

The “selfish” viewpoint: How humans see natural phenomena as “selfish” when in fact there is no “self” possible.

Richard Dawkins the biologist and protagonist of so-called “scientific rationalism”, wrote a key book that took him to his famous position now as the self-righteous “Pope” of the “church” of Newtonian science. The book was called “The Selfish Gene”. Convincing himself and others that he and his brethren (Brian Cox et al.) have the basis of understanding of the universe or are “investigating” using the very “great tool” of the human mind, is laughable in the face of those at the root of physics where no-one is even certain which way is up! The Newtonian model of physics, the basis of science, is out of date and too mechanistic, too narrow, it is a window of looking at the universe through a materialist dualism that separates everything off into parts. In fact by its very nature it is unnatural and a distortion, as a result the Newtonian model is to be replaced, as it needs to be by all the scientists, Dawkins and Cox included, who know no other way of thinking. However, this new “quantum” or Universal” theory has yet to be found, simply because the same mind that created Newtonian science is behind it, the same dualism of the modern physicists which prevents them understanding notions like yinyang that are as close as one can get to a theory of everything, but which are all seen as pseudo-science by most theorists. The modern use of Newtonian theory is similar to using a broken saw to cut down a tree, it’s not very good at doing the job but it’s all you’ve got, and it seems that trees are there to be cut down...aren't they?

This lack of foundational consensus in science is the key over-sight that skews the amazingly confident Newtonian scientist’s “pure observation” of nature. No one who sees the confusion at the heart of science understands the confidence of its proponents. This distorted confidence is then passed on through media to the non-scientific public who often swallow the scientists’ ideals without really getting a sense of them themselves.

I may be berated for uttering anything against the great David Attenborough, and while his film crew and technology are unquestionably skilled, his commentary completely distorts the processes we are seeing. Attenborough constantly makes nature seem like a soap-opera, dramatizing events that are simply natural life occurring. His interpretations and analyses of situations are only guess-work via the human perspective but are presented as “scientifically observed facts”. He describes areas of the world with a colonialism that is deeply narrow, and as such the spirit in which we understand nature is through the supposed tangibility of the biological-behavioural scientist, not the child’s view where nothing is labelled and nothing needs to be understood.

This is quite unlike the commentary of Werner Herzog who invites a child-like wonder into his work and an open question as to what it is that he’s actually looking at. He really doesn't know...which is honest, but neither do we and neither do Attenborough or Richard Dawkins know. Even if they say that they can “unweave the rainbow”, actually they are just looking at it through a total distortion of the senses...the “self” state, and as such only manage to unweave their own psychology. Not that any of them can do anything about it, but why do we want to take advice or try to see the world through the view of a person or group of people who see only a fraction of what there is and suggest to us that this is what’s “known”? What is the

use of this? What is supposedly “known”, what is considered tangible and “real”, is actually a fraction of what there truly is, and as such information from this portal is going to be distorted. Thus if society is founded on this misinformation or Chinese-whisper, then society too will follow this distortion. What we see around us today is as a result of science, science has formed the world we live in and all of its distortions. So it is from that level of so-called understanding that scientists profess to “know”, yet are unable to see what really is, just as a religious person will also miss the point. Both beliefs are of the same ilk, just different religions. Agnosticism is still a belief, in the ideal that god does not exist, it’s just an open space for another god to form and this is always the god of science and the foundational premises of Newtonian ideals which is just observation with the eyes shut. It is no more accurate than religious expression, simply described differently, but still the same dualism is at work.

Dawkins book “The Selfish Gene” was a marvel at the time as it expresses the key idea that genes *seemed* to him to be all about self-preservation. These foundations of cells *seemed* to be almost at odds with everything else that wasn't like them and were all into self-promotion and a “survival of the fittest” mentality. This tells us more about the scientist than it does about the actuality of what nature expresses.

While nature *SEEMS* selfish to the human observer seeing things through the dualism of a “me” who feels separate from everything else, this is not necessarily the reality of the picture. The really honest scientist actually gives up doing science when they realize that they themselves are distorting what they are doing. Science never takes into account the dis-ease process of “self”, which actually is the drunken illusion of separation of “me” from what “I’m” observing i.e. the experiment. This is why no scientific experiment is actually valid because pure observation is impossible as it requires a separation of subject and object that in the natural reality is impossible. So every experiment simply reveals an expression of the person who is forming the experiment, it mirrors what they expect to see or what they intend to look at because they are not interested in the bigger picture. Even those experiments that “went wrong” and in the process revealed something else that became a great cure-all, such as penicillin, were only noticed because of a person focusing down on it, someone who was trying to find something. One can always find something if one is seeking, even if it’s not what you expect or even wanted.

The point is that as we move into this time of disillusionment with both science and religion we also need to move into a disillusionment with the nature of seeing things in the foundational dualism from which these two were born. When we look at nature we may believe that what we are seeing is a struggle, a bitter aggressive war of survival, but actually there is no “self” that is doing any of it. Survival only comes in when there is something that aims to protect or help itself or even discover itself. When there is no “self” viewing, then what is happening is a play of sound and light that is beyond the imagination of the human mind’s cognition. The processes of finding food, finding shelter and finding a mate are something that *seem* as though they are promotion of one species above another, it appears that when weeds cover over a ground they seem to dominate the vegetables you put in, it *seems* that the weeds are “aggressive” and “virulent” but actually there is no such notion from the weed, it just senses, grows and responds. All of nature is like this. Even when it comes to seemingly complex mammals and humans, we are just the same, we grow as

we can and when we are blocked we stop growing, or can grow no further in that environment. In another environment it may change. Humans can bloom better in some environments and become stunted in others. It's all down to the whole and what the whole is *no-one* can know. The bigger picture of reality is something that is not known by an individual. It is only realised when there is no individual or "self" and that means that the question of "knowing" just drops out.

The human seems to be two things. There are the body-senses that have no notion of whether the body is dead or alive, no idea if it is functioning or not functioning, it is just what it is. On top of this is the illusory short-circuit of the "self". This is the disease process that believes that observes the body and considers the body to be "mine". "I own myself" and so this separation then means everything I see and do, from the religions and practices I express to the science and technology I invent, are all imbued with the ideology, foundationally, that I am separate from the whole and somehow need to get back to wholeness - seeking begins.

So going back to Dawkins' point of the selfish gene, in fact the genes have no conscious centre or soul to them. Interestingly Dawkins' notion of "selfishness" suggests that the genes have a direction and a purpose which in Dawkin's mind is "survival". Actually the genes are just functional genetic material, just a play of light, they expand as they can and when blocked by various environmental factors they can expand no further. So the actual situation is that the genes function like anything else in nature, it's just an instinctive process, it has no purpose, no reason for being and no projection of survival, there is no intention to nature. Yet scientists constantly create religions from the purposes they perceive nature to be, so imbuing everything with the same logic they are founded in... the selfish viewpoint.

Without dualism and so without "self", the entire universe is unknown and runs on pure instinct or innate response. There is no survival instinct, that is an illusion. It is more that there is a **direction born out of expansion** which is like heat rising and that is the expansion/growth or life of things. As heat expands so does nature, it grows outwards and flourishes, recycling all the time. There is no death... when a person dies we believe them to be "dead" because they do not respond in the same way and so are a loss to society. But they are consistently alive, nature uses the body in a billion different ways as it degrades, the energy of the universe is always balancing itself out and so one thing transforms into another and another and it is all part of a total oneness that has no divisions, only imagined ones.

What we call death is a transformation and what we call birth is a transformation, life doesn't have fixed frames, the death of "self" is also simply a transformation of energy, all thought is energy too. Death is like a cooling process, energy moves from a warm state to a cool state and then is re-used and forms warmth again in a different expression. This is constantly happening, even the living body is known to be recycled entirely every 7-8 years. The point of all of this is that the **"self" wants a continuum of a static state of being a "me"** but actually this never happens, even the body is not static, nor are the mind and "me" state static. Every time we go into deep sleep, or in rare moments when awake there is a dropping away of the "self" that just occurs spontaneously. This break open the believed continuum, pointing out time and again that what is, is not always seen through the "me", in fact the "I" doesn't

need to be around for the body to carry on regardless. We can see this very clearly in infant children and in nature and animals, no self is needed.

Instead of believing in the scientists or religious people, the points raised in this website and by U.G Krishnamurti and Douglas Harding and all expressions that are looking to the nature of the natural-reality, all are questioning what other people tell you and suggesting you consider what it is that you really and truly sense. When it comes down to it, what is really “known” by you when you walk around a local park or garden or anywhere that is partially natural? Do you see and hear a continual commentary of an Attenborough telling you how it all is, or a Dawkins explaining how the genes are selfishly fighting each other? Or in the situation of dogs meeting each other and growling and snapping at each other in a park, is it all to do with “one getting the better of the other”? Or do you see the child’s world where a constant question-mark is before the senses, everything is utterly unknown, even the direction and process of walking and what to do or where to go next are all governed by an instinctive sense, not through a thought-out intended or “intuited” process of investigation.

When, somehow, we stumble into the situation of there being no necessity to figure it all out or of trying to make the world the way we want it to be and order it the way we want it to be, then there is a possibility that life can lead through the body without the resistance and confusion added on by the “self” that gets in the way and that, through the selfish view, only gets a fraction of the whole picture. It is true that no-one can know the mind of god, and also true that there is no god or mind to know, and more clearly that the unknowing has a direction of its own and one that has absolutely no requirement of a reason or purpose, as there is no past to run from and no future to look forward to.

“If you have the courage to touch life for the first time, you will never know what hit you. Everything man has thought, felt and experienced is gone, and nothing is put in its place.”

- U.G. Krishnamurti, The Mystique of Enlightenment

David Nassim
17/ 4/ 2013