

Second Philosophy

Led by	Shingles Fotherington / Dane Standing
Title	Scientific Pantheism
Date	25 January 2009

INTRODUCTION

Scientific Pantheism: Science and Pantheism – What is the difference?

The two central tenets of Scientific Pantheism are:

- 1) The Cosmos is Divine.
- 2) The Earth is Sacred.

When we say that the Universe is Divine we say it with as much conviction, emotion and commitment as when a believer says that their god is The God. But we are not making some vague statement about some invisible being that is beyond proof or disproof. We are talking about our own emotional responses to the Real Universe and the Natural Earth.

We claim that when theists worship gods they unknowingly worship the Universe. The dominant religions in the world claim their gods to be mysterious, awesome, all-powerful, omnipresent, infinite and eternal. The very qualities possessed by the Universe.

However, at this point, doesn't the Scientist scratch his head and say 'Why must the wonder and amazement at our discoveries be connected with anything spiritual?'

And at this point the Scientific Pantheist might reply, 'why is this a worry? Remember that the reverence I feel for the Universe is for something physical and provable by science.'

Still, the Scientist might object, saying 'Why must you use the term 'Spiritual', then?'

To which the Scientific Pantheist might shrug and say 'Well, why deny the very term which is most apt to describe your enthusiasm for existence?'

An exploration of the ways and whys that Scientific Pantheism and Science make themselves distinct, how those distinctions affect each side and even if that distinction is valid.

REFERENCE:

See Pastor Nitro's YouTube playlist on Scientific Pantheism:

<http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=HSHoPQmjG6w&feature=Playlist&p=41D0B625E5E1EBD1&index=0&playnext=1>

See Einstein's Religious views:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Einstein#Religious_views

<http://www.einsteinandreligion.com/>

Also see something about Materialism:

<http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~socappeal/ABCintro.html>

Second Philosophy

DISCUSSION:

Wichard: Why scientific pantheism rather than scientific theism?

Simulat: why any sort of theism rather than just secular?

Reflection: It seems Shing, that when you use words like divine and sacred, you unavoidable connect these newer conceptions to the ancient supernaturalist conventions and so make communication about the underlying idea very difficult, It seems as though it is better to stay with words like awe and wonder

Shingles: because there is no Deity, simply that the Universe is Divine, that Divinity is not personified in any other way than the Universe, so the Divinity resides in all things, Wichard

Bash: Divine in what sense?

Wichard: So "that which is" is " that which is" why posit theogeny?

Simulat: I agree Reflection - awe and wonder work for me

Shingles: Because, why cheapen ones love and reverence for all existence, Sim?

Bash: Divine like a God or like a really good pudding cup

Renald: Technically, "no deity" = atheism.

Shingles: Why not posit one, Wichard?

Sojourna: Is the difference between scientific pantheism and science the difference between attempting to reconcile age-old feelings of awe in the face of the divine with a scientific outlook (SP) and having an outlook that is purely scientific without any need for notions of the divine (S).

Gentle: is this so or does atheism mean no theism?

Wichard: Or to put another way, we have experiences with existence, but aren't too good at dealing with non-being

Wichard: non-existence

Simulat: It doesn't seem to cheapen it to me Shingles - and I've been listening to your reference to YouTube, and there is a certain sort of proseletysm going on there that makes me uncomfortable

Renald: Gentle, the theos in theism is deity.

Reflection: it seems as though we are talking about defining the spiritual awe that people have, in a different way, and attaching it to naturalistic science, which seems perfectly reasonable, but then we get side-tracked dealing with words like "deity" and atheism, which really don't seem to be relevant

Shingles: I'm sorry; could you explain the meaning of 'proseletysm', Sim?

Gentle: to preach or try and convert

Simulat: its trying to get converts to a religion

Shingles: well, yes, those videos were trying to do that

Wichard: I have no problem with awe and wonder, but see that as reflecting understanding of scale and complexity rather than a deity.

Simulat: saying to people with one faith - drop your present faith and take up this other faith

Renald: Reflection, I suppose even referring to this awe as spiritual is a problem, given the typical associations with "spirit," eh?

Shingles: Might I restate our first question:

1) What is the difference between Scientific Pantheism and Science?

Wichard: It seems that Sp is possibly a religion while science is a system of beliefs that requires testing

Reflection: sure, Ren, that is why we want to use words as carefully, in regard to past associations as possible. But the awe is real, and it is the same emotion which has been attached to religiosity in the past, so the contamination is difficult to completely avoid

Simulat: One of the things that seems good to me about secular is that it doesn't insist that everyone be in a group that has a strong doctrine - for I think that strong identification with doctrines have caused a lot of harm

Second Philosophy

Oswy: We did have a previous debate on the idea of the spiritual and we did feel that the sense of the spiritual could be seen as a kind of awe in face of nature. It didn't involve a deity.

Renald: Shingles, from the names, I would infer that the difference is that "Scientific Pantheism" takes a position regarding theism, whereas, to my knowledge, science itself does not.

Wichard: Perhaps "awe" is merely a chemical state of the brain???

Bash: It the difference between look up at the universe and realizing you are small or looking and feeling that you must have a very special place in it all. Belief in God is an ego trip.

Pun: Well, for starters, it would seem that one important difference is that science doesn't deal with judging, while, by what you said, one would conclude that the basis of SP is judgement, and that one is: the universe is divine, and the Earth is sacred.

Renald: Oswy, yes, that's why I asked :-)

Pun: Science tries coming to conclusions about how things work, while SP seems to deal with our attitude toward things.

Reflection: sure Wichard, it is a chemical state, what is the implications of that?

Gentle: actually Bash I have read that we humans are about a middle sized object in the universe

Shingles: Might I suggest that its a Recognition rather than an Assertion, Pun

Bash: :-)

Renald: Gentle, how could we NOT be? ;-)

Bash: Swiss Theology

Wichard: The we could study the physical conditions that produce "awe" scientifically, Ref

Oswy: Wichard the fact that it is chemical is quantitative awe is qualitative.

Gentle: is there a diff between scientism and SP?

Reflection: yes pun, I think that is right, sp is essentially about peoples' emotional connection to reality I think

Pun: Well, as one can come to 'recognition' that universe is an awful and dull place, as it seems, I wouldn't call it recognition.

Pun: Because one can 'recognize' opposing things about a single thing.

Wichard: Oswy, dosage is quantitative, the experience is qualitative. Or maybe digital???

Reflection: absolutely Wichard, and there is a huge literature about that already, but that's like saying you can study the making of music, which is entirely different humanly than actually making it, and the one is not a substitute for the other

Shingles: but as much as one can train ones mind to see the Divine in the physical things, one can also train ones mind to recognise those things as dull and mediocre, which is preferable, Pun?

Simulat: related to your question Shingles is - what is the difference between pantheism and SP?

Oswy: Wichard but there is a different feel to the two things that perhaps corresponds to the difference between science and awe

Pun: The first thing, if you ask me.

Renald: Shingles, it sounds to me, then, less a recognition than a recommendation.

Shingles: because SP only concerns itself with the provable and present physical Universe, Sim

Simulat: Does SP think that science proves things?

Shingles: but look at the Universe, isn't it fascinating? isn't it full of wondrous possibility, Renald?

Pun: Do you agree, then, that this attitude isn't a truth we find, but rather an attitude we choose?

Reflection: perhaps Ren, it is a statement that people do not have to give up their awe, in a "spiritual" sense to fully embrace naturalistic science

Wichard: "awe" is an aspect of experiences that may or may not relate to theism, I'm not seeing why theism should be considered in relation to awe about the universe.

Shingles: Yes, it does, it says that it is in science that we can know things, Sim

Renald: Ref, that would be a nice thing for it to mean.

Second Philosophy

Shingles: Question 2)

If it's an emotional validation, why doesn't Science provide that already?

Reflection: agreed Wichard, I'm not hearing that theism is part of this at all, who said anything about "God"?

Simulat: Shingles - it seems to me that science provides the best knowledge that we have, but that it advances, and that the reason it advances is that it doesn't offer proof

Renald: Agreed Ref, Wichard... it seems a pansomethingelseism, not sure what. Panhierism.

Wichard: And for me, emotion is part of the human existence that I don't want to abandon

Shingles: because if it feels like a spiritual experience, why would one be reluctant to the use of that term, Wichard?

Oswy: Perhaps Pan offers an aesthetic or imaginative dimension that science is not really concerned with.

Gentle: I think that there is a difference between reverence and awe

Marya: I think in reference to the awe that a person feels when observing the awesomeness of the universe, from a faith based position and from a science based position – that feeling of awe is different. One is based on ignorance (the mystery in the same sense of a child's awe) or faith and the other is based on some knowledge of how things work - because we are associating different meaning to it, it is a different sense of awe.

Wichard: I see spiritual as a vacuous term used in too many theocratic settings.

Simulat: I've spoken to a lot of people who get upset at science because it says now one thing, and then another thing - and they wonder how science can be trusted now if what it had proven to be right before is now replaced by another idea - but I seems to me that their mistake is to think in terms of proof

Shingles: precisely, science gives us the answers but no kind of emotional reassurance and affirmation, Oswy

Wichard: But the process of science leads to changes in our interpretations of realities.

Bash: It think we should not try and get stuck in the definitions and take one question at a time. Some of our brains are still warming up you know

Renald: Marya, I think you describe some possibilities accurately, but I also think things can break down along different lines.

Sojourna: Yes, I think Marya's distinction is important - religious awe is based on the idea that there is something mysterious in the universe that cannot be accounted for.

Oswy: Marya sometimes the scientific uncovering of complexity is the very thing that induces awe and wonder.

Marya: yes Oswy, I think so too

Reflection: Shingles, I think there are important differences in the way we perceive things scientifically, and the way we perceive things artistically, in art we use metaphors loosely for emotional impact, and know we are doing so, while in science we avoid this with as much rigor as possible. I think this is the problem you are bumping up against with science

Alaya: I don't see why we would have the need of an emotional reassurance, with science, they are not figure of parents, as the church plays, before, so paternalist isn't necessary

Marya: Science gives us truth Shingles, as best as we are able to know what that truth is in relation to what we 'know' about the universe - spirituality relates far more to our own personal egos - that truth is not personal and does not appeal to our ego - it has a purity to it that a spiritual based approach does not have, to my mind.

Gentle: science needs to be falsifiable - religions needs not to be

Bash: I don't you can even say "we" perceive science one way or the other. Science to most just is, there is a smaller group that are in awe of science.

Shingles: but, and I think I can answer Marya's point too, it is stages in the history of our knowledge, we began ignorant and have grown and learned and learned, and now we have enough knowledge to have grand faith and reverence in that knowledge, so I personally see that is neither that distinction Marya made, or a problem with trusting science, Sim and Marya

Oswy: Soj, isn't it our fate that there will always be something seemingly mysterious about the universe?

Shingles: remember Scientific Pantheism fully embraces science

Patrick: Sim, I think those that get upset with the changing position of science fail to realize it is evolving and that it is a process not an answer

Second Philosophy

Renald: Marya, I would say rather that the spiritual is human rather than merely natural -- and that can be private or shared.

Shingles: I don't see where the involvement of the ego has come from, is that how you view that awe and reverence for existence, Marya?

Wichard: Certainly wonder in the sense of an inquiring mind is necessary to doing science

Alaya: the mediatisation of discovery of some level of science labs are made to fit the pantheist expectation, and well as some others are made to fit some others religious expectation, so I see 2 different schools there, but only one field that serves the palate differently, so to speak

Simulat: I agree Patrick - science gives us useful and pretty reliable knowledge - but it doesn't give us the Truth

Marya: yes Shingles, it is true that we are growing and learning - but I feel that there is a deeper and fuller kind of awe associated with being in awe of the universe from a knowledge base rather than a spiritual base

Sojourna: Oswy - maybe - but it isn't everyone's fate to fill the mystery with God.

Renald: Marya... that's a personal preference, though.

Shingles: Ah, but, Science works through Hypothesis, Experiment, Observation. How is not in hypotheticals, Reflection?

Oswy: Soj, well you can. But I see that as a failing a sort of lack of imagination. I prefer to see the whole investigation as a quest with marvels on the way.

Sojourna: Oswy - I agree

Shingles: Surely the only distinction that is made there is that from a 'spiritual base' would be referencing something outside of existence, whereas from a 'knowledge base' it is based within existence, Marya

Reflection: Marya, would that mean that awe associated with a knowledge base is greater than an awe associated with an artistic base? I think one of the purposes of art is to heighten emotional attachment to some concept, and what Shing is talking about is, in my view, attaching artistic levels of emotional engagement to concepts which are scientific

Renald: Let's remember, despite the term pantheism, Shingles isn't talking about God.

Marya: Shingles, our ego comes into it because approaching it from a spiritual perspective, that is approaching it from a 'me' perspective - 'my' place in the universe, how it relates to 'me' - what it means to 'me', as Ren said, personal preference :) But, when you recognise the universe for what it is (as far as science tells us away from spirituality), there is no 'me' in that - the universe will do just fine without 'me' in it and could care a less about 'me' - it is what it is irrelevant of what I think of it.

Alaya: spiritual materialism, is not the same as the physical spiritualism... on tend to be outside of the experimentation of the science as in art, indeed, and the other is more fitting the QM (quantum mechanics) tendencies of religion comparison with the invisible part

Shingles: but of course there is no 'me', you and I are parts of the Universe, Marya

Bash: AHH shingles there is the catch

Bash: What PART of the universe are you... there is the ego

Alaya: that doesn't make anything disappear Shingles

Pun: Well, if we are parts of the universe, all of us are still various 'me'-s, no?

Gentle: we are each modalities

Marya: I think so Ref yes, I think it is a more complete sense of awe - a more truthful thing that does raise emotions, because it does have a purity to it - the hard cold truth of how things work irrelevant of any of us - that is a humbling experience I think

Shingles: I fail to see that, only that my consciousness at present, is related to this specific body, Bash

Alaya: the spiritual materialisation of the self it is

Renald: Marya, Shingles... what I meant was that we cannot feel another's awe directly any more than we can feel another's pain. For me to say that mine is deeper or fuller just because of what I think it's based on is groundless.

Pun: I'm not disputing that all of us are parts of the universe. I fully agree with that. However, I don't think it leads to the conclusion that there's no 'me'.

Alaya: Renald, yes we can

Second Philosophy

Bash: Are you a minor collection of amino acids on a tiny rock or are you a major player in the grand scheme?

Reflection: Marya, I think for human beings there must always be a relationship to reality, there will always be ego (goodness knows most atheists have a fairly prominent one), we are really talking about the degree of emotional engagement in that sense of relationship, and a strong statement that there is a meaningful relationship

Marya: It isn't groundless Ren, sure, I don't know how you feel, but I do know how I once felt before becoming an atheist, to how I feel now

Shingles: I must disagree; Science has more grounding than Angels for example, Renald

Renald: Marya... the same words are used by all converts -- and I say that with deep respect.

Shingles: I am a part of the Universe, and that knowledge is grand and all answering, Bash

Oswy: Ref Why should we not attach aesthetics to our understanding of the universe or have that response to it?

Marya: I don't understand what you mean Ren? Which words?

Renald: Shingles, I'm not talking about angels, I'm talking about my awe, and yours, and anyone else's.

Alaya: I'm not sure that he angels theories is less grounded, but more distorted, as the spirit of a vine or a flower is really a substance that was meant to be invisible, and says so... in the past before translation Shingles

Wichard: Angels? Angels depend on the system within which one is working.

Renald: "I do know how I once felt before becoming an atheist, to how I feel now"

Shingles: and it is all of equal worth, what I'm worried for is if people will attach such awe to something non-physical or dogmatized, Renald

Renald: Shingles, why does it worry you?

Marya: Ren, so I'm saying the same thing as a lot of other atheists?

Pun: Okay. I guess it wasn't from SL. Let's move on.

Reflection: Oswy, I am saying we should attach our aesthetics to that understanding, and I really view sp as taking an artistic view of science

Oswy: Ref right we agree on that.

Renald: Marya, sentences of similar structure and portent are stated by people who have found an attitude or position that works for them. But I'm most used to hearing it from the born again.

Shingles: because in the first instance it prevents one from contacting and connecting to the physical Universe in its wonder, and second much harm has done in the name of any particular God, Ren

Reflection: I think so Oswy

Shingles: Question 3)

What different 'commandments' do Science and Scientific Pantheism have?

Oswy: Shingles On listening to the videos I was struck that this sort of thing had happened before ie the Romantics wordsworth etc. Not Alaskas but the Lake District. They had the same awe about nature and its force.

Renald: Shingles... I don't think either of those follow of necessity, but we're moving on.

Marya: Ahhhh, I see what you mean - well, not much I can say to that I suppose - except that what I feel is based on what I perceive to be the truth - not a story or a belief system per se ... the truth of what we 'know' about how the universe works - so in that sense, it is more pure to me, Ren

Alaya: also alchemy was differently translated, so to speak, not even understood, but, the transformation of human substance as in a relation of couple, with the invisible part, as an alchemy is still now accepted as real,, but wasn't taken as this before, we know hormones and others substance...that are

Shingles: Yes, but Wordsworth is awfully glum, to be a practising Scientific Pantheist is a wonderful experience, Oswy

Oswy: Shingles Science says discover. Pan says reflect and unify and be humble.

Renald: Marya, I understand what you mean and meant. I'm just saying that others mean the same, they just have something else to base it on. But I would no more tell them they are wrong, than I would tell them their aches don't really hurt.

Shingles: I don't think it says be humble, far from it, Oswy

Second Philosophy

Pun: For science, I guess those would be clarity, consistency, completeness, constant validity...

Oswy: Wordsworth Shelly Coleridge and Keats . Not so glum all the time?

Alaya: truth before translation, was meaning in Hellenistic Greece, un veiled...so all unveiled things , are not describe before and after further investigation as the same

Shingles: maybe its just my own taste, but I find Wordsworth doleful

Oswy: Shingles Humble in the sense that you should control your hubris that you can discover everything or explain everything.

Sojourna: Shingles might be right on the humble point, Oswy - unless we see Einstein as humble - and he said he believes in Spinoza's God according to the Wikipedia entry Shingles linked to.

Shingles: I would articulate those three into the more succinct commandment 'flow', Oswy

Patrick: If I read Dawkins' The God Delusion will I find an operational definition of scientific pantheism?

Alaya: we don't discover all in the same time, so tis normal that things stay in a certain way for certain person and things are not seen as they were even for the same person later on

Bash: People find religion because they want to be part of God, go into science because they want to be God, and philosophy because they want think like God.

Pun: To me, it seems that science strives to explain -all- phenomena in the universe in a clear way that isn't open to much subjectivity in interpretation, and in such a way that all phenomena are seen as interconnected.

Shingles: I disagree strongly, Bash

Bash: ;-)

Gentle: I don't think God is always involved Bash

Marya: Ren, I didn't say they were 'wrong' - I said that the experience of awe was different :)

Oswy: Soj Shingles. I made the point against the sense of scientific reductionism that we have debated before. Scientists who say none can come to the way of knowledge except by me Science.

Simulat: Oswy - I don't think we will ever know everything, but is it hubris to strive to answer for any question that comes up, and to have hope that the answer can be found?

Pun: Also, less is more works for science, it seems. It's good if we have as few laws as possible to explain - everything-; preferably only one single law, but that might be impossible to achieve.

Reflection: Shingles, I think that accurate awe before the universe necessitates an accurate judgement of how small a part of the cosmos we are, so the opposite of a geocentric, or homocentric worldview, and in that sense appropriately humble

Gentle: we can always have hope and strive to answer

Bash: No, God should not be part of it

Renald: Marya, "wrong" was an over-statement on my part. But you did imply inferior -- shallower, impure, etc.

Alaya: subjectivity will always be part of the observation since the subject do the observation, but partiality is different there and in this I see much differences between materialistic science and the science

Oswy: Sim I would not deny that but there are many ways to knowledge beside the valuable third person discovery of facts.

Shingles: yes, but the very word humility implies a bowing of your head, whereas one should raise ones head and be excellent, Reflection

Marya: Ref, about what you said earlier about a meaningful relationship - I think there is a meaningful relationship there yes, and it is a 'different' sort of relationship in my experience

Alaya: once include the subject with all the spiritual part, the other tend to put all on a so called objective view." as if object are separated from a system ,a full universe

Shingles: question 4)

Why is the idea of Physical Spiritualism so controversial for scientists?

Second Philosophy

Marya: Yes, I did imply it was not the same - that the experience from a 'realist' perspective, was more complete and in a sense, more pure - I cannot really demonstrate that though - since it is, as you mentioned earlier, a personal experience - I can only try to explain :]

Bash: What is Physical Spiritualism ?

Reflection: hahahaha Shingles, perhaps I can be excellent in my humility :))

Renald: Shingles, is it a principle of SciPan that there is ultimately a scientific explanation for everything? Because that would go along way toward clarifying this business of humility.

Reflection: actually, Shing, no one in my RL would accuse me, or exalt me in that fashion:))

Gentle: well because it seems a contradiction in terms. It implies two kinds of substance - physical and spiritual

Shingles: perhaps, but I claim the word 'humble' is unnecessary, Reflection

Simulat: Oswy - I'm open to the possibility that there are ways besides science that can provide knowledge, but though I've asked many people what those ways might be, nobody has ever answered me

Shingles: There is only one substance, Gentle

Gentle: I agree

Oswy: Shingles having spent hundreds of years combating the prejudice of the religious you can't expect scientists to welcome the term spiritual with open arms.

Pun: Alaya: The problem is that often, when many people hear one statement, and talk to them about how they understood what was said, you'll get many opposing opinions. Science tries not to create a multitude of fundamentally different opinions by its statements. It strives to create compatible opinions in the heads of scientists about a single thing.

Shingles: Well, I think that's a little churlish, Oswy

Alaya: gentle, there isn't contradiction between them but for the objective science they are separate and opposite, in a dual interpretation. As wet and dry are.. For them

Gentle: heterodoxy versus orthodoxy Pun

Bash: I'll answer you Sim, but that is another discussion and would be a good too

Renald: Allergic memitis... a generalized problem.

Pun: I guess so.

Shingles: I suppose it does think science may explain everything, yes, Renald

Simulat: cool Bash

Reflection: shingles, I think humility is essential for human beings seeking reality, we too readily believe that our perspectives are sacrosanct, so I'm not aware of a philosophical tradition that doesn't prize accurate humility

Gentle: but there is no spiritual substance Alaya

Bash: I totally agree Ref

Reflection: sim, art is a different way of finding knowledge!

Shingles: might I suggest 'Fallibilism' instead of 'humility', then, Reflection?

Pun: Maharishi believed, it seems, that matter was made of consciousness.

Alaya: pun yes some do try to talk this way but with much partiality in fact, so is the difference between being objective and partial, they are objective

Bash: Ref gets the monkey for that :-)

Oswy: Shingles, why churlish. The religious are always trying to smiggle in the deity by the back door. The god of the gaps, Intelligent design etc. Scientists are rightly on alert.

Renald Starostin counts exclamations.

Oswy: Smuggle as well as smiggle.

Simulat: Reflection - art may provide insight, but it takes science to show whether the insight is knowledge or a mistake

Alaya: Pun but in fact they should integrate more subjectivity

Shingles: but us SPs are not attempting to insert a God, we simply worship and revere the truth and all that exists, Oswy

Reflection: sure Shingles, Fallibilism sounds good:)) (a little clunky, but ok:))

Alaya: therefore recognise the partiality of their approach

Second Philosophy

Renald: Sim, Ref, the question is whether there is more than one kind of knowledge.

Gentle: worship the truth or the pursuit of it?

Pun: Alaya: I think it's difficult to find truth by allowing yourself to be subjective in your quest for truth.

Shingles: yes, that's a very good question, Renald

Oswy: Sim Try Davidson on the issue of Consciousness. But that is a different debate. on the issue of what science can explain.

Pun: If you're objective, there's much more room for rationality and consistency.

Renald: That's one kind of knowledge, yes

Simulat: OK - maybe I have knowledge of my own tastes that aren't verifiable by science

Alaya: Pun, the subject we are is include it, don't you think so, and nothing wrong with it, since there is no separation of the nature of human and the rest... so its ok to see partiality as the part of the picture of the observation of the full picture , never forget the observer

Gentle: Socrates' definition of Knowledge is simple: justified, true, belief

Reflection: Sim, I think knowledge involves understanding the pattern of things and not just the data points, and art often enlightens about the pattern of things, long before there is any test of things. Good book lately Proust was a neuroscientist.

Shingles: Knowing that you love your life-partner (or not) seems a very different kind of knowledge to the knowing by rote, Renald

Oswy: Shingles I am not saying you are but to many that is a very revolutionary idea. Its one I have some sympathy with. But for the typical Joe Scientists and Jolene you can understand why they might be suspicious.

Gentle: I agree with this Reflection ie Proust a neuroscientist

Renald: Indeed, Shing. My persistent impression is that there is more than one kind.

Bash: I think Ref gets the cognitive cookie for today

Wichard: so is religious knowledge different from scientific knowledge?

Shingles: would the example of 'Love' qualify as knowledge though? or is there a more appropriate term, Renald?

Wichard: How so? Why? That might get at the heart of this discussion.

Gentle: there is no religious knowledge, just belief and faith

Alaya: shingles knowing it is inclusion...of the inner aspect of the full picture seen by the observer.

Bash: Good question Wichard, I would say yes and no

Oswy: Shingles I would like to open a different lien of criticism of Pan that is related. The videos spoke eloquently about diversity and environment and nature. They seemed to be saying our greatest task is to preserve these. This clashes with the idea that I think many scientists have that we should master nature for our mutual benefit. Are they not rightly suspicious of Pan as just tree hugging?

Chico: Religion is about belief and not about knowledge.

Bash: If you are referring to Religious knowledge as in spiritual reference

Alaya: Wichard can we say psycho science...and not religious one

Wichard: But we "know" about religions in the same way we "know" about places that we haven't visited or scientific theories that we haven't verified.

Shingles: it traditionally is, but Scientific Pantheism dissolves that difference, Wichard

Pun: Well, Alaya, I'd say that of course there's separation. I -am- different than anyone else. Of course, we are all connected, but we are different. And yes, we are a part of the universe which we are exploring, and our own minds are a part of this universe. However, it's not practical to be 'subjective' in science in strict sense. We can't allow our whims, for instance, to affect our reasoning. On the other hand, we can take subjectivity in the broader sense, and I guess we're -always- subjective, if the meaning of that word is taken in the broader sense.

Renald: Shingles, that's a good question, too. I'm always in favor of appropriate terms. Of course, "knowledge" has much prestige... there will be many claims to it.

Bash: Religious Knowledge is an Oxymoron :-)

Gentle: not in the same way Wichard

Shingles: or a juxtaposition, Bash

Second Philosophy

Alaya: Pun, indeed, I also meant that

Pun nods.

Chico: only scientific theories which are verified constitute a contribution to knowledge

Bash: Spiritual Knowledge and Scientific knowledge are different but in the same pursuit and both as valid as the other

Oswy: In a sense Pan seems to be just fashionable Environmentalism

Gentle: I know of New York but have never been there but can go there to test if what I know is true. I can't do this with theological ideas

Chico: ...only of you redefine the word "knowledge"....

Wichard: Chico, would you accept scientific knowledge as a qualifier for your statement?

Alaya: ok then Bash, we can go back to the expression, of the past, and fuse science with the human spiritual nature, so we can reuse wisdom

Shingles: surely only that which can be readily known by all can be knowledge and that which cannot is not? Is that right, Ren & Bash?

Reflection: it does seem to be true Oswy that as soon as we make the emotional experience of awe primary, dogma seems to very easily attach, as in the sanctity of ecological conservation vs. Its defense as a good concept with pros and cons

Renald: All, I'd be happy to narrow the scope of what can be considered "knowledge" -- it may be overdue to be taken down a few pegs. :-)

Bash: Science and spirituality are the same thing, humans trying to understand themselves and their place

Gentle: I don't agree Bash

Shingles: really, now, spiritualism is never fashionable amongst you stern Western Philosopher types, Oswy, Ref

Bash: I have a quote from God... hold on I will find it

Gentle: hehe

Renald: "Hold my calls."

Chico: besides "scientific knowledge", which means evidence-based knowledge - what other kind of knowledge is there supposed to be on the market?

Alaya: knowledge is expression an objectable nature , but wisdom seem to include a human sensitive aspect,, more invisible than the objectable world we can see with the eyes

Wichard: But with science I can build and test things and they work like this interaction we're having through our computers which are not spiritual machines.

Alaya: wisdom ;)

Wichard: Unless electricity is spiritual!

Bash: Here is a question I asked God in an interview I did a few years back

Bash: Which is correct science or religion? Both are correct! This question comes from the misuse and misunderstanding of both. Sciences purpose is to explain how the physical world works. Religion relates to faith and spirituality. All too often science and religion have been used to dispel each other, when in fact they should function as one. Someday you will see how your spirituality and the physical world are intertwined and just how much influence one has on the other, it is all part of the evolution.

Shingles: wisdom, excellent, Alaya :)

Marya: That's a good question Chico ... I'd be interested in the answer to that one...

Alaya: its is spiritual, the polarity are not visible but only the effects, Wichard

Renald: Shing, Chico, Wichard, etc... If that and only that is knowledge, then there is indeed one kind. But it's a small thing, for all its greatness. Time then, to raise the reputation of "ideas" and "feelings"

Gentle: my foot is physical but what oh what is spiritual?

Shingles: or if spiritual energy is present, it is explainable by science, Wichard

Wichard: I think scientific knowledge and religious knowledge are very different systems with different rules and validation processes.

Second Philosophy

Oswy: Shingles Spirituality is popular amongst the environmentalist factions. Many scientists will be suspicious of the more far fetched elements of the environmental lobby. Greenpeace for example.

Bash: You must be careful of mixing religious with spirituality. They are not the same

Gentle: what is spirit?

Renald: Attitude

Bash: Religion is designed to squash knowledge not provide it

Wichard: There's electricity flowing through your foot, Gentle

Renald: Not always

Shingles: yes, I personally am not sure of the second tenet of SP, that the Earth is Sacred, Oswy

Gentle: yes... electricity

Reflection: well, Chico, we would have to admit that there is not a paradigmatic understanding (or knowledge) in the social sciences, and yet there are vast domains of folk and common knowledge about how to live well as a human being, and much of this is encoded still, only in the teachings of ancient religious texts and practices

Wichard: Yes, Ren, always, if it's composed of atoms.

Alaya: Bash before they were suppose to be related , by the content , but in fact , I completely recognise that its not

Renald: Sorry, Wichard, that was for Bash.

Oswy: Isn't Pan just attaching itself to two very fashionable ideas Atheism and Environmentalism? It is blending the two into a new sort of Quasi religion.

Shingles: Maybe not 'ideas' and 'feelings' as they are weak terms, instead could we talk of Inspirations and Intuitions, Renald?

Renald: Ah, Shing, why are they weak terms?

Shingles: for Scientists they are

Bash: Nothing is always one way or another

Patrick: I think the danger with scientific knowledge is we often consider it irrefutable as believers do the scriptures. Scientific knowledge is only as reliable as the latest technology and assumptions from which the scientist begins.

Gentle: I don't think good science does this Patrick

Shingles: why can it not be considered as a new and independent way of life, Oswy?

Renald: Shing, scientists qua scientists are rightly indifferent to ideas and feelings, except to the degree they can be measured.

Seaplane: may I ask whether pantheism shares in the pesky theodicy problem that plagues other theologies?

Wichard: And, Patrick, the latest version of a theory will be the lens for interpreting the data and providing the "scientific" explanation.

Alaya: Oswy, Pan was inspire an in awe most of the time...by the wisdom and greatness of the universe so he could include his partiality in it too and music came out as a very objective affirmation preventing it to be misinterpreted as partial

Renald: Sea, no. It avoids that, usually.

Shingles: there is no dogma in Scientific Pantheism, Seaplane

Renald: Well, pantheism generally, I can't speak for Shingles' atheist pantheism.

Oswy: Shingles My objection is that it reifies the `natural`. The natural is not so hot

Shingles: 'Scientific', if you please, Renald

Alaya: Oswy just a little pan picture there:)

Bash: Everything starts out a good idea. I see the stars and feel awe, I tell others. We ponder our place in it all, some feel we are tiny and find wonder in that, others feel we are special and see God in the stars. Of those some use this God to do good and others use it to control.

Seaplane: why then the emotion of awe? Some the universe is cruel, even ugly ... wouldn't fear or loathing be equally valid?

Renald: Shingles, the term has a technical problem, that's all. You said SciPan has no deity.

Shingles: why isn't the natural wonderful, Oswy?

Second Philosophy

Alaya: no deity or ...replace by authority figure....

Bash: The problem I see in many of these discussions is that we try and say "we" feel or we are when really "we" are all very different and there is not one way or right way was long as the direction is to understanding

Gentle: wonder leads to exploration leads to know environs leads to new food sources leads to magnificent continuation of the species

Wichard: and since the "devil is in the details", science, which deals with details, must be devil worship!

Reflection: sure Seaplane, I think you can be in awe of the supernova that destroys worlds

Oswy: Shingles Nature is Red in Tooth and Claw. As someone has said it can be cruel. Evolution is impersonal and cruel. Viruses are harmful etc. You could argue we have to master nature not venerate it.

Renald: Yeah... awe is neutral.

Seaplane: hard to worship cruelty, seems to me

Shingles: and I think the Human Being has a certain appreciation for the cruel and destructive, myself, Reflection

Bash: I think it is easy to worship cruelty

Renald: Only humanity is cruel.

Bash: Fear is power; Fear is simple to understand.

Alaya: cruelty is only a result, not a nature

Reflection: sea, cruelty is a human characteristic, not one of the cosmos, we don't like it because it is destructive to human corporate processes, I think. The predations of nature are not cruel

Simulat: I'd say that maybe only humanity knows that it is cruel Renald

Renald: I think so, Alaya, yes.

Wichard: Isn't Shiva the creator and destroyer in Hindu theology?

Pun: It seems to me we can't fully master nature. I think the best thing we can do is being in harmony with it - trying to work with it to our own benefit; sometimes yielding to it, and sometimes dictating things.

Patrick: I think Marya had the clue to why we use awe as our operational term. The scientist quickly realizes his/her existence has little to do with is being observed, measured, and predicted.

Gentle: I agree Sim - only humans tell themselves that they are cruel

Pun: It's the destroyer.

Alaya: who saw the dance of Shiva & Wichard

Pun: IIRC; the creator is called Brahma.

Oswy: All I don't want to live in unmediated nature, uncontrolled nature. I certainly don't want to return to a state of nature. Or worship it. I respect nature I don't have to worship it.

Shingles: that is awful, really, Oswy. If nature itself is partly cruel, surely we, as beings within nature, should revere not only our natural kindness but our natural cruelty too, we mustn't attempt to control Nature, Nature is far better at it than us, Oswy

Marya: agreed Oswy, respecting nature does not imply worship

Alaya: Pun... Brahman has not been a morphic deity; it's not even a substance

Pun: IIRC, there's a difference between Brahma and Brahman.

Gentle: worship is a religious idea based upon our separation from the divine

Bash: Is there cruelty or just what we perceive as cruel

Marya: Pun, what is IIRC?

Renald: Hinduism, so-called, is highly varied. You could assign almost any role to any deity, and it would be or have been true to someone somewhere.

Simulat: I agree with Oswy - humanity strives to escape the cruelty of the natural state

Pun nods to Oswy, "I think I share your sentiment."

Bash: Is a cat playing with a mouse cruel or just nature

Gentle: can u describe a non perception Bash?

Pun: IIRC is the abbreviation for 'If I reckon correctly'.

Alaya: yes allegory has too many variables in Hinduism

Marya: (thx Pun)

Second Philosophy

Renald: Bash, when cat's can talk to us, or we can listen, perhaps we'll know. Till then...

Alaya: as much as there is language in India

Renald: Pun, more often the R is for "recall"

Shingles: this is ridiculous! All of are cruel, we just have some fool notion that that's something we should cover up or deny! We should not deny Life in whatever aspect it is in us, all of us

Patrick: here, here, Ren well said

Bash: The point is, is what we do to each other really cruel or just nature? We are animals and territorial

Pun: If I remember correctly, actually. My bad.

Reflection: we call the cat cruel because of anthropomorphism, putting ourselves into the cat, probably the cat is just practicing its "catching" skills, which is simple survival

Marya: noted & thx Ren and Pun

Alaya: we cannot deny any aspect for sure Shingles...

Oswy: In the UK we venerate the Lake District the home of the romantics. Some see it as natural. In fact it is human made and generated. We respect the mountains and the natural forces. But they can still kill and there is nothing there to be venerated. Respected yes I wouldn't want them to be turned into a housing estate but lets not get too carried away with nature and its goodness.

Gentle: I think you are getting at the nub Shingles, it is not cruelty that is problematic when looking at a cat with a mouse but the ethical judgements we can draw

Alaya: but some aspect are movement of things ,only temporary appearances , as with water and ice, transition appearances

Pun: Sorry, I thought reckon, recall and remember can mean the same thing, for some reason. Works for the latter two, but it doesn't work for the first one, as I've just learned.

Renald: Bash, my definition of cruelty is the intentional causation of suffering in another. This can only apply to humanity, because we can't judge intent, if any, as well outside it.

Simulat: Shingles - it's not a matter of denial - but is a thing that most of try not to do - that is, we try not to be cruel

Alaya: Shingles but some aspect is movement of things, only temporary appearances, as with water and ice, transition appearances

Pun: (English isn't my native tongue, so I make mistakes)

Chico: Ref. if you speak about "common knowledge" that is encoded in ancient religious texts, and that people live according to this, this doesn't mean that the religious texts constitute knowledge - it just means that people use those texts as guidance

Bash: Exactly Ren :-)

Shingles: why, if something contains one bad quality do you turn yourself from it? Do you seek only things with good qualities? Your search will find nothing with that condition, Oswy

Oswy: Shingles I don't deny we are cruel as a historian I am well away of that . Its why I think we should be controlled.

Alaya: the things is that with science, they take the appearances, the transitional aspect as a things, which in the realm of spiritual materialistic they don't

Patrick: Sim, is not being cruel a luxury we enjoy because of our frontal cortex

Reflection: Chico, I would call rubrics that work knowledge, so before there was any science there was pragmatic assessment of what works, and doesn't, that is the kind of knowledge that still most people rely on in their lives and not scientifically based knowledge

Renald: What difference does it make?

Shingles: but we are by our very nature as social animals controlled by competing with our peers. The control is already present and operational, Oswy

Bash: Then I ask, since we can judge intent based on ethics then are we not just simply fighting our nature to do these things?

Pun: Okay, Wikipedia agrees with me. Brahma is the god of creation, while Brahman is the supreme cosmic spirit.

Second Philosophy

Oswy: Shingles I want to master some of the worse aspects of nature. I still realize taht I ahve to respect its complexity to at the same time.

Renald: Bash, what nature? Do what things?

Renald: Pun... it's more complex than that, as Wiki articles acknowledge if you read enough of them.

Alaya: Pun, I didn't find the same in the other language of the wiki translation; check that

Bash: To do the things that are cruel. To intentionally harm others because of natural inclinations, such as protecting territory

Chico: But "pragmatic assessment of what works" is evidence-based. Scientific knowledge is just more formal and as more degree of explanatory power....

Pun: What language should I check?

Reflection: correct Chico, I agree, and science is only a very small part of natural empiricism

Renald: Bash, ok. For me, whatever we do is in our nature. Therefore avoiding cruelty is as much as engaging in it.

Simulat: Patrick - we are cruel unavoidably sometimes, and there are people who like being cruel - and I guess all that we do depends on our brains

Oswy: Shingles, if we carried our veneration of nature to the ultimate then humans would return to a state of nature. The optimistic would say this is a state of tranquil innocence. I think rather it would be a state of life brutish and short a la Hobbes. I see no reason to raise nature on a pedestal of veneration.

Alaya: pun I'll check one moment

Reflection: actually Chico, I would suggest that traditional religions are repositories of cultural empiricism gained over millennia

Pun: Anyway, I think the English (and Hindu even more so) version of the article is most likely to be correct, as English has most speakers on the internet, and the article is most likely to be kept correct.

Shingles: its quite amusing how we the cruelty creeps in and we don't recognise it to ourselves and still enjoy the cruelty. Its endless amusement, for me, Oswy

Bash: And that Ren, I believe is what we call "the spirit" and the root of spirituality. Our internal conflict with nature.

Gentle: I don't agree with this Oswy. It would seem to me, with hindsight, that it has only been natural to develop as we have

Renald: Oswy... we are in our state of nature... we can't escape, to claim that would be to claim something beyond nature. ;-)

Alaya: Pun , I check in French, and they say it cannot be defined, only by what it isn't, so it isn't any object at all

Renald: Bash, I don't see it as a conflict with nature.

Pun: The English version of the article has a picture of a statue of Brahma.

Shingles: I disagree, I think that if we respect nature ultimately we respect our own nature ultimately also. Our nature is an inventive animal, to return to a state of nature therefore, would be backward, Oswy

Pun: <http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trimurti>

Bash: If you have to make a choice there is conflict.

Renald: Of course... but that conflict is itself natural. For us.

Bash: :-)

Alaya: Pun, it's a very different version on is maybe traditionalist materialist and the other might be a more Shivaist version

Oswy: Gentle/Ren, yes we have emerged into a state of civilization. I am for civilization the antithesis of nature. I repeat shingles I am not denying the cruelty of humans and the savagery of their uncontrolled nature. I want more control. I do not want to return to a state of nature the idealised world of some philosophers. I want to manage nature in a respectful way.

Bash: that conflict is spirituality

Alaya: Pun, in India there are as many version as there are language

Second Philosophy

Pun: The article on Brahma, however, says what you've mentioned: *Brahmâ est très souvent appelé "l'incommensurable"*

Bash: Which is why we believe animals have no spirit

Shingles: Then I repeat also: I think that if we respect nature ultimately we respect our own nature ultimately also. Our nature is an inventive animal, to return to a state of nature therefore, would be backward, Oswy

Reflection: Shingles, the state of our brain, however, is Neolithic (according to evolutionary psychology) and so does not fit well with the machine of civilization, so to return to our nature would mean returning to a hunter-gatherer society and technology (or to have chaos in civilization)

Renald: Bash, that's an interesting way of framing it. For me, spirituality is the aesthetics of attachment. And until I can have a conversation with animals, I can't say what they have and don't have.

Pun: I don't know. Perhaps you're right.

Gentle: there are various anthropologists who have refuted this of late Ref

Pun: I say we leave it, as we have two sources which say opposing things.

Shingles: surely those 'Neolithic' qualities are translatable to an age of civilisation, yes its not the smoothest transition, but I think that's already established, Ref

Alaya: Pun it says that it is our own conscience and not an outside morph deity

Reflection: oh, Gentle, it has not been refuted, although it is hotly debated:))

Bash: That's why I said believe, honestly I could not say animals have or do not have either

Gentle: sure

Alaya: Pun, it's from a Shivas version there

Renald: Shaivist :-)

Bash: And Ren, you are correct about attachment. We have to attach our conflict to something be it the universe or concept of God or an idol

Pun nods.

Reflection: cruelty is an example of a Neolithic tendency (and perhaps for the same purposes as the cat) which is too destructive in civilization and so must be dispensed with (like vengeance, and many other things)

Reflection: and, of course, this "knowledge" comes from religion primarily

Oswy: Ref, here is a subject for another debate. We may have culturally evolved beyond the Neolithic. I am not denying a major evolutionary residue but we could have advanced. Shingles my original point was that eh videos stressed the need to protect diversity and the environment. it seemed to say nature = Good. I don't always think that is the case Nature need to be modified controlled channelled. It's not good per se. Even you seem to admit this if you don't want humans to return to a state of nature, whatever that might be,

Gentle: but would not you say that an extremely cruel human is a sick animal

Shingles: silliness, when we get the job ahead of our peers and enjoy getting it ahead of our peers, Ref?

Shingles: Cruelty is very, very useful in an age of civilisation

Bash: Which is where spirituality and science are one. Science we tear apart the physical world to find answers and we attached spirituality to things to be able to tear them apart to find answers :-D AHHHHHH

Renald: I'll be honest, Bash, I'm very conflict avoidant, and that gets reflected in my ideas. ;-)

Alaya: its called survival residual effect Shingles

Chico: If "natural empiricism" refers to observation, then it is a subset of science, not vice versa, Ref.

Shingles: ok, we've well gone past our traditional duration, so officially the event is done with, but please feel free to stay as long as you like

Reflection: sure Shingles, that is a residue of the joy of victory over the competitor, where this was often life and death, although we have all been taught that we should avoid this feeling and empathize with our vanquished:))

Chico: ...because science provides an explanatory framework for those observations. Simple empiricism doesn't...

Second Philosophy

Shingles: and that teaching is no longer necessary upon reaching adulthood, Ref

Renald: Wait, Shingles, what?

Shingles: mmf? Yes, Ren?

Chico: (sorry for the delayed answer)

Renald: Why is the teaching no longer necessary with adulthood?

Reflection: perhaps you have found this in your life, Shingles, but it doesn't hold in the lives, that I know well :))

Shingles: because it would be desirable for children to know that, when we reach adulthood that teaching will cause us much anguish, Ren

Renald: I don't understand.

Alaya: every continuous curiosity and experiences and observations and synthesis and re-transcription of events... may be call science, so music is

Renald: Which teaching?

Shingles: From Reflection: *'we have all been taught that we should avoid this feeling and empathize with our vanquished'*

Oswy: Shingles Well done for introducing this subject. I am very sympathetic to Pan. Which is not to say I don't think it should be tested to its limits.

Renald: Right... so?

Gentle: Christian teaching - not pagan or say Roman

Alaya: yes not the pagan which I am

Shingles: we should feel victorious over our peers, we should enjoy conquering

Renald: Eh... that's an oversimplification.

Renald: We should enjoy conquering?!

Shingles: on a small scale, yes

Alaya: so reflection no need to generalise, because many don't have the same background about that

Shingles: over our peers, one to one

Bash: I want to be something!

Renald: Shingles, I'm afraid I'm skeptical

Bash: Marya is atheist, Alaya is Pagan

Reflection: Alaya, all religious traditions agree about this, I think :))

Alaya: conquering, is important for a man who seek a companions?? Conquering the earth

Shingles: not the Viking Pagans, Ref

Renald: Viking was a profession, not a religion.

Reflection: all traditional religion recognizes different rules for in-group, vs. out-group behaviour Shing

Shingles: who was Thor, then, Ren, and Wotan?

Alaya: Viking a profession? I didn't know that ,interesting

Shingles: and Odin & Loki?

Renald: They are gods, Shingles.

Shingles: whose gods?

Reflection: it was actually the Vikings who developed the idea of Weregelde, or a payment of money for the death of a kinsmen as a substitute for vengeance

Alaya: Odin, or addin..or al addin....its a very mystic persona

Renald: Many people's gods, over time, Shingles, including most Vikings.

Oswy: Yes I knew them all well 10,000 years ago

Bash: I have to say one thing. Being that ALL we really need to do is eat, sleep and mate, humans have made life SOOOOO complicated :-D

Renald: heh

Alaya: yes Reflection and before they create that money they came to Greenland, in north America, leaving there the Mongols, sammy people here....and its not 5000 years ago

Oswy: You had to watch that Odin One eye and a big staff a bad combination.

Second Philosophy

Reflection: but this is an area of empiricism shingles that you will explore through living :)))

Renald: Bash, if that were all we needed to do, it would be all we did. :-)

Bash: I don't think that is our intent but that is the minimum; our purpose is exactly what we are doing right now

