

Rupert Sheldrake - The Science Delusion

(December 27, 2012)

British biologist Dr. Rupert Sheldrake, one of the world's most innovative scientists, is the author of more than 80 scientific papers and ten books and is best known for his groundbreaking theory of Morphic Resonance. In this program we discuss Rupert's latest book "The Science Delusion." He begins with an overview of the ten dogmas of science. According to these dogmas, all of reality is material or physical, the world is an inanimate machine, nature is purposeless, free will is an illusion, notions of higher orders of consciousness and absolute "God" awareness exists only as ideas in human minds, which are themselves nothing but electrochemical processes imprisoned within our skulls. These powerful assumptions, have led science down the wrong path according to Rupert. He explains how originally the scientific field held a kind of Cartesian dualistic view of spirit and matter, which eventually was replaced solely by matter. The scientific view that matter is "dead" and has no soul or spirit is dangerous, argues Sheldrake. Later, we talk about the Large Hadron Collider, the most expensive scientific project in the history of mankind. Rupert explains that the results in the search for the "Higgs field" and the so called "God particle" might very well be influenced by the intention of the scientists performing the experiment, also known as the observer's effect. Lastly, Sheldrake tells us about the biotech bubble and shares his opinion on what alternative fields of science he would like to see funded

Palmgren

- 00.22 And we say Welcome ladies and gentlemen, thank you for taking some time off in your busy schedule to listen to some Red Ice Radio. I'm Henrik Palmgren I will be guiding you through our guests' ideas and theories today.
- 00.33 I hope you take the opportunity to sit back and relax wherever you are, as we are going to talk about the 'Delusion of Science' with British biologist Dr. Rupert Sheldrake today. He has to be one of the world's most innovative scientists,
- 00.50 he is the author of more than 80 scientific papers and 10 books and he is best known for his ground breaking theory of Morphic Resonance. Rupert's latest book is "The Science Delusion" and we are going to begin with an overview of the 10 dogmas of science, these powerful assumptions have lead science down the wrong path, according to Rupert. And before we talk about the Large Hadron Collider, the most expensive scientific project in the history of mankind and Rupert explains that the results for the Higgs Field and the so-called "God particle" might very well be influenced by the intentions of the scientists performing the experiment. Welcome to Red Ice Radio, Mr. Sheldrake, thank you for taking some time talking to us today.
- 01.32 I know how very, very busy you are, so we do appreciate it very much, thank you, sir, for coming on.

Sheldrake

My pleasure!

Palmgren

- Excellent! Now, we have a very short time set here, we have of course much to discuss, so why don't we begin and dive right into it. I think we should definitely talk about your latest book "The Science Delusion", it is called "Science Set Free" in the United States, the US version and this of course follows on from your previous work on the Morphic Resonance
- 02.00 and Morphic Field and everything else and maybe we can talk about that later if we have time, but maybe first, Rupert, you can give us an overview of what the science delusion is?

Sheldrake

Sure! Well, the science delusion is the belief that science already understands the nature of reality in principal, leaving only details to be filled in.

02.18 A lot of people think that is true, I certainly don't. I think we know a lot, but there's a huge amount we don't know.

02.27 And in this book what I do is; I take the 10 dogmas of science and I turn these dogmas into questions. I look at them to see how well they stand up to scientific examination in the light of scientific evidence.

02.42 And the answer is "None of them do". And the point of the book is not anti-science, it is pro-science. I think when we break out of these dogmatic assumptions, then science becomes much more interesting, all sorts of new research becomes possible, all sorts of new questions open up. And so that's really what my book is about.

03.02 It is an attempt to set science free, as the American title says, from these dogmatic assumptions.

Palmgren

Indeed and there are but 10 of them in the book of course, but maybe we can discuss some of the most –I guess- powerful assumptions of science, if that is an easy job to do, Rupert, if you can distill it even more?

Sheldrake

03.20 Well, they're all powerful in their own way, I mean, I could summarize them, shall I do that?.....

Palmgren

Sure, let's do that, good idea!

Sheldrake

..... to show what I'm talking about.

Dogma 1 is the assumption that nature is mechanical, or machine-like, that everything in nature is like a machine. Animals are like machines, plants are like machines and we're like machines, lumbering robot in Richard Dawkins' vivid phrase our brains are like genetically programmed computers. So that's the first assumption, being in science since the 17th century.

03.50 The second assumption is; matter is unconscious. The whole universe is made of unconscious matter, all of nature is made of unconscious matter, our bodies are made of unconscious matter, but for some peculiar reason our brains become conscious and that is one of the big problems in materialist science. Consciousness ought not to exist at all.

04.09 The third assumption is; the laws of nature are fixed, they are the same at the moment of the big bang as they are today and they will be the same forever.

04.21 And so they're constants and that is why they are called constant, things like the speed of light and gravitation are constant.

04.29 The fourth assumption is that the total amount of matter and energy is always the same, it all came into being at the big bang, it's been the same ever since and it will be the same forever.

04.42 The fifth assumption is that nature is purposeless. There are no purposes in animals or plants or in life as a whole. And the entire evolutionary process has no purpose; it's just come about by blind chance in the laws of nature.

04.59 Assumption 6; biological inheritance is material, it's all genetic or epigenetic or possibly inside the epigenetic inheritance, but in any case material.

05.12 Dogma 7; memories are stored as material traces inside the brain. All your memories are inside your head in some way, stored in nerve endings or phosphor related proteins or no one knows quite how. but the assumption is they are all in the brain.

05.28 Dogma 8 is; your mind is inside your head, it's an aspect of the activity of the brain.

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

2

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

Dogma 9; psychic phenomena like telepathy are illusory, they appear to exist, but they are not real. That's because the mind is inside the head and can't have any effects at a distance.

- 05.50 Dogma 10 is; mechanistic medicine is the only kind that really works. Alternative and complementary therapies may appear to work, but that's only because people have got better anyway or it's the placebo effect. And that's why governments and medical research funding and so on funds only mechanistic medicine based upon the principle of 'the body is a machine', working on chemistry and physics, so it can only be treated chemically or physically by drugs or surgery. And of course that is very effective up to a point, but it's just part of medicine, anyway that's the assumption
- 06.26 So these are the 10 assumptions on which the modern mindset is based or almost all educated people have this as their default world view, because it is THE standard view of modern science. But what I show in my book is; when we question these assumptions, every single one of them turns out to be just an assumption. And most of them were put in place in science in the 17th century, some in the 19th century, but in many ways science has outgrown these old assumptions and the scientists themselves have burst out of them, but most people don't realize that yet.

Palmgren

- 07.06 Well, that's very interesting, why do you think that it is that we haven't left them behind where they belong then in that sense. Why haven't we generally caught up with what we today know?

Sheldrake

- 07.17 I think the reason that they haven't really been questioned is partly because the sciences have been so successful, science has huge prestige and everybody, all of us, are impressed by the triumphs of modern medicine, the internet, computers, smart phones, jet planes. All of our lives are so surrounded by technology that it seems this entire enterprise which has changed the world dramatically for good and for evil, is incredibly successful, how could it possibly be wrong?
- 07.51 I just don't think occurs to those people, most people don't realize these are assumptions, they simply think they are the truth. And if it wasn't for the success of science, I think they would have been much more questioned, because they are not very plausible when you think about them. But science is so successful, it has such high prestige in government, education, business and so on, it's not something those people think of questioning.

Palmgren

- 08.18 If we talk about the larger context of what all these assumptions really mean, they have after all shaped our world view, Rupert, and I think you've postulated somewhere that it actually might be, we might be on a dangerous path, pretty much, if we actually follow through on these assumptions and take them for a fact. One of these is that we can see in our world, of course, the reflection of a soul-less outlook if you will; we assume that nothing is alive around us and so
- 08.47 maybe you can expand on that a little bit, Rupert, what you see is -at the end of it- dangerous with this world view, this scientific world view that we have today?

Sheldrake

- 08.58 I think it's dangerous in quite a lot of ways. First of all it gives us a false view of nature; that nature, the whole of the natural world is just unconscious matter and for some

mysterious reason we are the only conscious beings in it. Well, maybe along with other mammals or birds or a few other species of animals or maybe lots of species of animals, but otherwise it's unconscious. And that view, I think it is a completely false view of nature and our relationship to nature and of course the ecological crisis shows there is a terrible imbalance between our activities in the world we live in.

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

3

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

- 09.37 Secondly I think these assumptions alienate ourselves from ourselves, because instead of seeing our minds as an aspect of our whole being in the world and body being in the world, we see them as something, separate things somehow in our heads and it separates our mind from body and creates a terrible split between reason and emotion and experience and between science and the humanities
- 10.06 and it creates a whole series imbalances and splits in our own experience. Immense dangerous, because it leads to increasingly expensive one-sided medical systems that are increasingly unaffordable and which ignore everything to do with thoughts, emotions, social lives, spiritual beliefs and so forth. So, in many ways I think it is constricting and harmful and that's why I think we'd be better off by moving beyond it.

Palmgren

- 10.35 Indeed! I mean, in certain countries now herbs are banned, alternative practitioners are viewed as quacks all over. I mean, should we try to, can we disprove these assumptions, is that what you are trying to do in the book, pretty much, Rupert?

Sheldrake

- 10.49 Oh, yes! I mean, it's not so much disproving them. The first thing is to bring them into the daylight. When you do that they are not so powerful or so frightening. For example the assumption that matter is unconscious; you have to look into the history, the history of that belief, I can briefly sketch it out, because it gives an important example of how history is so important here.
- 11.18 In the middle ages in Europe the general belief taught in the universities of Europe and through the Roman church was that nature is alive, the earth was alive, animals and plants were alive, they had souls. This was the doctrine of Aristotle and it was formulated in the Christianized form by St Thomas of Aquinas. So, this doctrine that plants and animals had souls; -animals of course because the word 'anima' means soul, imagine- and humans had souls, but everything in nature was alive, the earth was alive, animals and plants throughout the whole universe was alive and
- 12.02 so the intelligentsias, angels, spirits, minds, it was a living world. Now the whole point about the 17th century revolution was that it said; no, it is not a living world, it is a dead world, made up of machinery, not organisms and Descartes, who did so much to formulate this view in the 17th century, proposed that nature is split into two parts; matter, which is unconscious and mechanical and that makes up the whole of nature and mind or spirit, which is conscious and to do with reason, rational thought, mathematics and science and reason is a kind of rational mind, which is not in space and time, which is immaterial
- 12.44 is confined to humans and angels and god. So he made a radical split between humans, angels and god, which is spiritual, human minds and everything else in nature, including human bodies, which are unconscious, dead, mechanical and machine-like. And this split created the split between body and mind, humans and animals and the rest of nature and between religion and science. And those the founders of modern science were quite devout Christians and it created a kind of way in which people could be religious and scientific at the same time. And that lasted until the 19th century. There was no real conflict, because they were in separate compartments, religion got the human mind, angels and god and science got the

whole of nature, including the human body.

- 13.30 So, the idea that matter is unconscious wasn't proved, it wasn't something that was proved by careful experiments and research and prejudice and refutable hypothesis, it was simply assumed or defined by a French philosopher in the 17th century as unconscious. That's why this idea is embedded in science and the next step was in the 19th century. A lot of people didn't like the idea that there's two principles in nature – matter and spirit- and they thought there actually ought to be only one (personally I think we need at least three) but the people who didn't like the idea of two in Cartesian dualism said, someone said, there's only one principal in spirit and that's the idealist

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

4

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

philosophy, everything is consciousness or mind and matter is a kind of dumb mind. Or the other opinion which dominated science through the 19th century, which is materialism, which says that matter is the only reality, this realm of the spirit doesn't exist.

- 14.34 What is not material therefore doesn't exist; angels and gods are therefore instantly abolished. So you had a kind of atheist world view and then the human mind is nothing but the activity of the brain. Now of course this assumption, the materialist assumption, is incredibly problematic because although matter is unconscious in this view, we should be unconscious, but actually we are conscious.

- 15.00 So, how do you explain that? And in the philosophy of mind that is called the hard problem, because no one has an adequate explanation for it. Some say, some philosophers say consciousness doesn't exist; it's just focus on view and illusion. Others say it's an epi-phenomenon, it's like a shadow of the activity of the brain, but it doesn't do anything. And others just simply say it's an illusion produced by the brain.

- 15.28 The trouble is that calling consciousness an illusion doesn't explain consciousness; it pre-supposes it because illusion is a negative consciousness. So this is deeply problematic and philosophers of the mind go round and round in circles. Most academic philosophers are materialists, they never concluded, never solved it and they can't. Some philosophers known today are suggesting that we've got to recognize there's some kind of mind or consciousness in, not just in human brains, but in all matter, even electrons and atoms have some kind of mental aspect to them.

- 16.07 That is a philosophy called Pan-psychism. The idea is there's a psyche or mind in everything and I think that is the only reasonable way forward and that recognizes a kind of mental life, even in electrons. The philosopher Whitehead, Alfred North Whitehead suggested that (he was the first philosopher to recognize the importance of quantum physics in the 1920's) that because quantum physics shows that matter is not stuff, matter is a process, there is no such thing as instantaneous matter or matter that just continues forever like hard little billiard balls.

- 16.45 Instead, atoms and electrons are waves and because they are waves, they are processes and because they are processes they take time, you can't have an instantaneous wave at a point, at an instant because a wave takes time. So everything takes time and is therefore in time and therefore it has a future and a past pole and an electron has a past pole and a future pole and the future pole is mind-like, it's about possibilities. The past pole is when something's happened, one of these possibilities has happened,

- 17.20 it becomes a fact, then it is in the past and our own minds are like that, our minds are conscious minds, are full of conscious possibilities we choose among possibilities and possibilities are not physical, actual things, they're just possibilities. As soon as we make a decision and do it then it becomes a measurable fact which is now in the past.

- 17.40 So the mental pole and the physical pole are poles in time, not in space. Anyway, these are some of the debates going on at the moment, within consciousness studies and philosophy of mind and I think we have moved on from this old style materialism to

something much, much more interesting.

Palmgren

- 17.59 Indeed, I mean when it comes to proving consciousness from a scientific point of view – I mean – is that ever going to be possible, because there is different ideas there. Maybe it's the scientific method that is wrong in itself, or as we know, Rupert, you and many other scientists are looking into these things now.
- 18.16 But their work is still not really being accepted, if you will, so there is a problem here somewhere. How to begin to move forward, do you think?

Sheldrake

- 18.24 Well, I think there are several things that we need to move forward at the moment. One is the unconsciousness studies, the problems of materialism are becoming more

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

5

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

and more obvious and a number of eminent philosophers breaking with it. A book came out last month which I think is very significant, it was by Thomas Nagel, who is a famous American philosopher, and he wrote a book called "Mind and Cosmos", the subtitle is "why the materialist neo-Darwinian conception of nature is almost certainly false."

- 18.59 And this is one of America's leading philosophers and it is a very powerful book in which he shows how this world views simply won't work anymore. I think there is growing disenchantment with it within the academic world. More important, this world view is breaking down within the very heart land of biology. The human genome project was supposed
- 19.24 to explain human nature in terms of genes, there were billions of dollars spent on it and everyone was saying it was going to be this total transformation of our world view, but actually it has led to a huge problem, the whole thing is crumbling. There is now something in the last 2 or 3 years, not widely known outside biology, something called the *missing heritability problem*. What they did was they took the genomes of 30.000 different people, they sequenced the entire DNA and got complete genomes of 30.000 people and then they looked to see how well they could predict things.
- 20.02 They expected they could predict about 80% of what was going on in people from their genes. They started with height, height is easy to measure and we already know that tall parents tend to have tall children and short parents short children. And it's already known that height is 80% heritable, which means you can predict with an accuracy of about 80% the height of children if you know the parents' height;
- 20.29 other thing being equal, assuming they are not starved or sick or something. Well, when they analyzed the genomes of 30.000 people and looked at their height, they found that out of these there were about 50 genes concerned with height and so they made a model to explain height in terms of these genes. Then they tried predicting people's height just on the basis of these genes, not knowing the height of people, they were kept sort of hidden, then they tried to predict height on the basis of the genes and they found they could predict it with an accuracy of 5%. Now you can do it with an accuracy of 80%, just with a tape measure, measuring peoples' height, and after spending billions of dollars, it turned out that the genome was getting predictive accuracies of only about 5% for those characteristics. So the difference between the 80% expected and the 5% achieved, there's 75% that is missing.
- 21.32 It's called the *missing heritability problem*. And this is a really major crisis in biology. Some geneticists say; you know, we failed and one or two of them are saying; to do this kind of research is throwing good money after bad. And the whole project has failed; now we need to find out what really does control inheritance, because the genes obviously play a very minor part. Other people say; oh, this is just because there must be hundreds more genes involved

- there must be hundreds more genes involved
- 22.00 and we need a few billion more dollars and another twenty years to get it right. That is probably the main stream view. But the fact is that hundreds of billions of dollars were invested in biotechnology and genetic technologies in the 1990's and 2000's and you remember in the late 90's we were always being told that the 21st century would be the century of biotechnology, governments would pour in billions of dollars and so would private investors. Well, they have lost most of it.
- 22.36 A recent report by the Harvard Business School called this the biggest money losing scheme that's ever been devised. Most of these companies have made no money at all; governments and investors have lost hundreds of billions of dollars.
- 22.50 And so this isn't just some kind of academic discussion, it's something that moved into the business world in a huge way. You know countries like Singapore built vast biotechnology hubs, because they wanted to be able to centre this brave new world by technology, we don't hear much about it now.
- 23.08 And so investors are now very reluctant to invest in these kinds of companies and the rewards of the investments are becoming very few and far between. So this is changing the whole climate and atmosphere. And within medicine the promise of

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

6

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

- genetic medicine and the so-called rational drug discovery based on molecular biology, these promises haven't been born out either. The drug companies are falling of patent cliffs as their patents run out and they're very few really new drugs in the pipe line.
- 23.43 So there is a crisis for the pharmaceutical industry, so it is not as if everything is going to go on in business as usual. There is a major crisis in the very heart of science and almost everywhere.

Palmgren

- 23.56 Speaking about expensive scientific experiments, what is your view of the Large Hadron Collider and the very expensive search for the Higgs Field and the so-called God Particle and all that, Rupert?

Sheldrake

- 24.07 Well, I mean, I think it's interesting to find out about these particles of matter, but it is extremely expensive and I think at very disproportionate cost, because it means that other forms of science don't get funded if this one does. I'm afraid I take a slightly cynical view about the Higgs boson. Here we have something that thousands of physicists desperately want to find and we have a huge piece of apparatus costing billions in Euros, but the grants are running out, they need more money.
- 24.40 If they simply said, we haven't found the Higgs boson, you know, the whole of their career, the whole of the whole project would thus falter, they've got to find the Higgs boson. Personally I think this could be an example of mind over matter effects. We know from parapsychology that people through their intentions can influence quantum random processes,
- 25.07 which is being shown over and over again. Here you have 20.000 physicists desperately wanting to find the boson, they know what they want to find. You have an apparatus that said something extremely indeterminate, indeterminate situations inside it, random quantum processes and they all desperately want to find it. They have the quantum random process, they're all beaming their thoughts and intentions towards it and sure enough it shows up.
- 25.37 Now is this objectively really there or is this a mind over matter effect? Now, physicists don't consider the mind over matter possibility, because parapsychology is a too buuh subject and they're not allowed to discuss it. But as soon as you take seriously the idea that experimenters can influence the experiment, that intentions can affect

quantum random processes, than the question "Is the Higgs boson real?" becomes rather an interesting question. I myself think that it's produced by an interaction between the minds of the physicists and the apparatus.

- 26.16 You don't always get what you want in experiments of course, but the experiment is a kind of dialogue between the experimenter and the natural world and like any dialogue, you can influence the outcome. So I myself think that as people become more skeptical about the Higgs boson, a whole lot of skeptics start saying it's not going to appear, it might become like a battle of minds, it might start disappearing again.
- 26.45 And then they'd have to have even stronger intentions to make it appear. So I think it may be a rather instable particle, that's my guess.

Palmgren

- 26.55 That's a very interesting take on things. In your view, in what field should there be more investments?

Sheldrake

- 27.02 In holistic biology, in holistic and alternative medicine. If we had more research on alternative therapies there would be much greater chance of making medicine more effective and cheaper. What I would do if I ran medical research, is have a series of outcome trials or comparative effectiveness research. For example, if someone has

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

7

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

- lower back pain or migraine headaches, I would have, take quite a lot of people of those and send pay for some of them to see acupuncturists, cranials or cranial osteopaths, or general practitioners and physiotherapists or homeopaths. Anyone who claimed to be able to cure this, send some people to them and just see what works
- 27.53 and do some of them work better than others? A theory-free trial, totally pragmatic trial, what works and if it turns out for example that homeopathy works best, then the critics would say "oh, well, that just shows that they're getting bigger placebo-effect". But I would say "What's wrong with that?" If people get better, it doesn't matter what you call it,
- 28.16 the only thing that really matters is whether they get better or not and if they get better from much cheaper treatment, then that's surely worth knowing. So I would take a completely pragmatic view instead of having; only these kinds of therapies can be researched because only those fit the theory. I'd just see what happens. And I think research of that kind of medicine could transform the medical world and give us a cheaper and more inclusive kind of medical system.

Palmgren

- 28.47 Yeah, indeed! Now, previously you mentioned the Cartesian duality between, pretty much and you mentioned there should be a third in there. What is that third?

Sheldrake

- 28.55 I think that in the old view, that was the view of body, soul and spirit, I think that what we have is, I think there are basically three principals at work, which in physics would be called energy, fields and consciousness. I think we have three basics principles at work and interacting in the world.
- 29.25 Already within physics, within quantum physics, the idea of matter as fundamental has been superseded. Materialism says matter is the only ultimate reality, but physics says matter is not the ultimate reality. Matter, like electrons or protons, are actually vibrations within fields, it's energy bound within fields. So energy and fields are the fundamental principles of nature according to physics. I have no problem with that and I think some fields interact with fields of consciousness which are fields of possibility. So I think we have consciousness which is the realm of possibility

- 30.07 ... I think we have consciousness which is the realm of possibility and the ability to choose among possibilities, fields which are the organizing fields of gravity and electromagnetism, quantum fields and – my own theory – Morphic Fields throughout nature which there are organizing fields more self-organizing systems which have a kind of memory within them. I think these are part of the field, part of nature and then I think is the realm of possibilities which our minds inhabit. Most of our mental life is unconscious, it's habitual.
- 30.40 Our conscious lives are concerned with choosing among possibilities. And that realm of possibility in virtual futures is not exactly the realm of fields and habit, nor the realm of energy, it's a third realm. And so I think we have this three-fold level of reality which corresponds in many philosophical systems to series of ultimate reality which see it in threes, you know yin and yang in times and with the circle that contains this, or the holy trinity in Christian theology which is a source, a conscious source of the words and the spirit
- 31.19 in which the three aspects of the trinity, spirit is energy, but words is form, structure, movement which I see as fields. So I think that we see basic three-fold or Trinitarian structures in many, in tantric Hinduism, Buddhism, we have Shiva and Shakty, Shakty is the energy principle, Shiva is the form principle and it is not just an uncontrolled duality they are united in a section and both as a part of larger whole.
- 31.50 So that again is a kind of implicit Trinitarian principle. I think that seeing things that way make more sense of nature and I get's us away from this idle unsatisfactory dualism of Descartes which has dominated western thought until the 19th century and still is quite an important part of our thinking. Or this narrow materialism which is so out of keeping with how we experience the world ourselves directly.

Interview at Red Ice Radio (27 December 2012)

8

Rupert Sheldrake on "The Science Delusion"

Palmgren

- 32.23 Indeed, I agree. Now, there's of course endlessly more to talk about here, Rupert, but we'll have to leave it at that for now, you have a train to catch. But I just want to say thank you so much for your time today and please go ahead and mention your website and the title of your latest book, so people know where to go and what to pick up when they go there.

Sheldrake

- 32.41 Good, well, my website is Sheldrake.org, www.sheldrake.org, s h e l d r a k e o r g and that has a huge amount of material about my work and it has lots of audio tapes, dialogues with Terence McKenna and Ralph Abraham, videos and so forth, all free. And then I have my new book, which really summarizes a lot of my previous work and puts it in this frame work we've just been discussing;
- 33.17 science moving on from the starting list of dogmatic world views. In Britain it's called "The Science Delusion"; it's published in German as "Der Wissenschaftswahn". It's in Norwegian, it's published just recently in November in Norway in Norwegian translation.
- 33.38 And in America it's called "Science Set Free" and it's published in the autumn this year. So it's available in various countries and in various forms, it's also available as E-book and audio book in English. So the details are on my website.

Palmgren

- 34.00 ...sheldrake.org, "The Science Delusion", go to the website and check it out and thank you, Rupert, again!

Sheldrake

Thank you!

raimgren

All right, this was a shorter program, I hope you enjoyed it nonetheless and got something out of it. We're going to try to get Rupert back with us later in January or February and really get into his theory of Morphic Resonance, which is fascinating. I hope you had a good year and that you're ready for the new, as we begin to look forward to new guests, new ideas and we're going to continue to develop our program, improve it and really take things to the next level. We only really began and there's so much more we can discuss and discover. We here at Red Ice Radio say cheers and we raise our glasses to you for your continued interest and support and for staying with us and sending us kind feedback and encouraging words and guest suggestions and ideas for topics of where to go and where to take the discussion next. For everyone making Red Ice possible, we say thank you and we'll speak to you soon!

Links: www.sheldrake.org

Key words: Animism; Dark matter; Large Hadron Collider; Morphic Fields; Panpsychism; Science Set Free; The Morphogenetic Universe

Books

R. Sheldrake: The Science Delusion (UK version)

R. Sheldrake: Science Set Free: 10 Paths to New Discovery (US version)

T. Nagel: Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False

[This transcript is supported by Matthias Rauterberg (TU/e), Eindhoven, The Netherlands]