima Materia'? If you don't mind, doesn't matter. Yet if 'It', this universal or divine 'mother', 'mind' or 'matrix' of all things, didn't quite literally 'matter' – materialising and actualising itself from a realm of pure potentiality - there would *be* no thing that we could either experience or conceive of scientifically *as* 'matter'.





**MYTH 2:**

**SCIENCE 'EXPLAINS' THINGS.**

**RELIGION ACCEPTS THEM ON FAITH.**



The truth is that even the most precise quantitative measurements, whether of things or of aspects of brain functioning, cannot – in principle - explain even the most elementary *qualities* of our actual *experience* of the world – qualities such as colour, density, texture, taste etc. Have you ever seen, felt or touched or in any way experienced a quantity such as ‘3’? By this I don’t mean a quantity *of* something – 3 oranges or stars, 3g of powder, 3ml of a liquid, three metres of carpet or road. I mean a pure, wholly abstract and immaterial quantity. In modern physics the only things that exist are such immaterial mathematical quantities, constants and relationships. For even such a thing as ‘mass’ is *no longer* understood as a quantity *of* something tangible – like some sort of dense corporeal matter we could touch and feel - but as a pure quantity. Instead ‘mass’ is a concept defined entirely by its mathematical relation to *other quantities* - such as velocity, momentum and acceleration – none of which themselves are ultimately quantities *of* anything whatsoever! Thus when laymen ask scientists such questions as what ‘mass’ or ‘gravity actually *is*, they are told this can only be ‘explained’ through a mathematics so complex and esoteric only the high priests of physics can understand it, one which should not be assumed to bear any relation at all

to our actual experience of the world or even to the common meaning of words such as 'mass', 'gravity' etc.

**MYTH 3:**

**SCIENCE IS MATHEMATICALLY PRECISE.**

**RELIGION IS FULL OF IMPRECISE TERMS.**



The much-vaunted *mathematical* precision of physics however, goes together with a *looseness of language and logic* of a sort that would make any true ‘rationalist’ gasp with shock – the verbal answers and ‘explanations’ offered by even the most famous of physicists being so full of logical gaps and contradictions (or based on so many totally circular arguments and circular definitions) that they would not pass logical muster even as high-school or undergraduate essays in that much maligned discipline called *philosophy* - a discipline of thought and precise use of language that physics and modern science as a whole just seeks to brush aside and marginalise, even though it was from *philosophies* of nature that the sciences first emerged. Yet even laymen scratch their heads in the face of the most obvious logical and philosophical inconsistencies of scientific explanations - for example the inconsistency of declaring that time itself ‘began’ with the so-called ‘Big Bang’. For it is self-evident that the very concept of a ‘beginning’ is itself a temporal concept and therefore one that already assumes the prior existence of time! If the very language of the scientific explanations is so loose and imprecise as to ignore *logic*, there is no way in which scientific claims – which are couched in words and not numbers - can be validated by even the most precise mathematics.

Science might mock religious ideas that we live in a universe created by an immaterial Spirit or spirits - but all it offers us in its place is the idea that we live in a universe of immaterial numbers! Its 'account' of the physical universe is just a set of mathematical numerical accounts in the *mind* of the scientist – quasi-mystical numbers that are then taken as supernatural realities - as semi-divine 'higher powers' behind nature itself. And whilst, on the one hand, scientists argue that these numbers are based on actual measurements of physical phenomena, on the other they admit that they cannot actually say *what* exactly the phenomena they are measuring (mass, gravity, energy etc) essentially *are* – except as purely mathematical constructs or constants represented by quasi-mystical Greek signs and letters of the alphabet.



**MYTH 4:**

**SCIENCE IS NOT BASED ON BELIEF IN  
SUPERNATURAL BEINGS OR FORCES.**

**RELIGION IS.**



Already in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Bishop George Berkeley showed how the principal founders of the modern scientific worldview sought - without any rational justification - to ‘explain’ our experience of natural phenomena and their qualities by postulating *supernatural* entities or forces supposedly ‘behind’ them – invisible entities such as ‘corpuscles’ or invisible forces such as ‘gravity’ - all of which are nothing but abstract *quantities*.

**“That a stone falls to the earth, or the sea swells towards the moon, may to some appear sufficiently explained thereby. But how are we enlightened by being told this is done by ‘attraction’?”**

*Bishop George Berkeley*

Density, weight and lightness are something we can not only measure but also directly experience – sense and feel. Thus we can feel our own weight and that of other objects, feel ourselves falling or see objects falling, but what we feel or see is not a ‘gravitational force’. Newton himself was one of the first ‘scientists’ (a term only coined in the 19<sup>th</sup> century) to recognise that terms such as ‘gravity’ posited the existence of wholly invisible and inexplicable ‘forces’ lying ‘behind’ nature, seeking then to use these *supernatural* forces to explain all *natural* experiences and phenomena – from feeling

the weight of an object or seeing an apple fall from a tree. Newton declared outright that though his own mathematical ‘model’ of gravity was provable through measurements, it did not in any way explain this seemingly supernatural force of gravity – *what* it was, *why* it existed in the first place or *how* objects could be attracted to another at a distance through it.

**“That gravity should be innate, inherent and essential to matter, so that one body may act upon another at-a-distance, through a vacuum, without the mediation of anything else by and through which their action may be conveyed from one to another, is to me so great an absurdity that I believe no man, who has in philosophical matters a competent faculty of thinking, can ever fall into it. So far I have explained the phenomena by the force of gravity, but I have not yet ascertained the cause of gravity itself ...”**

*Isaac Newton*

**MYTH 5:**

**SCIENCE IS SUPPORTED BY HARD FACTS.**

**RELIGION IS UNDONE BY HARD FACTS.**



Were billions to be spent constructing the most sophisticated and expensive technological instruments and installations to detect ghosts, most people would consider this a most ridiculous, if not outrageous waste of money. Yet right now there are technical installations all over the world, constructed or in construction designed to detect what are, in effect, no more than *mental constructs* invented by scientists to prevent physics from falling apart at the seams. Examples are the massive installations built at great cost - but with no success - to detect the 'gravitational waves' postulated by Einstein's theory of gravity or the 'gravitons' that are supposed to make up an otherwise invisible and undetectable source of gravity called 'dark matter'. But what if this 'dark matter' doesn't exist at all? What if it is a mental and mathematical construct needed to prevent the whole edifice of gravitational theory - and with it physics as a whole, from falling apart at the seams - in the face of facts? For the scientifically acknowledged *fact* is that without postulating this occult or *ghostly* form of matter there would be no explanation as to why the *whole* universe does not fall apart - why mega-velocity stars for example, don't just spin off into space and why every galaxy does not unravel like a spiral-coil firework not held together by string. Yet the claim that 'dark matter' is something that necessarily exists 'out

there' *to hold the physical universe together* is a perfect example of how scientists need to come up with ever more occult concepts to *hold their mental idea of the universe together* in the face of facts - to prevent not the universe *but their own theories* from falling apart at the seams and flying off into space!



**MYTH 6:**

**SCIENCE IS ABOUT REALITY 'OUT THERE'.**

**RELIGION IS 'ALL IN THE MIND'.**



The essential nature of true religious *experience* is one of something totally transcending the mind, incapable of reduction to any and all mental ideas we might have ‘about’ it. In contrast, scientific ideas about the universe are what can most truly be said to be ‘all in the mind’ of the scientist, even though they are projected outwards as if they were things in themselves. Indeed quantum physics itself effectively states that nothing observable actually exists before the act of observation on the part of an observing *mind*. Yet whereas ‘mind’ is associated with ideas in our own heads, the religious experience is one of a divine ‘mind’ that is not yours or mine and yet lies behind all things. Called *Noos* in Greek thought and *Chit* in Indian theology a better word for this divine ‘mind’ is *awareness*. Yet this is an awareness that is not bounded by our heads and bodies, not a product of our brains or boxed into something we call our ‘mind’ – for it is an awareness that transcends all ‘mental’ activity and ideas, even though it is the source from which all ideas arise. Scientists think that thoughts are generated by the brain in response to things or objects ‘out there’. Our everyday *experience* on the other hand, is not of our brain producing thoughts in response to things, but thoughts arising spontaneously in our minds - from an *awareness* of things within and around us. Religious experience can be

described as experience of an all-embracing, all-pervading and yet all-transcending *awareness* – one from which not only all *thoughts* but all things in the universe arise. Religious experiencing tells us that all beings and the entire universe dwell within that divine awareness which is God. Science dismissed God and religion as ‘all in the mind’ but effectively tells us that the entire universe is ‘all in the mind’ – the mind of the scientific observer. Science accuses religion of projecting human qualities onto God. Yet science itself projects the mental ideas and constructs of the scientists onto nature, never considering - let alone *experiencing* – the divine nature of that pure, thought- and mind-free *awareness* from which all thoughts, words and ideas in the ‘mind’ arise.

**MYTH 7:**

**SCIENCE RESTS ON 'EMPIRICAL' EVIDENCE.**

**RELIGION RESTS ON DOGMATIC BELIEF.**



We have already seen one major reason why science is not ‘empirical’, for it does not rest at all on the evidence of our actual sensory *experience* of the world but instead seeks to explain everything we naturally and sensuously experience as a product of supernatural energies, waves, fields or forces – all invisible and abstract quantities that we cannot experience directly. This brings us to the most fundamental reason why science is not based on hard facts - a very simple one. For the most fundamental ‘fact’ of all is not the ‘objective’ existence of a world ‘out there’ but ‘subjective’ experiencing of *such* a world. For how do we know that anything at all exists? How do we know we exist? How do we know the world exists? Because we *experience* things. Because we experience a self. Because we experience a world. But that means it is *experiencing* that is the most basic ‘fact’ of existence – not any ‘thing’ we experience as an objective ‘fact’. The most fundamental scientific ‘fact’, ‘truth’ or ‘reality’ is not *objective existence* but *subjective experiencing*. That does not mean that the world ‘out there’ exists only in our ‘minds’ or ‘brains’ - although *this is the conclusion* that both quantum physics and brain science lead us to. It is a false conclusion however, for though *what* we experience may be experienced as ‘in here’ (like an idea in our heads) or ‘out there’ (like an object in space) *experiencing as such* is not

something 'out there' or 'in here' – only *what* we experience and *how* we experience it.

Experiencing is 'no-thing', yet that does not mean it is nothing. It is, quite literally, everything. Which is why philosophers like Leibniz and Whitehead adopted the philosophy of 'panpsychism', recognising that every thing must itself be no mere object but an experiencing 'subject' or consciousness – one that merely appears to other subjects as an object. Reality then is not a physical-scientific relation between objects in an 'objective' universe 'out there', but is essentially an *inter-subjective* construction within a *subjective universe* of experiencing. Spelled out in another way then, this particular myth is a claim that whilst science can provide objectively and experimentally verifiable 'evidence' for its truth claims, religion - even if it does not rely on faith in dogma - can at best provide only unverifiable subjective *experiences* for its own truth claims (for example different types of mystical or emotional experience of God). This is the biggest of 'black holes' at the heart of that holiest of sacred scientific cows – the notion of 'objectively verifiable evidence'. For if we apply this notion to scientists themselves, then - like every other person in this world - they are in no position to provide 'objective evidence' for the experienced reality either of their own consciousness or



of their own thoughts. How then, can any experiment ultimately provide objectively verifiable evidence for any scientific ‘theory’ or ‘hypothesis’ if the experiential reality of the very *thoughts* that first constituted those theories or hypotheses (let alone the very consciousness or ‘mind’ in which they arose and were *subjectively* experienced) is itself unprovable?

Images from brain scans show nothing but images and readings of brain activity - they are not *proof* of the reality of consciousness or subjectively experienced thoughts, emotions, dreams that different types of brain activity are supposed to ‘correspond’ to. The fact that a scientist writes a scientific paper that is read and understood by other scientists is no more proof – in science’s own terms - of the *reality* of the thoughts expressed in that paper than is a declaration of love, or a cry of pain proof that there is such a thing as ‘pain’ or ‘love’. The truth that science dares not even consider is that *whatever* the ‘objective’ results of its experiments, spelled out in scientific papers, these remain just that - papers. The reality of the conscious mental activity and thoughts that generate their subject matter in the form of scientific hypotheses and theories, proven or unproven, remain, in the last analysis, objectively unproven and unverifiable. Instead of being ‘objectively’ verified they are

*inter-subjectively validated* – accepted in the consciousness, thoughts and minds of *other scientists* - who happen also to have the *unprovable* subjective experience of engaging in mental activity and coming up with ideas, theories and hypotheses.

With what double-standards then, does science set about seeking to study ‘dreams’ through ‘objective’ data obtained from brain-scientific research, knowing that no amount of such data will ever prove that any person ever subjectively experienced such a thing as a dream, a human emotion of any sort – or even a thought? The wholly unoriginal thought that has occurred to many – namely that science becomes totally unstuck in the realm of human subjective experience, being incapable *in principle* of proving the ‘objective’ existence (let alone ‘explaining’) such a thing as ‘love’ – only goes to show to what degree scientific thinking is *in denial*. That scientists cannot prove the ‘objective’ reality of even the most *basic elements* of their own human subjective experience (whether their own scientific thoughts, sense perceptions or emotional feelings) and that the most seemingly ‘objective’ of scientific experiments, instruments and readings themselves also belong to the realm of *subjective* experience - scientists do after all only know from their consciousness and subjective experience

that they are thinking up an idea, making an observation, handling an instrument or carrying out an experiment – all these constitute nightmare thoughts that threaten to undo the entire modern scientific world-view.

The alternative thought they threaten it *with* is that *reality as such* may, in the last analysis, be essentially *subjective* rather than objective in nature - and that ultimately it is inter-subjectively validated - even among scientists themselves. For otherwise they would be led - by their own criteria of objective verifiability - to demand *proof* of each other's *subjective experience* – indeed their very *existence* as conscious beings - before even sitting down to examine one another's models, theorems or experimental results. Together then with its confusion of *causes* of phenomena with their reasons and meaning, we must point out a yet deeper confusion in scientific thinking – the confusion of 'evidence' with 'experience'. Since its very inception, modern science has been based on distrust of *direct experience* - not least what is termed 'the evidence of the senses' – for sensory perception, like thinking and feeling is itself a mode of qualitative, subjective experiencing. Today, thankfully, many of the serious, lengthy and elaborate 'experiments' set up to provide evidence to 'prove' what every normal human being already knows from everyday (subjective) experience - has

become almost a standing joke. Yet the attempt of science to use such objective evidence not just to support but to *invalidate* the reality of human subjective experience - not least religious experience - continues. One may dispute an individual's *interpretation* of a powerful subjective experience, but the attempt by modern science to use 'objective' evidence to disprove the *reality* of any human being's subjective experience is *dehumanising* in principle.

**MYTH 8:**

**SCIENCE CAN ULTIMATELY EXPLAIN  
EVERYTHING WITH ITS THEORIES.**

**RELIGION CAN EXPLAIN NOTHING  
WITH ITS MYTHS AND DOGMAS.**



This is the faith to which all true believers in the religion of science are committed as their sacred creed, supremely arrogant though it is. Yet unknown to most followers of and believers in this creed, among the circles of the self-proclaimed *high-priests* of science – the quantum physicists – lurks a ‘secret’ esoteric doctrine running directly contrary to it. This ‘standard’ scientific doctrine effectively claims what Bishop Berkeley had already asserted in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, namely that things only *exist* in so far as they are being perceived (*esse est percipi*). Yet it goes even further than Berkeley, implying that there is nothing ‘out there’ *to be explained* in the first place. For what the quantum physicists assert is that, like time, space, and ‘energy’, ‘matter’ too (besides being itself mostly empty space) is ‘no-thing’ at all. It is nothing ‘hard’, or ‘corpuscular’, composed of unitary ‘particles’. Instead every particle of matter is just a ‘probability wave’ or ‘probability field’ - bounded neither by space or time. Science *explains nothing* we actually experience - except by reference to supernatural entities we do not experience, and all of which (unlike different concepts of God) are mere abstract mathematical quantities. Not only does science explain nothing, it ultimately claims that there is *nothing to explain* - that *nothing exists*. For nothing truly exists ‘as’ a thing. Hence the current, highly ‘spiritual’ love affair

between quantum physics and Buddhist philosophies of ultimate ‘Nothingness’! And since all supposedly ‘real’ or ‘material’ things are, in quantum physics, seen as mere perceptual illusions created by the actions of the observer on the observed, not even such ‘things’ as *bodies, brains* or *brain matter* exist to *create* this illusion of a world of material things – for *their* materiality or ‘thingness’ too, is ultimately just an illusion created by the observer’s ‘collapsing’ a so-called ‘probability wave’. The latter itself nothing tangible or perceptible but a mere mental and mathematical construct used to interpret instrumental readings and images - images that themselves are ultimately illusory in quantum-physical terms!



**MYTH 9:**

**SCIENCE ASKS QUESTIONS.**

**RELIGION DOES NOT QUESTION  
ITS DOGMATIC CREEDS.**



Firstly let us remind ourselves here of a bit of scientifically inconvenient *historical* and *linguistic* evidence. The most revered founding fathers of what we call ‘science’ - people like Newton and Galileo - did not call themselves ‘scientists’ (a word only coined in the 19<sup>th</sup> century) but philosophers - ‘natural philosophers’ or ‘philosophers of nature’. Secondly let us pay attention to a type of question that - like hard-line religionists - scientists *never* ask themselves. The literalist religionist believes in the *literal* word of the Bible or Koran, never questioning that it is *God’s* word and not considering for a minute that their holy texts are not just more or less adequate or misleading translations, but that language is both a *translation* of meaning into words and a *construction* of meaning through words. Deep theology, on the other hand, recognises many layers of symbolic or metaphorical meaning in religious texts – and recognises the need to place them in their historical, cultural and linguistic context. Like fundamentalist religion however, the religion that is science never questions its own language. Thus physicists speak of ‘waves’ and ‘fields’ of all sorts without ever stopping to consider even for a moment that their ‘waves’ or ‘fields’ are not ‘things in themselves’ but *words* - not ‘scientific facts’ but *metaphorical expressions*. Unlike deep-thinking philosophers and theologians, scientists never seem

to question their terms, assuming them to represent eternal, universal realities. Medical science and practice is one of the worst culprits in this respect, consistently using *military metaphors* to understand physiological functions, declaring that illness has no meaning but only ‘causes’, declaring ‘war’ on cancer and other diseases and speaking of the body’s immune ‘defences’ etc. Illnesses themselves are constantly constructed in medical and psychiatric discourse as if they were things in themselves, only to disappear – who now diagnoses or treats ‘neurasthenia’ or ‘hysteria’?

**MYTH 10:**

**SCIENCE HAS A LOGICAL FOUNDATION.**

**RELIGION DOES NOT.**



This particular myth is not just one I have rhetorically inserted in the light of the words of Einstein with which this article begins (“For the time being we have to admit that we do not possess any general theoretical basis for physics which can be regarded as its logical foundation.”). For the very words ‘logical’ and ‘logic’ – together with their reflection in the nomenclature of the sciences (bio-logy, geo-logy, cosmo-logy) is rooted linguistically in the Greek ‘logos’ – meaning ‘account’, ‘speech’ or ‘word’. Yet as we have seen, scientists rarely even consider, let alone seriously question, their own words and verbal formulations - with their loose, inconsistent or purely metaphorical use of language. Instead, like Biblical fundamentalists they take their own scientific terminologies for granted as *literal* expressions of truth. At the same time they have the arrogance to *privilege* the word of science (‘science-speak’ or ‘sciento-logy’) over the languages of the senses themselves, of religious myth, literature and poetry, music and the arts - denying *their* capacity to express fundamental realities or truth. If questioned along these lines they take recourse to reducing the meaning of ‘logos’ to a purely mathematical ‘account’ of the universe. Mathematical ‘logic’ is set above language and verbal logic as the highest, indeed ultimate parameter of truth – even though it is well-accepted that the foundation of mathematical logic itself lies

not in any sort of evidence or measurements but in what is called mathematical 'intuition'.

The paradox here is that what we take as the most elementary and intuitively self-evident mathematical intuitions for example ' $1+1 = 2$ ', falls way short of the *mathematical intuitions* of religious thought. Many religions, and not only Christianity are both 'unitarian' in the literal sense of seeing god as 'One' and also triadistic or 'trinitarian' – describing God or the Godhead as a 'three-in-one' entity or 'triune singularity'. The basic equations of these religions would be ' $1=3$ ' and ' $3=1$ '. A few moments reflection however, can show a far deeper *logical* sense to this mathematical equation than the everyday 'intuition' that ' $1+1 = 2$ '. For no 'one' thing - or even any number of things - can be even perceived or conceived except in a particular field or context of appearance, one which ultimately embraces the entire universe. Thus there may be one or more oranges in a bowl, people in a room, or galaxies in space, and yet the bowl, room, space as such (and ultimately the entire surrounding universe as their context of appearance) constitute an implicit Second or Other without which no oranges, people or galaxies could appear. The existence of any one thing then, automatically implies another - and therefore also implies a *relation* between this One



(symbolised by the numeral 1) and that Other, symbolised by the numeral 2. This very relation of the One and its implicit Other however, constitutes a third term in itself – like the Holy Ghost in the Christian Trinity. The One [1], its implied second or Other [2] and their mutual relation [3] may be distinct but they are also *inseparable* – and in this sense constitute a *higher unity* or Oneness [1]. So it is true:  $1=2$ ,  $2=3$  and ultimately  $3=1$  and  $1=3!$  Yet not just simple arithmetic equations like ‘ $1+1=2$ ’ but much so-called ‘higher mathematics’ is based on artificially ‘abstracting’ objects from their surrounding context or field of appearance, and then *counting* them as separate entities in a way which takes no account *of* that context - rather than truly *accounting* for how they emerge from and within it.



**MYTH 11:**

**SCIENCE TAKES US BEYOND THE  
SUPERSTITIOUS BELIEFS AND RITUAL  
PRACTICES OF 'PRE-MODERN' AND 'PRE-  
SCIENTIFIC' AGES AND CULTURES.**

**RELIGION STICKS TO THEM.**



Nowadays it has become fashionable to make fun of ‘post-modernism’. Yet few are aware of its legacy – a heightened awareness of the way in which words themselves not only shape our understanding of the very ‘things’ we take them as merely naming or denoting but lead us into the delusion that those ‘things’ exist independently of language itself. For no sooner has a new word been coined or become common currency – the word ‘stress’ for example – than we take it as referring to some ‘thing’ that has always existed in the way we understand and experience it. Few religionists or anti-religionists have yet realized that even the word ‘religion’ is a word of relatively recent coinage – yet having become common currency we casually regard all faiths in all cultures and ages as varieties of this eternal ‘thing’ we call ‘religion’ – even if the very languages of these cultures and faiths have themselves *no word* corresponding to the relatively new word ‘religion’ (as is the case with all the non-Abrahamic faiths, including Taoism, Hinduism and Buddhism). The same applies to the word ‘science’. It is somewhat tautological to dismiss the arcane beliefs, symbols and rituals of pre-modern cultures as ‘unscientific’ or ‘prescientific’ when the very notion of ‘science’ and ‘scientific’ truth is a *construct* of our own modern culture, and given that the *cultural reality* of ‘science’ also consists of a set

of highly questionable – if not entirely *delusory* – beliefs, symbols and ritual practices. If the term ‘delusion’ in this article appears too strong for the ‘scientific’ reader here, let me again allow Einstein the word, in this case in relation to quantum physics. This he compared to “... the system of delusions of an exceedingly intelligent paranoic, concocted of incoherent elements of thought.”

**MYTH 12:**

**SCIENCE CAN FULLY EXPLAIN THE ORIGIN OF  
THE UNIVERSE ON THE FOUNDATION OF  
PHYSICS.**

**RELIGION NEEDS METAPHYSICAL  
SPECULATIONS AND PHILOSOPHIES TO  
SUPPORT ITS BELIEFS.**





The distinction between physics and metaphysics goes back to Aristotle and received new cogency through the insight of Martin Heidegger into modern science. What he reminded us of, quite simply, is that “Physics as physics can make no assertions about physics.” Only a physics beyond physics or ‘meta-physics’ can. Why? Because physics conducts experiments which - whatever their results – are set up in a way that is already determined by the established framework of physics. As Heidegger pointed out however, that framework - physics as such – is not itself the object of any possible physical experiment, nor can it be confirmed by any such physical experiment. The ultimate physical explanation of the origin of the universe is of course the famous ‘Big Bang’ – which took place who knows where, and ‘before’ which there was no space or time in which it could occur! And yet the claim is made that the Big Bang can be dated! It seems that the most obvious *meta-physical* questions raised by this theory do not so much as occur to physicists *as* questions. Examples: how can we ‘date’ the beginning of ‘time’ if ‘dates’ and ‘beginnings’ are themselves temporal concepts? If space too, ‘began’ with the Big Bang *where* exactly could it be said to have occurred? If the universe, time and space began with a Big Bang, are we not implying that there could be something ‘before’ time or

‘outside’ space? Such simple questions subvert the assumption that Big Bang theory is a verifiable physical hypothesis confirmed by physical evidence. Instead it is quite evidently a theory loaded with the most obvious of meta-physical questions - and is *effectively* a highly meta-physical theory in itself. Pity then, that the only *metaphor* that physics could find to name it is so pathetically banal!

**MYTH 13:**

**SCIENCE IS BASED ON OBJECTIVE  
OBSERVATIONS OF NATURE.**

**RELIGION PROJECTS SUBJECTIVE HUMAN  
FEELINGS AND PHANTASY ONTO NATURE.**



This brings us to the central myth of science itself – the myth of ‘objectivity’. Modern science began by first assuming the existence of a world of independent external objects in space-time and then sought to explain the behaviour and relation of these objects. It saw these objects as external to and separate from the observer, even though neuroscience now tells us that the very objects we *think* that we perceive ‘out there’ in an ‘external’ world are but figments of the brain – which makes it difficult to ‘explain’ how the brain receives sense data from them in the first place! Then again, the whole notion of external objects perceived by the brain or ‘mind’ through our body’s ‘senses’ made no sense to begin with. It ignores the obvious truth that all experiencing, whether of ideas or objects, thoughts or things, is by nature subjective. Space itself, as Kant recognized, is not a basic dimension of objective reality ‘out there’. It is a basic dimension of *subjective* experience, the subjective *experience* of things as separate from one another and from our own bodies. Paradoxically however, despite having begun by seeking to explain objects and our perception of them, ‘objective’ science has, through quantum mechanics, removed the ground from under its own feet by ceasing to believe in the existence of ‘objects’ independent of a ‘subject’ - a human observer. Whereas the

Abrahamic religions raised God to the status of a supreme being or 'subject', both creating and ruling over man and creation, science has now raised man - as supreme subject or 'observer' - to the status of a supreme being or God. This is not a 'demythologization' of religion, but a new form of religious mythologisation - not of God but of man, and above all 'man' understood as 'scientist' - as an observing ego or subject standing over and *apart from* the universe rather than being *a part of* that universe. Again, Einstein was onto this *delusion*, which he correctly pictured as a type of imprisoning optical *illusion*:

**“A human being is part of the whole called by us universe, a part limited in time and space. We experience ourselves, our thoughts and feelings as something separate from the rest. A kind of optical delusion of consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from the prison ...”**

The idea of a wholly *subjective* universe seems to be belied by our everyday experience of 'objects' such as tables and chairs, cups and kettles, computers and TVs, houses and trees. Yet if we think about it there is no such 'thing' as 'a chair' for example. Or rather, the telling word is the word 'as'. For when we think we are perceiving 'a chair' what we

are actually doing is something quite different. We are perceiving some thing or ‘phenomenon’ – in essence a pattern of sensory qualities such as colour, shape, texture etc – *as* a chair.

What we think of as our most basic and reliable sense perceptions of ‘objects’ are in essence human *sense-conceptions* – for example our perception of something *as* ‘a chair’. That is why an insect, however sharp its *sense perceptions*, would not and could not ever perceive ‘a chair’ - for it lacks the *idea* or *concept* of chair-ness. Animals do not perceive any of those things we take for granted as ‘objects’ existing ‘out there’ - things such as ‘chairs’. Their worlds are not made up of ‘objects’ at all, but of subjectively experienced patterns of sensations of different sorts – such as colour, shape, smell, temperature or tactile feel.

That is why no amount of physical or chemical analysis of the thing we think of as ‘a chair’ will reveal anything to do with its ‘chair-ness’, since ‘chair-ness’ as such is not a perception but an idea or *conception* of something we perceive – even if that conception went into the very making of the chair. Our human conceptions of things as ‘objects’ have solely to do with our human world, with our human words for things, our specifically human relation to them and the specific human purposes for which we make or make use of

them. It is we who, using it to feed a cat, both name and perceive something *as* ‘a cat bowl’. A cat itself perceives no such a thing as ‘a cat bowl’. Similarly, what makes the kettle in the kitchen ‘a kettle’ is no mere objective sense perception but our sense conception of it *as* a kettle. This sense conception of ‘a kettle’ has do with our human relation to it - in particular its sensed *potential* for being picked up, filled with water, turned on, and used to make a cup of tea or coffee.

This understanding of sense conceptions does not only apply to man-made ‘objects’. For what in earlier ages human beings themselves perceived *as gods* – the Sun, Moon and Earth for example – are now merely perceived as ‘bodies in space’. That is because they are scientifically *conceived* as such, and because it is scientific *sense-conceptions* that rule the day – that pattern our very perception of nature and the cosmos.

The difference between the world-views and modes of perception belonging to religion and science is essentially a fundamental difference between their respective sense-conceptions. This is a difference that cannot be resolved by appealing to the ‘evidence of the senses’ or our everyday perceptions of ‘objects’ – for these themselves are shaped by our sense-conceptions. Nor can the difference be resolved in favour of the scientific world view by appeal to the concept



of ‘matter’ or to the ‘material’ analysis of things. For ‘matter’ is itself a *conception* – one that expresses nothing *actual* or sense-perceptible, but rather the universal *potential* of things for being sensed, perceived, analysed, used and *conceived* in countless *different* ways.



**MYTH 14:**

**SCIENCE SHOWS THAT EVERYTHING IS  
'ENERGY'.**

**RELIGION BELIEVES THAT BEHIND  
EVERYTHING IS 'GOD'.**



Christianity has its dogmatic trinity of ‘Father, Son and Holy Spirit’ – all very human metaphors, including ‘spirit’ which derives from the Latin *spirare* – to breathe (as in ‘respiration’). Science has its own dogmatic quarterternity – ‘Matter, Energy, Space and Time’. The idea of ‘brute’ corporeal ‘matter’ was dispensed with long ago by a Christian - Bishop Berkeley, just as secular physics has now suspended it in favour of the paradoxical concept of matter as condensed ‘energy’, condensed ‘space’ or ‘probability waves’. Today the great new dogma, shared by both science and new age pseudo-science is not the materialist dogma that ‘everything is matter’ but the ‘energeticist’ dogma that ‘everything is energy’. How did this theological revolution in the religion of modern science and in pseudo-scientific ‘New Age’ religions come about? Through scientific experiment or personal experience? No. For no one has or *can* ever ‘experience’ what is called ‘energy’ in the modern scientific sense - which is a mere abstract linguistic and mathematical *construct*. ‘Energy’ is one of the most central modern scientific terms that has become so common that, despite being ‘no thing’ at all, is still assumed by all to refer to an eternal reality or ‘thing in itself’. Thus science speaks of ‘electromagnetic’ energy, theology of ‘divine’ energy, and New Age pseudo-

science of subtle spiritual ‘energies’ of all sorts and an ‘energy body’.

Yet just as few religionists ask themselves what they mean by ‘God’, so also do few scientists ever ask themselves what ‘energy’ *as such* essentially *is*? In its root Greek meaning the word refers to no ‘thing’ but simply to formative and transformative *activity* – its simple meaning is *action*. Yet the tendency to think of ‘energy’ as some objective ‘thing’ and to turn that ‘thing’ into the essence of all things persists. Just as God continues to be seen as some supreme being or ‘transcendental subject’, so is Energy now seen as some supreme transcendental thing or *object* - one which, like God, is thought of as *lying behind all things* and as being their *ultimate essence and source*.

The revolution that overturned materialist science and has reached its apotheosis in the religion of ‘Energy’ had its roots in a circle of eminent scientists such as Helmholtz who sought to elevate and bring to dominance the concept of ‘energy’ and the so-called ‘laws of thermodynamics’ associated with it.

In his essay on ‘Power vs. Energy - The Difference Between Dynamis and Energeia’, Johnathon Tennenbaum shows clearly the geo-political use that the ‘Energy’ concept was promoted to serve:

“... the ‘Energeticist Movement’ associated with Wilhelm Ostwald around the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century advocated a World Government based on the use of ‘energy’ as the universal, unifying concept not only for all of physical science, but also for economics, psychology, sociology and the arts ... Not accidentally, the Kelvin-Helmholtz doctrine of ‘energy’ became a key feature of Anglo-American geopolitics, from the British launching of Middle East ‘oil politics’ at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century ... to a new Middle East war.”





**MYTH 15:**

**SCIENCE WAS A PROGRESSIVE REVOLUTION  
IN OUR HUMAN UNDERSTANDING OF  
NATURE.**

**RELIGION IS REACTIONARY, BECAUSE IT  
RESISTED AND STILL RESISTS THIS  
'REVOLUTION'.**



To dispel this myth we need to recapitulate the history and explore the nature of this supposedly ‘progressive’ scientific ‘revolution’. The Greek philosopher Democritus was the first to give us an indication of what sort of ‘revolution’ this was and what its consequences might be.

**“According to common speech, there are colours, sweets, bitters; in reality however only atoms and emptiness. The senses speak to the understanding: ‘Poor understanding, from us you took the pieces of evidence and with them you want to throw us down? This down throwing will be your fall.’”**

*Fragment #125; Diels, 1992, p. 168; Dahlin’s translation*

As Dahlin comments:

**“... Democritus was anticipating one of the fundamental difficulties involved in teaching natural science to children and young people today. This difficulty has to do with the “idealising” tendency of modern science, i.e. its reduction of our experience of the world to abstract representations and mathematical formulas in which the concreteness and contingencies of everyday life are annihilated, as it were – or at least set aside as belonging to the “not real”. This has lately come to be regarded as a major stumbling block for students’ learning in science.”**

In the fragment cited, the position still mythically attributed to Democritus himself — that everything is

composed of atoms in a void — is treated skeptically by Democritus himself. For he clearly points instead to the paradox – and danger - of using an *abstract idea* of what lies ‘behind’ sensory experiencing to deny the *primary reality* of experience. In this way he foresaw what was to become known as ‘the scientific revolution’ – literally a delusory ‘re-  
volving’ or total turning round of reality. This revolution or turnaround, as we have seen, first found clear and explicit expression in John Locke’s philosophy of “primary” and “secondary” qualities.

In this philosophy all actually experienced sensory qualities such as colour, taste and texture are relegated to the status of “secondary” qualities and regarded as the (inexplicable) ‘effects’ of so-called “primary qualities”. Yet in essence the latter were not *qualities* at all, but rather anything that could be reduced to a measurable *quantity*. This position of John Locke’s was the one that Bishop Berkeley attacked most fiercely in defense of religion. He argued that since there was no way that we ever could *experience* Locke’s measurable ‘primary qualities’ independently of the so-called ‘secondary’ ones, human experience was necessarily and self-evidently the *expression* of God - of a transcendental subject rather than a transcendental object or intangible ‘thing in itself’. If Locke’s position was that reality is only what is

measurable, Berkeley's was that what was real was God - and God alone.

**“... nothing can be more evident to anyone that is capable of the least reflection, than the existence of God, or a spirit who is intimately present to our minds, producing in them all that variety of ideas or sensations, which continually affect us, on whom we have an absolute and entire dependence, in short, in whom we live, and move, and have our being.”**

**“That the discovery of this great truth which lies so near and obvious to the mind, should be attained to by the reason of so very few, is a sad instance of the stupidity and inattention of men, who, though they are surrounded with such clear manifestations of the Deity, are yet so little affected by them, that they seem as it were blinded with excess of light.”**

*Bishop George Berkeley*



**MYTH 16:**

**SCIENCE HAS OVERCOME  
'THE GOD DELUSION'.**

**RELIGION STILL HOLDS TO IT.**





To question whether or not ‘God’ exists, and thus whether the idea of God is or is not a *delusion* begs a much deeper question - the question of how we understand what ‘God’ or ‘Divinity’ *is*? Both religious *theists* and scientific *atheists* share a common idea of God as a *supreme being* - separate and apart from other beings and from the world. This theistic idea of God makes no sense, not only in scientific but in religious terms – for it reduces God to *one being among others*, and hence to a finite limited being. The idea of God as a *beginningless* being does not answer but *begs* the question of the origin of that Being - just as the scientific concept of time itself ‘beginning’ with a ‘Big Bang’ at a datable point *in* time does not answer but begs the question of what came before it.

Yet theism is only one among many different understandings of the nature of divinity. What if God is not a supreme or ultimate being but a supreme or ultimate consciousness? This brings us to what I see as the most important *delusion* shared by *both* science and religion. This is the delusion that consciousness or ‘subjectivity’ is the *private property* of a being or ‘subject’ – human or divine – or else that it is the mere *by-product* of some ‘thing’, whether matter or energy, bodies or brains. Along with this goes the false idea that ‘consciousness’ is identical with the elements that

make up our conscious *experiencing* - or that of any being. What if it is not? What if consciousness *as such* is more like an infinite space or 'field' of pure awareness *within* which all experiencing and all experienced worlds arise? What if all beings – indeed all things - are but bounded and individualised portions of this pure, unbounded and universal awareness? This being the case, we might begin to see the *reality* of God in a quite different way - overcoming the delusory notion of God as some sort of supreme being 'with' awareness, and affirming instead that God, quite simply is awareness – not an awareness that is yours or mine, but one that is the very essence of the Divine. Behind both atheistic science and theistic religion is the failure to recognise that there can be nothing 'outside' awareness as such - beyond which there is nothing higher or more primordial.

Understanding God not as a supreme being but rather as a supreme *awareness* however, we can begin to acknowledge that we dwell within that awareness - within God – in the same way that we dwell within space, or that fish dwell within an ocean. An ocean is the *source* of all the fish and other life-forms that dwell within it, each of which is a unique portion and a unique expression of its source – the ocean as a whole. On this analogy however, religious

theists are like fish that make the mistake of seeing the ocean as a whole in a purely *fishy* way - as one huge 'God-fish'. The religion of this theistic *fish* would then no doubt compete with that of other oceanic life-forms, who might see the ocean not as a supreme God-fish but rather as a supreme 'God-crab', 'God-octopus', 'God-whale', 'God-coral'. Getting fed up with such religious disputes, our dwellers in the ocean might decide that the ocean God was none of these things, but a purely indeterminate being or God that could not be represented as fish or whale, octopus or coral. They might become 'abstract' monotheists. Alternatively they might become 'polytheists', recognising God in the multiple forms of fish *and* whale, octopus *and* coral. As for *so-called* 'a-theists', they would simply substitute the (poly)theistic idea of God as a Supreme Being in the form of a fish or whale, octopus or coral, with the no less religious idea of a Supreme Force, Supreme Energy, or, like Buddhism - a Supreme Void.

The current confusion that reigns in both science and religion is a confusion between *monotheism* and *monism*. The Abrahamic faiths are religious *monotheisms*. The chief religion of science is a quasi-religious monotheism of *man* rather than God, together with a *monism* that declares that 'Energy is Everything' and 'Everything is Energy'. Neither religious monotheism nor scientific monism have yet arrived at a

fundamentally new way of thinking the nature of God and the Universe, one based on the principal that *Awareness is Everything* and that *Everything is an Awareness* – that all that can be experienced is an aware expression and portion of that ultimate, universal and unbounded Awareness that is the highest reality of all, that *is* ‘God’.

I call this new monistic principle ‘The Awareness Principle’ – in contrast to ‘The Being Principle’, ‘The Matter Principle’ and ‘The Energy Principle’. The Awareness Principle alone overcomes both the monotheistic ‘God Delusion’ (the delusion of a Supreme Being), and the monistic ‘Science Delusion’. The fact that this Awareness Principle has yet to be acknowledged as *the* new foundational principle for science *and* religion rests on the most *fundamental delusion of all*. This is the delusion that ‘subjectivity’, ‘awareness’, ‘sentience’, ‘consciousness’ or ‘experiencing’ requires the *pre-existence* of an aware, sentient, conscious or experiencing ‘being’, ‘subject’ or ‘self’ – or can arise from a purely ‘objective’ and insentient universe of unaware things.

**MYTH 17:**

**SCIENCE DOES NOT BELIEVE IN MIRACLES.**

**RELIGION DOES.**



What greater myth unites science with theistic religions than the belief in the miracle of creation *ex nihilo* – out of nothing? The difference is only that whereas monotheistic religions see a single God as having created the world out of nothing at a datable time, science replaces this singular and divine *being* not with a singular and divine *awareness* but with what is termed a ‘singularity’ – in particular that singular point, from which - through the ‘Big Bang’ - everything (including time) is supposed to have miraculously and inexplicably emerged out of nothing, also at a traceable and datable point ‘in’ time!

As theoretical physicist Paul Davies admits:

**Whatever the success of the big bang theory in explaining the key observed features of the universe, it is clearly incomplete. People always want to know what came before the big bang. Why did it happen at all? Here physical theory merges with philosophy and even theology ... Everyone agrees, however, that many of the deepest questions about our cosmic origins cannot be answered within the framework of existing physical theory. Hopes are pinned on a final unified theory that will merge all of physics into a single superlaw. Only then might we be able to answer the most fundamental question of all: why there is something rather than nothing.”**

The idea that a unified physical-scientific theory can address the fundamental philosophical question of why there

is something rather than nothing is a contradiction in term, since all scientific theories proudly assume to have their basis in the verifiable and measurable reality of some actual 'thing'. In answer to the unanswerable question of how the universe and time itself can be said to have begun at some datable time he refers to an alternative scientific model of an eternal 'multiverse'.

**“In the 1960s, the ultimate origin of the universe was regarded as lying beyond the scope of science altogether, but today there are many attempts to explain it using physical theory, most often by appealing to quantum processes. If the big bang was indeed a natural event, then presumably nothing could prevent it from happening more than once. This suggests there may be many big bangs scattered throughout space and time, each producing an expanding universe of some sort. Possibly the entire assemblage of universes - often dubbed "the multiverse" - is eternal, even though each individual universe undergoes a life cycle of birth, evolution and perhaps death. In a popular version of the multiverse theory, called eternal inflation, universes 'nucleate' like bubbles in a liquid, and although each bubble universe may expand explosively fast, different bubbles are conveyed apart by unending inflation in the overall matrix of space faster than the bubbles themselves expand. As a result, the different universes rarely collide.”**

What exactly the *medium* is in which multiple universes 'nucleate' like bubbles in a liquid is left unclear. All we are offered is the philosophically loose and contradictory notion



of big bangs “scattered throughout space and time” or “conveyed apart within the overall matrix of space” – when big bang theory itself tells us that not only time but *space* itself began with a ‘bang’ - space and time being inseparable aspects of 4-dimensional space-time.

There *is* a possible answer to the question of the medium in which multiple universes could nucleate. This is a wholly non-extensional or ‘intensional’ realm of *pure potentiality* – trans-spatial and trans-temporal - one brought to actualisation with ultimate trans-physical or divine *awareness* in the same way that an artist’s very awareness of creative potentials allows them to differentiate and ultimately find actual expression. This however, is an answer that would not even be considered by physicists since it questions the scientific identification of reality as such with ‘actuality’ rather than potentiality, and its insistence on the fundamentally objective rather than *subjective* nature of the universe – or any multiverse.



**MYTH 18:**

**SCIENCE HAS PROVED ITS TRUTH THROUGH  
MODERN TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE.**

**RELIGION HAS NOT.**



Who is to say that the ‘technologies’ of earlier civilizations were more ‘primitive’ than our own, for even today science remains wholly incapable of understanding and accounting for many of their technological accomplishments - most of which were the product of ‘sacred sciences’ bearing little relation to the jargons of modern science and technology? There have, for millennia, been other forms of ‘knowledge’ that long pre-dated our modern concept of ‘scientific’ knowledge and yet in many ways surpassed it - *even technologically*. To compare modern technology with ancient technologies and assume the former to be more advanced is, as Heidegger suggested, like regarding Shakespeare as more ‘advanced’ than Aeschylus. Nor should we fall into the casual assumption that modern technology is merely the ‘application’ of modern science.

**“It is said that modern technology is something incomparably different from all earlier technologies because it is based on modern physics as an exact science. Meanwhile we have come to understand more clearly that the reverse holds true as well: modern physics, as experimental, is dependent on technical apparatus.”**

Indeed, we can, along with Heidegger, go further and argue that the technical instrumentation of modern scientific research restricts its thinking to the terms and parameters of

instrumental measurement determined by such instrumentation. Then again, most of the major technological advances of the modern era have arisen from *subjective awareness* rather than *objective research* - from *subjective* thought experiments, intuitions, insights and even dreams of pioneering 'scientists' such as Einstein and Tesla. We would not have an oil industry for example – and all its products from plastics to petroleum, without Kekule's *dream* of the molecular structure of *benzene*. We can go even further and argue that behind the whole 'argument from technology' lies a fundamental question that scientists constantly fail to ask themselves, the question of where their own terms, thoughts, theories, hypotheses and mathematical intuitions *come from*.

The simplistic assumption that these are mere mental mirror image representations of objective 'facts' or 'data' is a blatant denial of the everyday experience they share with all human beings - namely, that thoughts themselves emerge from subjective awareness. Subjective awareness embraces our experience of both our inner and outer world, both internal and external phenomena, but this in no way means that our inner experience is mechanically 'caused' or 'produced' by outer phenomena.

Finally, in what way can it be argued that modern technology ‘works’ better or more efficiently than technologies of the past when we consider the *price* we are now paying for that ‘progress’ and ‘efficiency’ - in the form of ecological devastation and the degradation of nature? Can a technology which ends up *destroying* precisely those natural elements and phenomena which are the very ‘objects’ of the science on which it is based be said to be more ‘advanced’, or to express a more ‘advanced’ understanding *of* nature?

As regards medical science and technology, if this ‘works’ so effectively, why is it that the statistics published in the Journal of the American Medical Association in the United States show that ‘scientific’ treatments, surgery and drugs are the third major cause of death after heart-disease and cancer? Why is it that sufferers of cancer are more and not less likely to die as a result of medical treatment, and why is it that most major improvements in both social and individual health have come about through improved sanitation, living conditions and general quality of life - and not from the latest medical treatments or technologies? The established scientific or ‘medical model’ of health – which regards illness as having no *meaning*, has been effectively challenged by many therapists who have rejected this model in their practice – to the great benefit of their patients. At the same time the orthodox medical model of disease has been effectively *deconstructed* by many thinkers such as Ivan

Illich - showing how it encourages sufferers to *objectify* their body and any subjectively felt *dis-ease*, bodily or mental.

Meanwhile biological psychiatry has become an ever-more obvious 'medical model' of the way in which 'scientific' research and new diagnostic labels are used to 'scientifically' *construct* one new 'disorder' after another – turning 'science' into a mere ideological arm of the pharmaceutical industry. Genetic 'science' is playing an increasing role in modern medicine. Yet as Heidegger pointed out, the genetic 'explanation' of illness:

**“... suffers from a deficit which is all too easily and therefore all too often overlooked. To be in a position to explain an illness genetically, we need first of all to explain what the illness in itself *is*. It may be that a true understanding of the essence of an illness...prohibits all causal-genetic explanation ... Those who wish to stick rigidly to genetic explanation, without first of all clarifying the essence of that which they wish to explain, can be compared to people who wish to reach a goal, without first of all bringing this goal in view. *All explanation reaches only so far as the explication of that which is to be explained.*”**



**MYTH 19:**

**SCIENCE CAN CREATE INSTRUMENTS OF WAR  
AND GENOCIDE BUT DOES NOT CAUSE THEM.**

**RELIGION HAS CAUSED AND JUSTIFIED  
WAR AND GENOCIDE.**



Whilst it is true that the Old Testament seems to sanction war - indeed divine genocide - we need only look back to the Second World War and the Holocaust to dispel the myth that *science* is *not* itself a cause of war or genocide. Hitler's entire military and genocidal project was not rooted in some sort of quasi-religious pagan fanaticism, but in his acceptance of *scientific authority* - in particular a *medical model* of society which saw the Jews as a life-threatening 'cancer' in the communal 'body' or 'Volk' and saw other races and groups (whether Gypsies and Slavs, the mentally ill or the physically handicapped) as genetically inferior and detrimental to the communal body. It is well-known that it was German atomic physicists and rocket scientists who helped create terrible new weapons of war and genocide. It is not so well-known that it was German 'scientific' physicians and psychiatrists who first *suggested* gas chambers as the 'Final' most scientifically rational 'Solution' to all social ills. Similarly, it was German geneticists who pioneered today's 'genetic medicine', an approach to the human body which - like the gas chambers, reduces it to a mere *impersonal object*, a body inherently flawed (as if by 'original sin') by its genes - which therefore stand in need of bio-technological 'elimination' or 'correction'. If DNA is the body's biological 'language' and genes its biological

‘alphabet’, then seeking to ‘scientifically’ eliminate social ills such as violence through removing or altering individual genes is no more rational a ‘solution’ than seeking to abolish the use of violent or abusive words by eliminating the *letters of the alphabet they contain*. The result can only be an impoverishment of our genetic language and potentials, not to mention a wholly new means of scientific *genocide* – one that consists in seeking to eliminate all *natural* genetic variation in human beings, and replace it with arbitrary scientific, social and cultural criteria by which to ‘improve’ on nature.

**MYTH 20:**

**SCIENCE FREES US FROM SUPERSTITIONS.**

**RELIGION BINDS US TO THEM.**



Look around! We live in a culture veritably plagued by scientific superstitions of all sorts, which generate superstitious fears and phobias of all sorts. Since illness has been reduced by genetics to a mere statistical probability we had all better check our genes – touch wood! And since all manner of things – not least foods - have been counted, depending on the ‘scientific’ source, as either increasing or decreasing our chances of getting cancer and other diseases, we had all better watch what we eat - touch wood! At least religion sees *meaning* in illness, rather than reducing it to marginal mathematical probabilities wholly independent of the actual life of the individual. It is true that science does not see illness as punishment for ‘evil’ or ‘sin’. On the other hand, it has led us to see it *as a sin* not to respect scientific superstitions which reduce ‘the good’ to ‘good’ or ‘healthy’ foods and lifestyles, and the avoidance of ‘bad’ or ‘unhealthy’ ones. Not since Hitler’s era, when the first smoking bans were introduced, has *health* become such a religious *icon* of the ‘good’. No ethical or scientific incongruence is seen in the fact that – *in medical-scientific terms* - many Nazi war criminals were totally ‘healthy’.





**MYTH 21:**

**SCIENCE IS RATIONAL.**

**RELIGION IS IRRATIONAL.**



‘Scientific’ psychiatry, whilst recognising, for example, that the term ‘depression’ is a mere word - a diagnostic label for a set of *symptoms* - at the same time treats it as if it were some ‘thing in itself’ - a disease entity or ‘disorder’ called ‘depression’ that is the *cause* of those symptoms. Whilst people might have all sort of *reasons*, good or bad, for feeling or acting the way they do - for example feeling unhappy, stressed, anxious, ill or ‘depressed’ and acting out their feelings through different types of behaviour - medical ‘science’ seeks to reduce their *reasons* for feeling and acting the way they do to *causes*.

Thus instead of seeking *reasons* why people might feel depressed, it treats ‘depression’ as some thing in itself, and then in turn seeks the ‘cause’ of this ‘thing’ in some other thing - such as an unproven imbalance in their brain chemistry. *Reasons* for thinking, feeling or acting in a certain way can be freely *questioned* by rational reflection - by *reasoning*. Reasons and reasoning are thus the basis of both freedom of thought and freedom of action – free will. The search for ‘causes’ on the other hand, implies a type of physical or biological determinism, which rules out both free will and free thinking. *In reducing reasons to causes science throws both rationality and free will out of its world view.* Furthermore, the ‘rationality’ of scientific thinking as such collapses in on itself

as soon as we accept the current 'scientific' belief that 'rational' thinking as such is merely the autonomous, unwilled biological activity of some bodily 'thing' - *the brain* - rather than a free and independent activity of *mind*. For if thinking *is* merely an autonomous activity of the brain, then how and by what independent 'rational' criteria can its 'rationality' be judged? Science then, does not lead us up into the heights of free and rational thinking, but is instead its very nemesis - an irrational, self-contradictory world-view parading itself as the very apotheosis of rationality.

**MYTH 22:**

**SCIENCE DOES NOT PERSECUTE 'HERETICS'.**

**RELIGION DOES.**



Both Judaeo-Christianity and Islam are infamous for their persecution of religious heresy and heretics - not least the notorious attack by The Church on Galileo. Yet today, anyone who questions for example, the supposed 'scientific' fact that smoking is a major 'cause' of cancer would be regarded as no less *heretical* in the face of 'The Science' than a Galileo was in the face of 'The Church'.

Yet whereas accusations of religious heresy could in the past be challenged in religious courts, anyone seeking to legally defend their right to smoke in public places would today have no right to question in court the *entire framework and foundation* of 'The Science' that denies that right. Nor would they be given legal opportunities today to offer rational arguments showing that anti-smoking propaganda *is itself responsible* for more cancer-related deaths than smoking itself – working as it does like a damagingly negative counterpart of the *placebo* effect on which the effectiveness of so much 'scientific' medication rests. That modern medical treatments for disease are, as has been pointed out earlier, the 3<sup>rd</sup> major cause of death or that psychiatric medications aimed at 'treating' anxiety and psychosis are themselves responsible for a *veritable plague of psychoses and suicides* – these are some of the 'facts' that sit uncomfortably with today's unquestioned faith in the authority of Science, a

faith as difficult and ‘heretical’ to question today as the dogmas and authority of The Church were in the past. ‘Scientific’ medicine is *just one example among many* of how the repression of scientific ‘heresy’ however does not go without its own human consequences – in this case the persecution and suffering of countless people tricked or forced into taking life-threatening, addictive, psychosis or suicide-inducing prescription drugs. Such people find themselves victims of a new *health fascism* of the sort first promoted by Hitler with the principal encouragement of ‘scientists’ - doctors, geneticists and psychiatrists. For as we have seen, it was the latter who first proposed a ‘final’ and ultimately genocidal ‘medical-model’ solution to all diseases afflicting the social ‘body’ or ‘Volk’ – this solution being the radical surgery and excision (in essence a type of scientific ‘exorcism’) of all genetically ‘inferior’ races and individuals.

Scientists themselves however are far from immune to persecution. Quite the opposite - hardly a single major new idea in science has not been *preceded and delayed* by the most rabid attacks – often tantamount to accusations of heresy – not just on the new concepts or theories themselves, but on the persons who originated them. Isaac Asimov distinguished between two types of scientific heretic:



**“Endoheretics are appropriately credentialed scientists. If the person is outside the scientific community or at least outside of his specialty, he is an exoheretic. If a person is an endoheretic, he will be considered as eccentric and incompetent, whereas if the person is an exoheretic, he will be regarded as a crackpot, charlatan, or fraud.”**

A recent and still on-going example of the scientific persecution and ‘excommunication’ of endoheretics is the attack on the biologist Rupert Sheldrake. The radically new yet well-argued theory advanced in his book *A New Science of Life* received the following response from the editor of the British Journal of Nature, Sir John Maddox: “This infuriating tract...is the best candidate for burning there has been for many years.”



**MYTH 23:**

**SCIENCE FREES THOUGHT.**

**RELIGION RESTRICTS  
FREEDOM OF THOUGHT.**



It cannot be denied that institutionalised religions often *deliberately seek* to restrict freedom of thought - confining it to the lexicon of their own officially authorized 'canons' of scripture, and the specific language and symbolism they employ. Yet the sciences too, have not only generated a whole range of new, *no less thought-confining* jargons and terminologies of their own, but have gone even further – abolishing all *awareness* of the way in which these terminologies can, in and of themselves, restrict freedom of thought by confining it in the framework of their own unquestioned terms and lexicons. In many ways the scientific world-view is one that is held even more tightly in the grip of its own unquestioned terminologies than religious theologies – which have a long and venerable history of exploring and re-interpreting the *meaning* of their own, most sacred words, symbols and scriptures.



**MYTH 24:**

**SCIENCE HAS TO DO WITH FACTS ALONE.**

**RELIGION HAS TO DO WITH VALUES.**





To so neatly compartmentalize the respective realms of science and religion in terms of a simplistic dualism of experimentally observed ‘facts’ and ethical ‘values’ is misleading. It implies that our ‘scientific’ understanding of relations *between* things and between people is something entirely ‘value neutral’, having nothing to do with what is the very essence of ‘ethics’ - namely our relation *to* things and *to* people. It forgets that the way we understand the complex relations between things and between beings is shaped, from the beginning, by the nature of our relation *to* them.

**“The relation that constitutes knowing is one in which we ourselves are related and in which this relation vibrates through our basic posture.”**

**“... it seems necessary to characterise our entirely different method as *specifically engaging in our relationship* to what we encounter...”**

**“In a sense, what is characteristic of phenomenology is the will not to resist this engaging-oneself.”**

*Martin Heidegger*

If we grant all our awareness to contemplating and fully taking in a landscape, animal or person, our ‘observation’ of that landscape, animal or person, reveals its truth or reality to us in a quite different way to how it would do if instead we merely set about digging up or mining the land,

conducting experiments on animals, or wiring up the bodies and brains of human beings to machines.

The scientific world-view and scientific experimentation and observation is not in any way value-neutral because it expresses a specific *relation* to the world - what Martin Buber called an 'I-It' relation in contrast to an 'I-You' relation. As Marx saw, it belongs to the very nature of capitalism to turn all human values into commodities, and in doing so to reduce all authentic relations between beings – which have the character of an 'I-You' relation - to a relation between things or commodities – an 'I-It' or even 'It-It' relation.

Thus all relations between the human beings and the world are reduced to a relationship between the human brain (a mere thing or 'It') and a world of things. Consequently also, relations between human beings are effectively reduced to relationships between their brains or genes. The legal profession is already aware of the 'ethical' implications of this idea, which would logically imply for example, that criminal acts are not a result of the perversion of all human relations into an 'I-It' relation - human beings treating each other as mere things or objects, motivated by the desire to accumulate things and objects. No, for scientifically understood there is no 'I' or 'being' in the first place – only a

brain with the delusion of an autonomous, free-willed self or T.

Not only is the scientific world-view not value neutral. In its relation *to* the world – a relation determined by technology - it ends up giving free ethical reign to the most ruthless and ‘unethical’ forms of experimentation, exploitation and ultimately - destruction. That it may do so in the name of ‘knowledge’ and not just commercial profit should not delude us. For the *type* of knowledge gained is narrow in the extreme - limited precisely by its prime purpose - the application of technology in the pursuit of profit. Does all this mean we should abandon the lifestyle that modern technology with its televisions, mobile phones and computers offers us? Surely such technology is practical proof, not of the delusory nature of science but of its truth and enormous value?

This brings us back again to the last-ditch defence of the ‘Science Delusion’ - the ‘argument from technology’ that claims that its ability to create effective and practical technical appliances is evidence of the truth of science. Yet is it? Our common sense understanding of everyday appliances such as televisions and computers tells us that they are designed on the basis of scientific knowledge, then built in dedicated factories, bit-by-bit, so that they can finally

be shipped to us and become part of our lives, life-world and 'lifestyle'.

This common sense view applies not just to the latest but to the very earliest forms of modern industrial technology and its products – everything from the steam engine to electricity generation, light bulb, radios and modern automobiles. How is it then, that modern physics *itself* tells us that this common sense view is simply *not scientifically true*? For according to quantum physicists such as Hawking, whilst it may seem that your television or computer came from a factory in China, in reality its every atom and particle is constantly manifesting from an invisible but all-pervasive quantum 'vacuum'.

In other words, the mobile phone you pick up or the television or computer screen you look at today is *not* the one built in a factory - or even the one you picked up or perceived a minute or even a nanosecond ago! For matter – all matter – is constantly emerging from and disappearing back into a quantum vacuum. What exactly this quantum 'field' or 'vacuum' *is* no physicists can say. Yet what they *are* saying could and has been said in a quite different way and from a quite different perspective. It was said by those ancient sages, who declared that every aspect of our experienced world – and everything in it – is constantly and

continuously manifesting from a vast and infinite field of *consciousness*.

The mystifying mathematical complexities of quantum physics are the last attempt to both deny and mystify this simplest and yet most primordial truth of all - the truth that it is no mysterious 'quantum void' but rather *consciousness* itself which is the *sole reality* behind and within all things - and the source of them all. Not 'my' consciousness or 'yours' but consciousness *as such*, understood as an infinite, all-pervasive field of pure awareness, one latent with infinite *potentialities* of expression that are constantly manifesting as every existing thing we experience - from a rock to a laptop. For as a saying of the great 10<sup>th</sup> century Indian sage Abhinavagupta expressed it so well: "The being of all things that are recognised in awareness in turn depends on awareness."



## POSTSCRIPT

The ‘Science Delusion’ is more than just a delusion. It is the dictatorship, not of an individual, but of an irrationalist and self-contradictory world-view more dangerous than the most fundamentalist, dogmatic and totalitarian forms of institutionalised religion or ideology. Institutionalised religion in the form of ‘The Church’ once openly and almost totally dominated the culture of Europe, as fundamentalist Islam now openly seeks its own form of global ideological domination. Yet ‘The New Church of Science’ (not the so-called ‘Church of Scientology’, which is but an ugly mirror image of scientific ideology itself) is far more dangerous than any self-professed church or religious cult. That is because its dogmatic, fundamentalist, irrationalist, destructive and totalitarian nature remains almost *wholly invisible* – not only to its lay believers but even to its most fervent high priests.

At the heart of ‘The Church’ that is now duly called ‘*The Science*’ is the urge to seek ‘explanations’ and ‘causes’ for things - rather than *exploring* and directly *experiencing* more deeply what they essentially *are* and *mean*. Taken to its logical conclusion, science would seek to ‘explain’ words themselves as ‘effects’ rather than *expressions* of meaning - with meanings seen as their quasi-deterministic ‘cause’. Given its confusion

of causal explanations with reasons and meanings it is no wonder that science cannot satisfy people's search for a rational understanding of the 'meaning of life' - what Viktor Frankl called 'the Will to Meaning' at the heart of our being, and of religious experience. True 'science' - true *knowledge* - can neither arise by reducing the *subjective reality* of our lived experience to explanatory *causes* nor by seeking to counter orthodox 'scientific' explanations of nature (evolution for example) with counter-explanations drawn from religious myths.

Both ways reflect 'The Science Delusion' - the confusion of *reasons* with deterministic *causes*, and of meaningful subjective experiences of reality with 'objective' explanations. Yet what if people could *escape* from this delusion? What if they knew that, being *a part of* the entire universe, they could each explore the entire universe *from within themselves* - directly, experientially, and *without the aid of any scientific instruments or equations*? This is no mere hypothetical question. For there have always been and still are individuals who *know* this - from *direct experience*. Indeed whole civilizations have been built around this type of direct experiential or 'phenomenological' knowledge. And as Heidegger emphasised, it is such primordial *knowledge* (German *Wissen*) that belongs to the very essence of *science* as



*Wissen-schaft*. Yet what the ‘Science Delusion’, as I have described it here, has most effectively succeeded in concealing is the existence of wholly *different* understandings of and approaches to ‘science’ to the modern one, which has come (if only in the last few centuries) to be taken as definitive, and exclusive of all others. Yet other models of science have survived and evolved from the ancient past to this very day. They include not only ‘phenomenological science’, but also what has been termed ‘sacred science’, ‘yogic science’, ‘spiritual science’, ‘dialectical science’, ‘hermeneutic science’, ‘integral science’, ‘qualitative science’ and ‘subjective science’. The essential principles and primary methodologies of *direct experiential research and experimentation* that could together constitute a newer and truer science of the *future* is the subject of my book: ‘The Qualia Revolution - from Quantum Physics to Cosmic Qualia Science’.

## NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

Born in London in 1952, Peter Wilberg studied at Oxford and with Antioch University. He has spent his life researching and writing in the fields of philosophy of medicine, psychiatry, psychotherapy, science and religion. He has a particular interest in Indian tantric metaphysics and theology and in the Eastern roots of early Christianity. His published books include *The Awareness Principle – a radical new philosophy of life, science and religion*; *Heidegger, Medicine and ‘Scientific Method’* and *The QUALLA Revolution – from quantum physics to cosmic qualia science*.

Other books and essays by Peter Wilberg can be found on his multiple websites.

These include not only [www.thenewyoga.org](http://www.thenewyoga.org) but also  
[www.heidegger.org.uk](http://www.heidegger.org.uk)                      [www.thenewmedicine.org.uk](http://www.thenewmedicine.org.uk)  
[www.thenewscience.org](http://www.thenewscience.org)                      [www.thenewtherapy.org](http://www.thenewtherapy.org)  
[www.thenewphenomenology.org](http://www.thenewphenomenology.org)                      [www.thenewgnosis.org](http://www.thenewgnosis.org)  
[www.thenewsocialism.org](http://www.thenewsocialism.org)                      and                      [www.peterwilberg.org](http://www.peterwilberg.org)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avery, Samuel *The Dimensional Structure of Consciousness – a physical basis for immaterialism* Compari 1995
- Berkeley, George *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* Kensinger Publishing 2004
- Buber, Martin *The Eclipse of God* Humanities Press International 1988
- Dahlin, Bo *The Ontological Reversal: A Figure of Thought of Importance for Science Education* Department of Educational Sciences, Karlstad University, Sweden
- Davies, Paul *Creation in the Blink of an Eye*  
The Guardian, April 26 2008
- Frankl, Victor *The Will to Meaning* Touchstone 1984
- Eagleton, Terry *The Gospels* Verso 2007
- Gendlin, Eugene *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning* Northwestern University Press 1997
- Heidegger, Martin *The Question Concerning Technology* Harper Torchbooks 1977
- Heidegger, Martin *What is Called Thinking?* Harper Torchbooks 1968
- Heidegger, Martin *Zollikon Seminars* Northwestern University Press 2001
- Hogan, James P. *Kicking the Sacred Cow: Heresy and Impermissible Thoughts in Science* Mass Market Paperbacks
- Husserl, Edmund *The Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Philosophy* Northwestern University Press, 1970
- Illich, Ivan *Medical Nemesis; The Expropriation of Health* Penguin 1990

- Lewontin, R.C. *Biology as Ideology, the doctrine of DNA* Harper 1993
- Tauber, Alfred *The Immune Self: Theory or Metaphor?* Cambridge University Press 1997
- Tennenbaum, Jonathan *Power vs. Energy - The Difference Between Dynamis and Energeia* Executive Intelligence Review November 22, 2002 issue
- Wilberg, Peter *The Awareness Principle – a radical new philosophy of life, science and religion* Exposure Publishing / New Yoga Publications 2007
- Wilberg, Peter *Heidegger, Medicine and ‘Scientific Method’; The Unbeeded Heritage of the Zollikon Seminars* New Gnosis Publications 2003
- Wilberg, Peter *Human Ontology or Human Genomics? Heidegger’s Health Warning to Humanity* [www.heidegger.org.uk/hum\\_ont\\_hum\\_gen.pdf](http://www.heidegger.org.uk/hum_ont_hum_gen.pdf)
- Wilberg, Peter *The QUALIA Revolution; From Quantum Physics to Cosmic Qualia Science* New Gnosis Publications 2004

**Books by Peter Wilberg from  
www.thenewyoga.org**

***The Awareness Principle** – a radical new Philosophy of  
Life, Science and Religion* New Yoga Publications,  
Exposure Publishing 2007

***The New Yoga - Tantric Wisdom for Today's World*** New  
Yoga Publications, Exposure Publishing 2007

***Tantra Reborn - the Sensuality and Sexuality of our  
immortal Soul Body*** New Yoga Publications, Exposure  
Publishing 2007

**Books by Peter Wilberg from  
www.newgnosis.co.uk**

***Heidegger, Medicine and 'Scientific' Method** - the  
unbeeded Message of the Zollikon Seminars*

***Heidegger, Phenomenology and Indian Thought***

***The Therapist as Listener** - Martin Heidegger and the  
missing Dimension of Counselling and Psychotherapy Training*

***The Qualia Revolution** - from Quantum Physics to  
Cosmic Qualia Science*

***Head, Heart and Hara** - the Soul Centres of West and  
East*

***From New Age to New Gnosis** - the contemporary  
Significance of a New Gnostic Spirituality*

***Deep Socialism** - a New Manifesto of Marxist Ethics and  
Economics*

