

## The scientific illusion

Posted on July 27, 2021 by Elements of Racial Education

Developing simple arguments first formulated by the philosopher George Berkeley (1685 - 1753), "The Science Delusion" identifies and disproves twenty-four of the common myths that shroud "science" and in so doing, challenges the invisible dogmas and the undisputed or contradictory beliefs on which it is based. The purpose of "The Science Delusion" is to show that what is considered science is based less on actual "evidence" or tangible human experiences than is religion. By publishing several chapters, ours is simply to show that science is not based on real "evidence" or tangible human experiences. Indeed, as David F. Noble has shown (<https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2020/11/01/la-religion-de-la-technologie/>), modern man's fascination with technology has its roots in religious expectations and the quest for transcendence and salvation, the conviction that the apocalypse is imminent and the hope that the increase in human knowledge would make it possible to regain the Edenic state.

The aim of this book is not to defend a specific religious doctrine or dogma, but on the contrary to offer an appropriate counterpart to the new wave of aggressive anti-religionism illustrated by the "scientific" criticism of Richard Dawkins in his book *The God Delusion*.

It does so by critically examining the supposed supposed rationality of "science", showing that it rests as much on unchallenged assumptions and dogmatic beliefs - taken at word of mouth - as the more "fundamentalist" of religions.

The words "science" and "conscience" come from the Latin *scire* ("to know"), a verb whose root means "to cross".

In "traversing" the countless common myths and illusions which constitute our idea of "science", as well as those which science itself promotes and on which it is founded, I launch a "heretical" challenge to quasi-authority, religion and the near-totalitarian hegemony that the scientific worldview exercises today in the globalized Western culture and media - a culture in which respect for "science" has become as automatic as respect for "science". Church "was in medieval Europe.

Unlike religious and anti-religious, religious "theists", and secular or scientific "a-thées", I maintain that the reality of God has nothing to do with the problem of "existence" or "non-existence" of some sort of supreme being "endowed" with consciousness. On the contrary, the essential reality of God is consciousness, a supreme or universal consciousness of the type recognized in Indian philosophy - a consciousness which cannot be reduced to the property of a thing or a being that would come to distinguish itself or to "exist" within it.

Whatever your perspective on God (1), *The Science Delusion* raises two important questions:

Why is it politically and culturally acceptable to question the rationality of the religious belief in the existence of an invisible God, a belief shared by Newton and Einstein, while it is politically and culturally "incorrect" to question - as Newton and Einstein did - scientific belief in an invisible force called gravity?

In what way are religious fundamentalism of the waves due? Are fundamentalist clerics just crazy or bad or are they reacting unconsciously to the rise of a new religion - "science"? Because, despite its worldwide authority - and as no one is likely to play the role of "Galileo of God" - this is a religion whose fundamentalist dogmas remain invisible and totally unchallenged in educational establishments "secular" - whereby a large number of people blindly accept what I call "scientific illusion".

## INTRODUCTION

A typical newspaper article of the kind one finds almost every day in today's press begins by announcing that "[Oxford University researchers] are going to spend \$ 1.9 million. books to study why people believe in God. The academics received a grant to find out if belief in a deity is a matter of nature or of education ". In other words, belief in a deity is no longer even considered a theological or philosophical question - that is, an intellectual question.-, but is reduced to a question of "scientific" investigation which must be decided by "research" (and this, within the framework of the parameters of a totally unchallenged, thoughtless and superficial dualism of the "innate" and the "Acquired"). Even more frightening is the fact that no one seems to flirt with the completely unchallenged new faith in "science" that this type of "news" reveals. This is why, against the backdrop of the controversy surrounding the role of religion in today's world - and the ever more aggressive attacks on it, exemplified by Dawkins' book *The God Delusion*- it is good to remember the words of the German philosopher Martin Heidegger, namely that "science is the new religion". He also pointed out that science is "... to a wholly unimaginable degree, dogmatic through and through; it deals with thoughtless conceptions and preconceived ideas".

The identification of rational thought with "scientific" thought makes us run a danger against which Heidegger warned us. It is about the danger of the total disappearance of thought as such - replaced by an entirely unthought science .or a totally thoughtless opposition between "science" and "religion". For the point is that most people remain literally "blinded by science", unable to see or penetrate its quasi-religious nature and the unchallenged dogmatic foundations on which it rests. The reason why faith in this "new religion" of science can only be blind is that it is based on a completely mythical understanding of the true history and nature of modern science and scientific "explanations". of the universe - which in fact themselves have the character of mythical explanations . The *Science Delusion* offers a brief description and critique of twenty-four commonly accepted myths about the nature of science, each of which highlights a mythical dimension of scientific "explanation". Although these myths (both those which surround science and those which it maintains) overlap to a very large extent, what follows is intended (1) to make the reader aware that he must consider them as such and (2) to subject them to rational and ethical criticism which undermines them and philosophically "crosses" them. To begin with, I draw on and describe the philosophical roots of modern science. This is significant in itself. Indeed, if

scientists like Stephen Hawking immediately reject philosophy and theology as outdated approaches to pre- or pseudo-scientific knowledge, they forget that modern science has its roots in "natural philosophy" - and that its first pioneers were not called "scientists", but "natural philosophers". It is therefore high time to save Philosophy, mother of Science, of the arrogance of his child. For even a cursory examination of the language adopted by leading physicists reveals the use of the most imprecise terminology, the crudest logical contradictions - and the crudest forms of pseudo-philosophy .

#### MYTH 1:

SCIENCE IS 'MATERIALIST'. RELIGION IS "IDEALIST".

The terms "materialist" and "idealist" are used here in a philosophical sense which will be explained and repeated throughout this work. Although part of the scientific "illusion" lies in its belief that it has succeeded in superseding all previous philosophies (which it does, as it is today the true dominant worldview), it is 'is a philosopher Englishman, John Locke, who was the first to lay the foundations of what was to be called "the scientific revolution". What is extraordinary, however, is that even today Locke is still considered an "empirical" philosopher - a philosopher who believes that knowledge must be based on verifiable experience. In fact, he laid the foundation for what, philosophically, is a totally "idealistic" concept of scientific "knowledge". Locke's main claim to fame is that he echoed Galileo's most basic claim - that what ultimately was "real" was only the measurable properties of things. This implied that all the qualities tangibles of natural phenomena were only abstract or "ideal" quantities .

It took an Irish philosopher, Bishop George Berkeley, to undermine Locke's unbearable separation between the so-called "primary qualities" of things (which are in reality nothing more than measurable quantities such as density or weight) and the tangible qualities (such as hardness and heaviness) of which they offer a measure. And it took a German thinker, Edmund Husserl, to come up with a totally different view of science. The science that Husserl called "phenomenology" followed Berkeley in totally rejecting the idea of "explaining" the phenomena experienced as mere subjective "effects" of quantities. abstract physico-mathematics.

What is called scientific "revolution" effectively excluded from the idea of reality everything it owed to common sense. Far from being "materialistic," the essence of this revolution was to treat the mathematical abstractions, "intangible" or "ideal" conceptions and formulas of science as more real than the very phenomena they were meant to explain . Thus, as Husserl asserted in his groundbreaking work on The Crisis in European Sciences, the idea that natural science is "materialist" or "empirical" is a deception. Indeed, in reality, it substitutes "... a world of idealities for the only world which is real, the one which is effectively given by perception, which is and can always be lived - our world of everyday life". Husserl here follows in the footsteps of Bishop Berkeley who first saw in the myth that science offers us a more "solid" explanation of our real sensory experience of phenomena than that given by

religion. This is why Heidegger insisted that "phenomenology is more of a science than natural science". Phenomenology is that science which explores our direct experience of phenomena.

But, if we experience the sensory qualities of "nature" or "material" phenomena - qualities such as heaviness or lightness, hardness and flexibility, shape and texture, color and sound. - we never experience "matter" as such and neither do we ever perceive "matter" as such. As Samuel Avery notes, "We experience the visual and tactile perceptions that indicate the existence of an independent material substance, but the acceptance of its reality is an act of faith.. [Emphasis added] The myth that science is "materialist" is therefore also linked to the ancient idea, now entirely obsolete, of "matter itself" - the myth of matter. Indeed, if science still clings scrupulously to the idea of matter, relativity and quantum physics no longer consider that matter possesses even the most fundamental and measurable "primary qualities" that Galileo and Galileo had associated with it. Locke - on the contrary, they admit that, at the quantum level, "things" such as mass, momentum, energy, space and time cease to be quantifiable or even separately definable realities and that even "particles" like electrons have the same character of non-localized wave than light. In this sense, science has become, like religion, an immaterialist vision of the world. The scientific "charge" against the "concept of God" - that God cannot be seen, has no sensory qualities, and is not locatable - also applies to the scientific concept of God. Matter.

Both the concept of God and the concept of Matter can be seen as substitutes for the recognition of a dimension of potentiality. matrix-like - a dimension that is no less real than anything we actually experience. Indeed, not only do all real experiences begin as potential experiences, but they are all the more "real" because, like, for example, the real experience of seeing a ball rolling towards us, they are accompanied by awareness of potential experiences in a different sensory dimension - like, for example, moving around to catch the ball and feel it in our hands. According to Samuel Avery, "it is the potential for tactile sensations that makes a visual image 'physical'." And, more generally "the concept of substance [...] is derived from the potential perceptions in every sensory domain. »[Emphasis added].

What we consider to be the "matter" is real only in the first sense - because the "matter" is the "mother" God [ watch ] of all things - a matrix of potential models or matrices sensory experiences. This idea is not new, it was recognized long ago by philosophers and theologians. Aristotle defined what we call matter ( hyle ) as potentiality and its form ( morph ) as actuality. Likewise, Thomas Aquinas means by "raw material" ( Prima Materia) not something actual or "substantial", but pure potentiality - a kind of formless "passive potentiality" inseparable from God as "active potentiality". "Matter" can be seen as the very "spirit" of God - understood as a universal or divine consciousness of every potential experiential pattern. or "formal idea" of the phenomena experienced. In this case, who cares and what does it matter (2) that we call this primordial consciousness of the potentiality "spirit" or "matter", "the spirit of God" or "the Great Mother"? If you don't mind giving it either of these names, it doesn't matter (3). But if "It", this universal or divine "mother", this "spirit" or "matrix" of all things, literally had no importance (4) - to the extent that it materializes and actualizes itself in start from a realm of pure potentiality - we could not experience "matter" or scientifically conceive "matter" (5).

## MYTH 2:

SCIENCE 'EXPLAINS' THINGS.

RELIGION TAKES THEM FOR CASH.

The truth is that even the most precise quantitative measurements, whether of things or aspects of the functioning of the brain, cannot - in principle - explain the most basic qualities of our actual experience of the world - of things. Qualities such as color, density, texture, taste, etc. Have you ever seen, smelled, touched or in any way experienced an amount such as "3"? I am not talking here about a quantity of something - 3 oranges or stars, 3g of powder, 3ml of liquid, 3 meters of carpet or road, etc. By that I mean a pure quantity, totally abstract and immaterial. In modern physics, the only things that exist are these immaterial quantities, constants, and mathematical relationships; even the 'mass' is more understood as a quantity of something tangible - as a kind of dense physical matter that we could touch and feel - but as a pure quantity. "Mass" is a concept defined entirely by its mathematical relationship to other quantities - such as speed, momentum, and acceleration - none of which is ultimately a quantity of anything! Thus, when laymen ask scientists what is, for example, "mass" or "gravity", they are told that it can only be "explained" by mathematics so complex and esoteric that only the high priests of physics can understand them; mathematics which should not be assumed to have any connection whatsoever with our actual experience of the world or even with the ordinary meaning of words such as "mass", "gravity", etc.

## MYTH 3:

SCIENCE IS MATHEMATICALLY ACCURATE.

RELIGION IS FULL OF UNSUCCESSFUL TERMS.

The much-vaunted mathematical precision of physics, however, comes with a freedom of language and logic that would make any true "rationalist" jump. The verbal answers and "explanations" offered by even the most famous of physicists are so full of loopholes and contradictions (or are based on so many arguments and circular definitions) that they would not meet the standard of logic which is submitted in high school or undergraduate dissertations in this much disparaged discipline that is philosophy - a discipline based on thought and the precise use of language, a discipline that physics and modern science as a whole seek to set aside and marginalize, even if the sciences are born from the philosophies of nature. Yet even laymen scratch their heads at the most obvious logical and philosophical inconsistencies in scientific explanations - for example, the inconsistency of stating that time itself "began" with the so-called "Big Bang." Indeed, it is obvious that the very concept of "beginning" is a temporal concept and therefore a concept which already supposes the prior existence of time! If the

very language of scientific explanations is so vague and imprecise that it ignores logic, it is impossible to validate scientific claims - which are expressed in words and not numbers - by the most precise mathematics.

Science may scoff at religious ideas that we live in a universe created by an intangible spirit or spirits, but all it offers us instead is the idea that we live in a universe of intangible numbers! The "description" that she makes of the physical universe is only a set of numerical and mathematical explanations in the mind of the scientist; they are quasi-mystical numbers which are then taken as supernatural realities, as semi-divine "higher powers" which would be at the very origin of nature. And if, on the one hand, scientists claim that these numbers are based on actual measurements of physical phenomena, on the other hand they admit that they cannot say exactly what the phenomena they are measuring (mass, gravity, energy, etc.) are essentially - if not purely mathematical constructions or constants represented by Greek signs and almost mystical letters of the alphabet.

MYTH 4:

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

RELIGION EAST.

As early as the 18th century, Bishop George Berkeley showed how the main founders of the modern scientific worldview sought - without any rational justification - to "" explain "our experience of natural phenomena and their qualities by postulating entities or supernatural forces supposedly hidden "behind" them - invisible entities like "corpuscles" or invisible forces like "gravity" - which are nothing but abstract quantities. "Some," Bishop Berkeley wrote, "do not feel the need to seek an explanation for a stone falling to the earth or the sea swelling its waves towards the moon. But how does telling us that these phenomena are due to 'attraction' enlighten us? "

Density, weight and lightness are things that we can not only measure, but also directly experience - that we can feel and feel. We can thus 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 coined only in the 19th century) to recognize that terms such as "gravity" implied the existence of totally invisible and inexplicable forces hidden "behind" the. nature and sought to explain by these supernatural forces all natural experiences and phenomena whether it's feeling the weight of an object or seeing an apple fall from a tree.

Newton stated bluntly that while his own mathematical "model" of mathematical gravity could be proven by measurement, he in no way explained this seemingly supernatural force that is gravity - what it was, why. it existed or how objects could attract each other from a distance thanks to it.

"That gravity is innate, inherent and essential to matter, so that a body can act on another body at a distance, through a vacuum and without any intermediary which transmits this action, it is for me such an absurdity great that it seems to me impossible that a man capable of dealing with philosophical matters could fall into it [...] Until now, I have explained the phenomena by the force of gravity, but I have not yet determined the cause of gravity itself. (Isaac Newton).

MYTH 5:

SCIENCE IS BACKED BY THE CONCRETE FACTS.

RELIGION IS INFIRMED BY THE CONCRETE FACTS.

If billions were spent building the most sophisticated and expensive technological facilities and instruments to detect ghosts, most people would consider it a most ridiculous, if not outrageous, waste of money. Yet technical facilities have been or are being built around the world to detect what is in fact nothing more than mental constructs invented by scientists to keep physics from floundering. Let us quote for example the massive installations built at great expense - but without success - to detect the "gravitational waves" postulated by the theory of the gravity of Einstein or these "gravitons" which are supposed to constitute a source of gravity - otherwise invisible and undetectable. - called "dark matter". What if this "dark matter" did not exist at all? What if it was a mental and mathematical construction necessary to prevent the edifice of gravitational theory - and with it physics as a whole - from collapsing in the face of the facts? Indeed, as science recognizes, the fact is that, if this occult or ghostly form of matter were not postulated, it would be impossible to explain that the entire universe does not collapse - why hyper-fast stars don't just wander through space and why not every galaxy is falling apart like spiraling fireworks. Yet the assertion that "dark matter" is something that necessarily exists "somewhere" to ensure the cohesion of the physical universe perfectly shows that scientists need to invent ever more occult concepts to maintain their representation of the universe facing the facts - to prevent not the universe, but their own theories, collapse and fly into space!

MYTH 7:

SCIENCE IS BASED ON "EMPIRICAL" EVIDENCE.

RELIGION IS BASED ON DOGMATIC BELIEFS.

As we have already seen, one of the main reasons why science is not "empirical" is that it does not rely at all on the evidence provided to us by our actual sensory experience of the world, because it seeks on the contrary, to explain everything that we naturally and sensorially experience as being the product of

supernatural energies, waves, fields or forces - invisible and abstract quantities that we cannot experience directly. This brings us to the most basic reason why science is not based on hard facts - a very simple reason. Indeed, the most fundamental "fact" of all is not the "objective" existence of an "external" world, but the "subjective" experience of such world. How do we know that something exists? How do we know we exist? How do we know the world exists? Because we experience things. Because we are experiencing a self. Because we experience a world. This means that it is experience that is the most basic "fact" of existence - not "what" we experience as an objective "fact".

The most basic scientific "fact", "truth or" reality "is not objective existence, but subjective experience.. This is not to say that the "outside" world only exists in our "mind" or "brain", although quantum physics and neuroscience lead us to this conclusion. This is a false conclusion, because, although what we are experiencing may be experienced as being "inside" (like an idea in our head) or "outside" (like an object in space), experience as something. that such is not something "outside" or "inside" - it is only what we experience and how we experience it.

Experience is not a "non-thing" (5), but that does not mean that it is nothing. She is literally everything. This is why philosophers like Leibniz and Whitehead have adopted the philosophy of "panpsychism", recognizing that everything must be not a mere object, but a lived "subject" or a consciousness - which simply appears to other subjects as an object. . Reality is therefore not a physico-scientific relationship between objects in an "external" "objective" universe, but essentially an intersubjective construction in a subjective universe of experience. In other words, this particular myth is the assertion that while science can back up its claims to truth with objectively and experimentally verifiable "evidence", religion - even if it is not based on faith in dogma - cannot. to support its claims to the truth at best than with subjective experiences unverifiable (eg different types of mystical or emotional experiences of God). This notion of "objectively verifiable evidence" is the biggest "black hole" at the heart of the most sacred of science's cows. Indeed, if we apply this notion to scientists themselves, we find that no more than any other person in this world are they able to provide "objective evidence" of the lived reality of their own consciousness or their own thoughts. Ultimately, how can an experiment provide objectively verifiable evidence of a scientific "theory" or "hypothesis" if the experiential reality of thought even who established these theories or hypotheses (not to mention the very consciousness or "mind" in which they arose and were subjectively experienced ) is itself unprovable?

Brain scan images show nothing more than pictures and readings of brain activity - they are not proof of the reality of the subject's consciousness or thoughts, emotions or dreams to which they are supposed to "correspond" the different types of brain activity. The fact that a scientist writes a scientific article that is read and understood by other scientists is no more proof - in the scientific sense of the term itself - of reality of the thoughts expressed in this article that a declaration of love or a cry of pain is not proof of the existence of "pain" or "love". The truth that science does not even dare to consider is that whatever the "objective" results of its experiments, recorded in scientific articles, these are only articles. The reality of conscious mental activity and of the thoughts which nourish the matter of their intellectual activity in the form of scientific hypotheses and theories, proven or unproven, remains, in the final analysis, objectively unproven and unverifiable. Instead of being "objectively" verified, they are validated inter-subjectively - accepted into consciousness, thoughts and mind. other scientists - who also



happen to have the indisputable subjective experience of mental activity and the development of ideas, theories, and hypotheses.

Should not science be biased in attempting to seek to study "dreams" using "objective" data obtained by scientific research on the brain, knowing that none of this data can ever prove that a person has ever had the subjective experience of something like a dream, of a human emotion of any kind - or even of a thought? The totally unoriginal thought that has crossed the minds of many - namely that science is totally disconnected from the realm of human subjective experience, because it is incapable of in principle to prove the "objective" existence of a phenomenon like "love" (and even less to "explain" it) - only shows how much scientific thought is in denial. The fact that scientists cannot prove the "objective" reality of the most basic elements of their own subjective human experience (whether it is their own scientific thoughts, their own sensory perceptions, or their own emotions) and that the most apparently "objective" experiments, instruments and scientific records also belong to the domain of subjective experience - after all, it is only through consciousness and subjective experience that scientists know they are thinking of an idea, making an observation, handling an instrument, or performing an experiment - a something terrifying that threatens to destroy the entire modern scientific view of the world.

The other thought that threatens to destroy is that ultimately the reality as such may be essentially subjective rather than objective in nature and that, ultimately, it is validated so intersubjectively - including by the scientists themselves. Otherwise, they would be led - by their own criteria of objective verifiability - to demand proof of each other of their respective subjective experience - even of their very existence as conscious beings - even before mutually examining their respective models, theorems or experimental results. Besides the confusion of the causes of phenomena with their reasons and meaning, we must point out an even deeper confusion in scientific thought - the confusion of "proof" with "experience". Modern science has been founded from its beginnings on a distrust of direct experience - especially what is called "the proof of the senses" - because sensory perception, like thought and feeling, is itself a mode of qualitative and subjective experience. Fortunately today, many of the serious, long and elaborate scientific "experiments" put in place to "prove" what every normal human being already knows from daily (subjective) experience have almost become a joke. Yet science nonetheless continues to attempt to use such objective evidence to invalidate the reality of subjective human experience - especially religious experience. One can dispute the interpretation of a strong subjective experience, but the effort of modern science to use "objective" evidence to refute the reality of the subjective experience of every human being is dehumanizing in principle.

MYTH 8:

SCIENCE ENDS BY EXPLAINING EVERYTHING BY ITS THEORIES.

RELIGION CAN EXPLAIN NOTHING BY ITS MYTHS AND DOGMA.

As arrogant as it is, this is the sacred profession of faith of all who truly believe in science. Yet unbeknownst to most followers of this religion, the circles of the self-proclaimed high priests of science - quantum physicists - keep hidden a "secret" esoteric doctrine that is directly contrary to it. This "standard" scientific doctrine affirms in fact what Bishop Berkeley had already asserted in the 18th century, namely that things only exist to the extent that they are perceived ( *esse est percipi* ). But she goes even further than Berkeley, pretending there's nothing to explain "In the outside world". Indeed, what quantum physicists assert is that, like time, space, and "energy", "matter" (in addition to being itself essentially empty space) is "nothing. " at all. It is neither "hard" nor "corpuscular", nor composed of unitary "particles". On the contrary, each particle of matter is only a "probability wave" or a "probability field", which is not limited by space or time. Science explains nothing of what we actually experience - except by referring to supernatural entities that we do not experience and which are all (unlike various concepts of God) mere abstract mathematical quantities. Not only does science explain nothing, but it ultimately claims that there is nothing to explain - that nothing exists.. Because nothing really exists "as" a thing. Hence the current and very "spiritual" love story between quantum physics and the Buddhist philosophies of ultimate "nothingness"! And since, in quantum physics, all things assumed to be "real" or "material" are considered to be mere perceptual illusions created by the actions of the observer on the observed, there is not even such "thing" as such. than bodies, brains, or cerebral matter to create this illusion of a world of material things - because, ultimately, their materiality or their "thing" is also only an illusion created by the "collapse" of the so-called "wave packet" in the mind of the observer (6). The latter has nothing tangible or noticeable, it is a simple mental and mathematical construction used to interpret the readings and the instrumental images - images which are themselves illusory from the point of view of quantum physics!

MYTH 9:

SCIENCE ASKS QUESTIONS.

RELIGION DOES NOT CHALLENGE ITS DOGMES.

First of all, let us recall here a scientifically inconvenient historical and linguistic evidence [for scientists]. The most revered Founding Fathers of what we call "science," people like Newton and Galileo, did not call themselves "scientists" (a word that was not coined until the 19th century), but "Philosophers" - "natural philosophers" or "natural philosophers". Second, pay attention to a type of question - such as religious hardliners - scientists will arise ever. The religious fanatic, who believes in the literal word of the Bible or the Quran, never doubts that it is the word of God and do not contemplate for a minute that his sacred texts are not only more or less adequate or misleading translations, but that language is both the faculty of translating ideas through words and the faculty of giving meaning through words. words. Deep theology recognizes many layers of symbolic or metaphorical meaning in religious texts and recognizes the need to place them in their historical, cultural and linguistic context. However, like fundamentalist religion, the religion of science never questions its own language. Thus, physicists speak

of "waves" and "fields" of all kinds without ever considering even for a moment that their "waves" or "fields" are not "things in themselves", but words - not "scientific facts", but metaphorical expressions . Unlike deep philosophers and theologians, scientists never seem to question the terms they use, for they assume that they represent eternal and universal realities. Medical science and practice are among the worst culprits in this regard, as they consistently use military metaphors to explain physiological functions; they declare that disease has no meaning, only "causes", declare "war" on cancer and other diseases and speak of the body's immune "defenses", and so on. In medical and psychiatric discourse, diseases themselves are constantly presented as if they were things in themselves, only to disappear - who still diagnoses or treats "neurasthenia" or "hysteria" today?

MYTH 12:

SCIENCE CAN FULLY EXPLAIN THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE FROM PHYSICS.

RELIGION NEEDS METAPHYSICAL SPECULATIONS AND PHILOSOPHIES TO SUPPORT ITS BELIEFS.

The distinction between physics and metaphysics dates back to Aristotle and was given new strength thanks to the insight that Martin Heidegger shed on modern science. What he reminded us, quite simply, is that "physics as physics cannot make any claim about physics." Only a physics beyond physics or "meta-physics" can. Why ? Because physics conducts experiments which - regardless of their outcome - are set up in a way that is already determined by the established framework of physics. However, as Heidegger pointed out, this framework - physics as such - is not itself the object of a possible physical experiment, nor can it be confirmed by such a physical experiment. The ultimate explanation that physics gives for the origin of the universe is of course the famous "Big Bang" - which took place who knows where and "before" which there was neither space nor time in which it could have happened! And yet, it is claimed that the Big Bang can be dated! It seems that the questions meta-physical most obvious raised this theory are not considered as issues by the physicists. Examples: the notions of "date" and "beginning" being temporal notions, how can one "date" the beginning of "time"? If space has also "started" with the Big Bang, where exactly can we say that this happened? If the universe, time, and space started with a Big Bang, aren't we implying that there could be something "before" time or "out of" space? Such simple questions overturn the hypothesis that the Big Bang theory is a verifiable physical hypothesis confirmed by physical evidence. On the contrary, it is obviously a theory loaded with the most obvious metaphysical questions - and it is indeed a highly metaphysical theory in itself. Too bad therefore that the only metaphor that physics could find to baptize it is so pathetically banal!

Peter Wilberg, The Science Delusion, New Yoga Publications, 2011, translated from English by B. K (7),

(1) However, it is possible and even healthy not to have a “point of view on God”. See Julius Evola, *The Doctrine of Awakening*, Editions Archè Milano (1976), chap. 4: “Destruction of the demon of dialectics”.

(2) “Who should 'mind' and why should it 'matter' if”. “Mind” as a verb means “to care about” and, as a noun, “spirit / mind”; “Matter”, as a verb, “to be important” and, as a noun, “matter”. This double play on words is absolutely untranslatable in French.

(3) “If you don't mind, doesn't matter”. See Supra, note 2.

(4) “Yet if 'It', this universal or divine 'mother', 'mind' or 'matrix' of all things, didn't quite literally 'matter'”. See Supra, note 2. Once this highly suggestive double play on words has been fully appreciated, it may however be good to reread the first (“Quality and Quantity”) and the second chapter (“*Materia Signata Quantitate*”) of the *Reign of the quantity* of René Guénon.

(5) “Experiencing is 'no-thing'”. It seems that the author takes up here the Heideggerian concept of “non-thing”, which designates the “state” of Being after it has, according to the German philosopher, “withdrawn to make beings intelligible” ( Niall Keane, “metaphysics, politics and nihilism in Heidegger and Jünger”, *La Règle du Jeu*, n ° 58-59, September 2015; see also Alphonse de Waelhens, *La Philosophie de Martin Heidegger*, Éditions de Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1946, p. 59, 255; John H. Walsh, “Heidegger's Understanding of No-Thingness,” *CrossCurrents*, vol. 13, n ° 3, summer 1963 [p. 305-23]).

(6) The “reduction” or “collapse” of the “function” or “wave packet” is the “process by which the wave function, associated with a particle or a group of particles in a quantum system, disappears quickly, if you try to subject it to a measurement ”. “The theory of quantum decoherence is intended to provide an explanation for this process” (emphasis added).

(7) *The Science Delusion* bears a subtitle which reaches a rather unprecedented degree in the paradox: “Why God is real and 'Science' is religious Myth. Peter Wilberg studied at Oxford and at the University of Antioch. He researches and writes on the philosophy of medicine, psychiatry, psychotherapy, science and religion. He is particularly interested in tantric metaphysics and theology. He has a site: [peterwilberg.org](http://peterwilberg.org). Other chapters of his book will undoubtedly be published on this page in the future.