

Scientism, Atheism, And The Admissibility Of Spiritual Experience

Post by "Susan Hill" of November 2, 2020 at 5:29 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

[Quote from Don](#)

1) In this discussion are we suggesting that there are characteristics or hypothetical interactions with us which are in any way excluded from "scientific" examination? Is anyone suggesting that this area is prima facie off limits to "science?" If so, how can we even engage in conversation about them, so I presume the answer to this is no?

2) If we agree that what we are talking about can be systematically studied, would there be a way to eliminate the possibility that the experiences we are talking about are coming from within the brain rather than from outside?

3) I personally hold open the possibility that there are all sorts of "natural" phenomena that are not yet recognized, just like radio and X-rays were at one time not recognized, and (to my understanding "gravity waves" are accepted to exist but are still not understood.) However if we accept for the sake of argument that such a phenomena might be involved here, should we not presume that such phenomena will at some point be just as capable of being studied, analyzed as accurate or distorted, as the other phenomena we are currently familiar with? No one is suggesting that there is completed information/opinion being deposited directly in the brain in fully-formed completion, correct?

How could you create a science experiment to measure something you do not have a tool other than a mind to measure? Also, you can't reliably repeat a "peak" experience like this on demand. There are some fascinating things coming out of "the neurology of meditators", but lit-up areas of a brain don't really tell us a whole lot about the actual experience of the meditator, or how he got into that state.

What if it is "something happening within the brain" that results in our being able to perceive real things that one would not normally be aware of? Simply "paying attention" falls into this category. 😊 The husband is not quite aware of what his wife is saying until he decides to pay attention. So sometimes an event does not register until the brain is able to receive it. You can't receive calculus before you have done arithmetic.

I think it is both the case that we will increase our ability to measure and prove things scientifically, and that there will always be things that we will not - like the physiology of a bug on a planet a billion light years away... No, we will never know everything. Physicists still like to theorize, and sometimes we manage to find a way to test these things scientifically. Some things are presently untestable with present tools, and some things we have no clue how to test. Some things we just have no clue about. They can be real without a human validating their existence.

Epicurus may have the minimalist theology that validates the human instinct towards honoring the divine, while setting limits on speculation that leads us to think we can in any way control it.