

Session 3.2 – The Borders of Reality
Metaphysics & Mystery online course
charleseisenstein.org/metaphysics

Charles Eisenstein: Lauren you had a bunch of more specific things? Are we getting to that or maybe we can take a break?

Lauren Buckley: We are getting to that soon. I just have a few. Yeah, if you have a little bit more...

C.E.: Yeah let's do a little bit more then take a break.

L.B.: Yeah I was thinking that too.

C.E.: OK

L.B.: A little more of this deeper and heavier stuff then we could take a break and come back to more specific stuff. So one thing I'm very curious about, and you alluded to it when you started talking about quantum mechanics, is if there is compelling science about the existence of a universal consciousness or who's studying that or what are interesting scientists or theories?

C.E.: I don't know. I haven't done a lot of reading on that for a while. I'm going to record a podcast with Brian Swimme, he's a cosmologist. Maybe I can take some of these questions to him. That might be interesting.

L.B.: A lot of people probably haven't thought about mainstream science as a religion and it may take decades to come to that realization. Mostly it was like life throwing me around that made me come to that realization. When I got a crazy sick and mainstream medicine made me sicker and failed to help. Can you talk a little bit about what would make science kind of a religion or more specifically, what givens is mainstream science operating on?

C.E.: Yeah, I have a whole section, it's most of a chapter I think in the climate book, about science as religion, which is not meant as a critique of science. It's not to say, "well science is just religion so it's bad" because that would be to take religion as science sees it as a term of critique, but if you can embrace religion as a valid path to knowledge then calling science a religion does not invalidate it. I would say that each religion has its own utility and its own resonance with civilization at a certain state and reveal certain things, the essence. It has like an esoteric core. The esoteric core, the primary virtue, what word could I say, its quintessence is humility says we don't know so we're going to ask. Other religions have that too, it's called divination. So science has its own divinatory procedure. It's called the experiment. It has its own metaphysical assumptions that are not explicitly recognized, but one of them is that there's an objective reality outside of ourselves. Another is that experiments are repeatable, that this reality does not change according to the question that you ask, but it's already out there. Another is that everything is measurable. These are not provable from within science, they are metaphysical teachings. Then there is a lot of other ways that science is like a religion especially like Catholicism or like an organized religion. It has a priesthood for example. It has initiation procedures to get to enter the priesthood. It has its own mystical language that is only comprehensible by people who have studied it and have been initiated into it. It has preachers who bring the gospel to the masses. It has

schisms. It has heretics. It has apostates who once believed and no longer believe. It has a system to indoctrinate youth. It wields political influence. It prescribes values and ethics and morals. It has an origin story just like a religion does. It has an account of the nature of life and what humans are here for. It's a pretty bleak one, but it has one. It has a system of ritual around it called technology. I think there's other things on the list that I don't recall right now, but wow! It really seems like a religion to me, but again that's not necessarily bad. It's the primary religion of our time and really is in just as much a state of crisis as all of our other defining institutions.

L.B.: I agree, it's not bad that it is like a religion in the same number of ways, but what's crazy is the lack of self-awareness about that.

C.E.: Yeah, but most religions have a lack of self-awareness about that. They think they are the truth. I mean that's another religious aspect of science; there is a path to truth. Most religions prescribe a path to truth. In science it's called the scientific method. Here's how you can find out anything, you do an experiment according to these principles and all will be revealed and this is the truth, not the other ones and they're all right.

L.B.: With righteous indignation.

C.E.: Yeah. I mean there's excommunication you know. Your funding gets cut off. I mean there's ways to maintain orthodoxy. I mean not anything new on this earth has the power to work miracles.

L.B.: Yeah, the excommunication. That makes me think of another question which is; do you have any knowledge or experience about cutting edge science being censored or prematurely rejected?

C.E.: Oh yeah, anything that doesn't fit into the zeitgeist gets cast aside and then sometimes when the zeitgeist has developed to a point where it's no longer inconsistent with it it gets resurrected. Lamarckian inheritance is an example of that. Ridiculed for a century or more and now, as a biologist confided in me, he said, "oh everyone's a Lamarckian now" because I advocated what I called neo-Lamarckism in the *Ascent of Humanity*, which I wrote in the early 2000s. If I approached a biologist I would be deliberately provocative, I'd be like, "yeah I'm a Lamarckian" and I would get eye rolls. I tried it again on this guy last year and he's like, "oh, big deal." Everyone's a Lamarckian now because of epigenetics, but it's more than epigenetics, it's genetics too. Acquired characteristics, as Lamar put it, can enter into the germline DNA and be inherited and this is routine actually. There's a book by James Shapiro that, in exhausting detail, explains all the mechanisms by the different enzymes that cut and clip and connect DNA together so yeah everyone's Lamarckian now. This is an example of something that was excluded because it didn't fit with the selfish gene competing with other selfish genes paradigm which fit into the zeitgeist like fit into capitalism. It fit into the money system as we had known it. This re-admittance of this heretical belief is significant way beyond biology, but for every one of those there's a thousand that have been excluded because they're just so flagrantly in violation of the dogmas and metaphysical teachings of science and I hesitate to mention these because that'll flag me as a conspiracy nut or ignoramus who's anti-science. Let's just say that I believe that much of scientific orthodoxy will be overturned someday. Not that science is self-correcting. I think it perpetuates error more than it self-corrects because of institutional confirmation bias of various kinds, publication bias and funding bias and paradigm protection and all that kind of stuff. I don't

know. Maybe I'll confess to one or two things like I don't believe in dark matter. I think that it's something they added in to make the equations work from a gravity centric cosmological theory that if you're going to exclude electromagnetism as a macro structuring force of the universe then you have to somehow account for the fact that galaxies don't fly apart given their observable mass. So that's something that I can articulate without sounding like a total nut job, but if I talk about free energy devices or something like that then I'm going to get some raised eyebrows and people are going to... well I just did it didn't I? People are going to begin to write me off. So let's say I don't believe any nonsense like that or psi phenomena, E.S.P., that kind of thing. Certainly don't think that the human mind could affect the results of a quantum random event generator. No, that would be impossible. Maybe I should shut up while I'm still ahead.

L.B.: Yeah, I was thinking I'm like I have so many questions I want to ask him about cold plasma.

C.E.: Yeah I mean I'm not an expert in these things though. I just like interface with them a little bit you know. I read a little bit about electric universe or whatever. I look at some of the alternative theories about water. That's a big one. Water as a carrier of information through its nano structure and micro structure and I'm like, "yeah, that seems really plausible" and it's not actually answered by Orthodox scientists. They just ignore it, which means whether it's true or false I can't really know that, I'm not really necessarily equipped, but it could be true and sometimes I would like it to be true and sometimes I am shown a device that I cannot explain from what is conventionally accepted as true. So when I have an experience that seems to fit a lot more into the heterodox view than the orthodox view, but I don't know, I really don't know. Maybe there is dark matter. Maybe water is just a structureless fluid. I don't know. I wish a lot more people would not know, that's what science is supposed to be about. Yeah. So in fact I would say I'm not anti-science at all, I'm pro-science. I would like science to be really taken seriously. I would like people to be devout in their religiosity of science and humble themselves even if it means letting go of an idea that you spent your whole career upholding. Sometimes I run into scientists who are willing to do that. Yeah, I was wrong for 20 years. I mean it comes down to that, the advancement of knowledge ultimately comes down to our personal willingness to put truth above anything else. If you have that, then any religion will carry you to new truth. If you do not have that, then any religion can be perverted into protecting your existing intellectual identity and worldview which is usually also, coincidentally enough, aligned with the interests of established power, political and economic power.

L.B.: Yeah, ironically that made me want to say Amen. (both laugh) That's like one of the deepest desires I have in life is for more people to say, "I don't know," to admit how much they don't know, maybe everything ultimately entered into, like you said, a devout way seek truth at all costs. Not being right.

C.E.: That's right and there are so many institutional and psychic pressures to be right. We're trained to be right. You get bonus points in school if you're right. You get funding if you're right. You get money if you're right. You get to prove of yourself if you're right. There's a lot of a lot of benefits to being right. So there's a lot to let go of if you want to actually learn more. The problem with the addiction to being right is in the end it makes you stupid, because you don't dare to think a new thought, because if it's a new thought, then it's different from the thoughts you've been having and that means you weren't really right. You end up in a ghetto of the mind, recycling the same thoughts over and over again and your brain then

gets rutted with these established pathways and you become stupid. So if you don't want that to happen you have to sacrifice being right and that can be humiliating sometimes.

L.B.: Should be required course for all scientists. (Laughs) This is going into the doctrine. (Laughs) Yeah, I don't want you to be assassinated or anything, but there's so many things I want to ask you.

C.E.: Uh huh.

L.B.: I know the answer to this, but if you have any stories of breakthrough technologies being silenced that you would be willing to share.

C.E.: Yeah, you know there's these, I call them shadow realities in which free energy researchers and alternative cancer researchers and people like that get assassinated and their research gets suppressed and the FBI comes and carts away their files or burns their research and destroys their devices and things like that. Whether these things actually happen or not there's a story in which they're happening and there's a story in which they're not happening. The more you investigate the reality in which they are happening the more confirmation you seem to get of that, but in a way you could say that, just to take free energy devices as an example, in a way they are not real. If reality is a relationship, if existence is a relationship as I said in the context of quantum mechanics, then you could say that they have not entered our collective reality. They are in a sense not real and people have had the experience of wanting to research these things encountering all kinds of hoaxes and frauds and devices that have other explanations. It's hard to pin down the proof and people promising, "oh I'm going to have a commercial version of this ready in two years" and then two years becomes five years and five years becomes ten years and was this guy just bringing all this investor money in and bilking the investors and like there's that also. I'm not a crusader who says, "oh, if we only accepted the reality of these things then the planet would be transformed." I think it's the opposite. It's when the planet is transformed then these will be able to enter reality. They are incompatible with the perceptual set that dominates today and in fact it would be a catastrophe if we had access to free energy devices. You could say that these devices have an intelligence, not individually so much, but the archetype of these devices, the being of these devices, has an intelligence. It's like look what happened with the last major upgrade in your ability to generate energy. It was called nuclear weapons. I don't think so. I'm not going to go there like you're not ready for me yet. I'm not going to be real yet. I'm only going to exist on the fringes of your reality. When you have entered a mentality of abundance and sharing and generosity and healing so that I know that I will not be misused, then I will come to you. That's one way to think of it, but also just that it doesn't fit. It can't be real because it so contradicts the scientific articulation of scarcity which is the second law of thermodynamics, you're always losing. Now there are theorists who say that these devices actually do not contradict the second law of thermodynamics and I don't want to go into those subtleties mostly because I don't remember exactly what the arguments are. I don't think I'm in danger of being assassinated because I'm not aligning myself with this oppositional energy that is trying to fight an existing reality to assert the reality of these things. What I would like to do is to influence the prevailing story and the prevailing state of being to bring it to a point where cancer cures and free energy devices and so many other technologies of reunion as I call them have a habitat. They are able to exist. We are not ready for them. The fact that they don't come in and can't come in is a sign of our unreadiness. We're not in that reality yet. Same thing with UFOs landing, they can't. They literally cannot intrude except, generally speaking, sometimes there's like a random breakthrough, but usually they're seen by two or

three people or a few unreliable witnesses. They don't land on the White House lawn. They can't. Now this is changing. They're able more and more to break through into a collective reality, but still not yet. Reality isn't what we thought it was. I could say a lot more about all these things. I mean part of even the way that UFOs move in the sky and their propulsion indicates that they are not in a Newtonian reality of conservation of energy and momentum. They move at sharp right angles in the sky generating infinite G forces if they are actually accelerating, so they're not. In a way they're the technologies that they use play with reality as we have formulated it, so it stands to reason that they would not be able to enter into what we call and hold as objective reality. Are we ready for a break?

L.B.: I was going to ask one more question.

C.E.: One more question, okay.

L.B.: I thought it would be a natural spot.

C.E.: All right.

L.B.: How much do you choose your perspective based on how it plays out in the real world? Like if it results in something beautiful or if it results in something disastrous.

C.E.: I mean I don't know the results of what I say and do usually until years afterwards. So it's more a matter of what feels satisfying and fun at the moment and accepting that as a guiding light because what else do I have to go by?

L.B.: That's true and I can also say that the story of separation, we see it playing out disastrously. When you say the more beautiful world our hearts know is possible, when you say Interbeing, though we have not lived a world of Interbeing, it seems like that would result in a much more beautiful actual.

C.E.: Yeah. So there's a there's a matter of prophecy here which is based on an understanding that words have a generative power. I was reading this... I think he's an economist. He's a French intellectual, talk about an archetype, French intellectual Jean-Pierre Dupuy, and he was speaking about economics and how economic expectations create a reality that justifies the expectations and that could say the pronouncements of the Fed about the economic outlook change the economic outlook. He spoke of prophetic speech as speech that creates the reality that it prophesizes. I think that most people have some kind of instinctive awareness that speech has that power, but to be able to use it effectively in that way is a rare skill. Some people have that skill. Certain entrepreneurs have that skill. They can say this is going to happen like Richard Branson. It's like oh yeah there's going to be an airline. I mean how many people say something's going to happen and it actually happens? Not very often, but there are certain people who have either instinctively or through some kind of cultivation have access to some of the generative power of speech. So that's in part what I'm doing here. I'm speaking a reality into existence by speaking the story; by saying a more beautiful world is possible. You can feel it in your heart on creating the reality that I'm saying, yet it's also the case that I'm not making it up. It has to, in a sense, already be true for me to speak it into existence. So there's a paradox here or to any mind that is accustomed to thinking in objective terms, there is a paradox. I see myself sometimes as a servant of this future, of this reality, of the story that has recruited me to speak it into existence. That's in an auto-poetic fashion. That's how realities are born. They bootstrap themselves into existence. They reach

into the present from the future to create the conditions from which they will be born. We can align with that. Our alignment with that brings it into existence, but in a sense it's already there. You cannot use that same technique to create a fantasy world. The story has to already be true. Truth and objective fact are two different things. It's a matter of coming into service and speaking into and from a true story, recognizing a true story. How do you recognize it? Maybe you have an experience of it like a little incursion of that future into the present that points to what's possible and that's how I know it's true. It's because I've been gifted with experiences or memories of the future. I think that if you want to recover this profound power, and I'm not saying that I'm especially highly developed in it, but I've gained some skill, if you want to recover this power of the magical quality of speech, the generative power of speech, the first step is to attune to the truth because the truth doesn't have to be like a pretty thing. Demagogues and dictators can speak realities into existence to. So there's also what truth? What future that already exists? There are coexisting futures. They're all there at the same time. Which one do you align with? The first step is to feel what's true, to recognize a true future as opposed to your projection and delusion and then ask, "is this what I want to serve?" That would be the elements of this particular technology of prophetic speech.

L.B.: I've never heard you articulate that that's part of your work, but it makes a lot of sense to me and I have a love of archetypes and studying.

C.E.: Right, you're a Jungian.

L.B.: Yeah, I love Carl Jung's stuff and yeah he's the original theories that led to Myers Briggs which I love as you know, but he also has the archetypes of the collective unconscious and there's a game Kyle and I made up where we figure out what somebody's primary and two supporting archetypes are at that time in their life. I was glancing through the cards one day and visionary just struck me so strongly as likely to be your primary archetype. It even has a description on there where it says, "the visionary has a tremendous ability to project or predict great distances into the future, but also that they usually have a surprising humbleness as though this vision was something gifted to them rather than like a talent or something earned."

C.E.: Right. Yeah it's gifted. True visions are not something that you invent.

L.B.: Tempted to share that with you later.

C.E.: Okay. Let's have a break okay?

L.B.: Yeah, very good.