

Having said all this, a large proportion of material scientists still tenaciously maintain that material knowledge covers everything, and that there is no need to introduce the “needless hypothesis” of a supreme being. Many people have become consciously convinced of this point of view, or have accepted it without thinking much about it. As long as this conviction persists, it is practically impossible to have any faith in spirituality and spiritual happiness.

On the other hand, dear reader, perhaps you do not have faith in the arguments of material scientists. Perhaps you are convinced about the absolute necessity for spirituality, and materialistic arguments are simply not an issue for you. In that case, the next section may prove more of a distraction than of a help, and it may be better to skip it, and move on to Vedic Wisdom on page .

## Science and Mystery

Throughout the ages, materialists have tried to deny the mystery of life and the world in which we live. They have tried to explain the origin and the structure of the universe as products of chance and the mechanical laws of nature. Material scientists are continuing this project today, but they have still not succeeded.

Material scientists want to take the mystery out of life with their mechanistic explanations, but their own explanations are themselves full of mystery. A Swedish scientist related to me how he attended a lecture by Albert Einstein in Stockholm. At the end of the lecture, the chairman, himself a distinguished scientist, said, “Thank you so much for your lecture, Professor Einstein. Unfortunately, I don’t think anyone in the audience understood it. Will you please repeat it?” When Einstein had finished presenting his lecture for the second time, the chairman said, “Thank you, Professor Einstein. I think that Paul Dirac [a very distinguished physicist] understood it this time, but I don’t think anyone else did. Would you be so kind as to give it a third time?” And Einstein did so.

The quest for mechanistic knowledge of the origin and nature of life and the universe has always been futile. Life and the world in which we live are full of wonder and mystery, as they have always been, and always will be. In fact, the quest for mechanistic knowledge of life and the universe is actually self-defeating. The more scientists investigate the world, the more they find mysterious complexity and evidence for design. The alternative to denying the miraculous mysteries of life is to live with them, and be part of them.

## Science and scientism

Many of our most prominent scientists have affirmed that Being is essentially mysterious. The original founders of the scientific method, such as Sir Isaac Newton and Descartes, were profoundly religious. Newton compared himself to a child playing with pebbles on the beach by the ocean of knowledge. Many modern scientists have realised the importance of spiritual insight within science, and of scientific insight within spirituality. Charles Tart, who has investigated near-death experiences, writes, “I am a scientist, which I consider a noble calling that demands the best from me, and I’m very much in favor of using *genuine* science to help our understanding in all areas of life, including the spiritual.” He contrasts “genuine science” with “scientism”, the irrational belief in material science: “Scientism, on the other hand, is a perversion of genuine science. Scientism in our time consists of a dogmatic commitment to a materialist philosophy that ‘explains away’ the spiritual rather than actually examining it carefully and trying to understand it (Wellmuth, 1944).”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles T\_ Tart *Six Studies of Out-of-the-Body Experiences*

Western material civilisation as a whole does not recognize the Perennial Mysteries. This civilization also has its high priests, namely the material scientists. They (like other priests) claim to benefit society by making a link with higher reality and tapping into its power. Material scientists claim that in principle everything in the world can be described, measured and explained in terms of direct sense perception and logic (and preferably mathematics). (One such scientist said, "We want to sum up the whole universe in a formula that you can put on a T-shirt.") Within this framework, it is forbidden to believe in experiences that contradict this conception. The penalty is to be considered socially invalid or insane. However, it is clear that there is something wrong with this materialistic program. On the one hand, material science has no power to describe and explain the essential nature of life and the world in which we live. On the other hand, although everyone wants to be happy, Western material civilisation shows a spectacular level of distress and dissatisfaction.

### **Material science and the origin of the universe**

Material scientists have failed to explain how the universe can have appeared automatically, simply as a result of physical reactions. It is clear from at least two points of view that the physical universe must have a non-physical origin.

First let's consider the origin of the matter in the universe. Modern science accepts that matter is equivalent to energy, and we also know that energy always has a source. Then what is the source of all the energy of which this entire universe is composed? The source of all physical matter must be beyond physical matter; it cannot be physical itself. But the only principle that we experience directly other than matter is the consciousness by which we (including scientists) are aware of matter. Then the most consistent explanation is that the source of the universe is Universal Consciousness.

Sometimes scientists try to say that the universe has appeared out of nothing, but we have no experience of something appearing out of nothing. The universe exists in time and space and it is governed by the laws of nature. Now, what is the origin of the laws of nature that govern the universe? What is the origin of the time and space within which it exists? What is maintaining these laws and time and space now? Material scientists have not even begun to explain these mysteries. Meanwhile, one thing is obvious. It takes intelligence to understand time, space and the universal laws, so it must require intelligence to create them and maintain them. And that intelligence acts universally.

Another point is that the universe is ordered to a far greater degree than can possibly be explained in terms of physical laws. Modern scientists have investigated the "fine-tuning" of the universal constants that is necessary to produce a workable universe capable of sustaining life. They have found that this fine-tuning is supernaturally fine. Statistically, the odds against this happening spontaneously are more than astronomical (roughly 1 to  $10^{123}$  against, according to one mathematician). Hence, many eminent scientists have conceded that the most consistent explanation is that of intelligent design. Physicist Paul Davies writes:

The temptation to believe that the Universe is the product of some sort of design, a manifestation of subtle aesthetic and mathematical judgement, is overwhelming. The belief that there is 'something behind it all' is one that I personally share with, I suspect, a majority of physicists.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Davies, Paul C.W., *The Christian perspective of a scientist*, Review of "The way the world is," by John Polkinghorne, *New Scientist*, Vol. 98, No. 1354, pp.638-639, 2 June 1983, p.638

Davies reiterates this conclusion in the last paragraph of his book *The Cosmic Blueprint*: "The impression of Design is overwhelming."<sup>3</sup>

"The scientific community is prepared to consider the idea that God created the universe a more respectable hypothesis today than at any time in the last 100 years."

## **Material science and the origin of life**

Material scientists have tried without success to show how life can have originated in some physical and chemical process. This is not the place for a detailed discussion of the technical evidence. To sum it up, in June 2000, Nicholas Wade, a science writer for *New York Times*, wrote an article entitled *Life's Origins Get Murkier and Messier*. His conclusion was: "Everything about the origin of life on Earth is a mystery, and it seems the more that is known, the more acute the puzzle gets."<sup>4</sup> Even Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the structure of DNA and an affirmed and vocal atheist and materialist, admitted: "An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle."<sup>5</sup>

## **The evolution myth**

Material scientists teach that life-forms have appeared through "the evolution of species", but this directly contradicts all experience and scientific evidence. Species are the distinct categories that we use to distinguish one form of life from another, and our direct experience is that species always remain fixed and stable, and do not change. Scientific research has confirmed this, for all processes of breeding and genetic mutation only produce limited varieties of the original forms. The fossil record also confirms that species are fixed and immutable, for new species always appear in it suddenly, and not gradually.

A scientific theory of evolution would require specific knowledge of how the simplest cells appeared from inert matter, and then an unbroken succession of specific life forms linking the simplest single cells to human beings. Evolutionists, however, cannot say what life is, or how it could appear from matter. They cannot specify what life-forms have evolved into what new forms, nor can they specify the mechanism by which one life form is supposed to evolve into a completely new life form. Thus, there is no scientific theory of evolution. Evolution is a myth, and so is the "theory of evolution". Scientists have not actually demonstrated the existence of either.

Gareth Nelson, the Chairman and Curator of one of the departments in the American Museum of Natural History in New York, writes, "[E]vidence, or proof, of origins – of the universe, of life, of all of the major groups of life, of all of the minor groups of life, indeed of all of the species – is weak or nonexistent when measured on an absolute scale, as it always was and will always be."<sup>6</sup>

## **Science and nescience**

Materialists claim that they can show how the whole universe works mechanically, without conscious intervention. However, this belief, with which they have indoctrinated society, is

---

<sup>3</sup> Paul Davies, *The Cosmic Blueprint*, London: Penguin Books, 1987, p. 203

<sup>4</sup> Nicholas Wade, "Life's Origins Get Murkier and Messier", *The New York Times*, June 13, 2000, pp. D1-D2

<sup>5</sup> Crick, Francis; *Life Itself: It's Origin and Nature*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88

<sup>6</sup> Gareth Nelson, "Preface," in Bird W. R., *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Regency: Nashville TN, 1991, Vol. I, pxii)

irrational. The concept of evolution of species, for example, does not even make sense. Evolutionists want to explain how the mechanical laws of nature can convert one very complex form of life into another complex form of life. This only makes sense if forms of life are simply the products of physical laws. Otherwise, the physical laws alone cannot change one form of life into another. For example, it is obvious that a pendulum clock cannot evolve into an electric clock by a mechanistic process, because neither type of clock has appeared by the unaided action of mechanistic laws; they are products of design. It requires a planned, conscious process to convert one product of design into another product of design.

Let's recall that pendulum clocks and electric clocks – as well as television sets, computers, communication satellites and so on – are products of design and purposeful activity. Chance and the mechanical laws of nature cannot possibly produce such things unaided. All living beings influence their environment in a way that cannot be described and explained physically. All forms of life are outlaws, because we consistently disobey the physical laws. Nobel Laureate Albert Szent-Gyorgyi wrote, "Life is a revolt against the statistical laws of physics. Death means that the revolt subsided, and the statistical laws resumed their sway". Scientists are the most notorious outlaws, for they always oppose the laws of nature that they are investigating. They lift weights to see how they fall, and they break apart atoms to investigate the forces that hold the atoms together.

Materialists say that we are just mechanical, physical mechanisms, but that does not make sense. Physical systems must necessarily follow physical laws, but we see that living beings, and especially human beings, and especially scientists, consistently oppose the laws of nature. They produce artificial objects, information and symbolic representation such as money, which physical systems cannot do. All-in-all, it is clear that living beings in general, and human beings in particular, are not just mechanical physical systems. Therefore, it does not make sense to say that physical interactions can transform one living form into another (any more than physical interactions will cause one kind of vehicle to evolve into another kind.) This means that the so-called theory of evolution is not only completely false; it does not even make sense. We can take the logic one step further. Since human beings are not just mechanical physical systems, no mechanistic theory whatever will ever account for their appearance and behaviour.

Actually, the whole program of trying to understand the origin and nature of life and the universe with the rational mind is completely futile. There must be mystery at the root of knowledge. Every system of objective knowledge depends on necessary conditions, and no system of objective knowledge can explain what it depends on. For example, arithmetic depends on numbers, but it does not explain what numbers are. Geometry depends on form, but geometry does not explain what form is.

Let us take an example. Suppose we look at an object through a telescope. What will we see? Naturally, we'll see the object. Will we see the whole telescope? No. Will we see the stand that supports the telescope? No. Will we see ourselves looking at the object through the telescope? No.

Similarly, suppose we look at an object through the medium of the objective, scientific method. What will we see? We will see the object. Will we see the objective, scientific process? No. Will we see the support and basis of the scientific process? No. Will the objective scientific process show us ourselves, the conscious subjects who are performing scientific activity? No.

All scientific knowledge depends on the scientist's ability to perceive the world, to act purposefully, to think logically, and to communicate his conclusions to others. Material science rests and depends on life and consciousness, so material scientists will never be able to explain life and consciousness in an objective, mechanistic way. Material scientists also depend on matter in their scientific investigations, for the scientists' body and instruments are all composed of matter with its own particular laws and properties. Consequently, material

science will never be able to explain objectively and mechanistically where matter has come from.

Scientists must necessarily describe and explain everything in terms of matter and consciousness. To describe the origin of life and matter, they would have to describe – in terms of matter and consciousness – a state in which there is no matter or consciousness. This is a contradiction in terms. It makes no more sense than trying to understand what an object looks like in pitch blackness.

Throughout the ages, materialists have tried to deny the mystery of life and the world in which we live. They have tried to explain the origin and the structure of the universe as a product of chance and the mechanical laws of nature. Material scientists are continuing this project today, but they have still not succeeded. They will never succeed, because their theories do not even make sense.

### **Self and Universal Self**

It is self-evident that we exist as conscious individuals, and the materialistic .

Our interest in spirituality is safe. It is rational to accept the relationship between consciousness (or spirit) and matter and to live in it, and it is irrational to deny it. On the one hand, the materialists will never prove that spirituality is just sentimentality. On the other hand, spirit or consciousness is a positive, self-evident and undeniable principle.