

## **The scientist's wife: the lack of yin in science**

Science is fundamentally an expression of the warped-yang/ masculine approach, however yang by nature is the energy of light and expansiveness. When there is contraction of the dis-ease state of "self" layered on top of the nature of yang, it forms a "self". This "self" is the quality of detachment and this is the expression we have in science, previous articles have described science as being colonial, basically it is the process of attempting to find objectivity through detachment.

The title of this article isn't meant to incite a sexist argument, but really to point out the nature of the scientist being associated with the stereotypical masculine quality. Of course many scientists are women, but what we're actually looking at here is why the nature and quality of the yin/ female energy is in fact deeply and happily unscientific. This article is based on Douglas Harding's book called "Science Of The First Person", which is available from [www.headless.org](http://www.headless.org)

The problem is that science is based around avoidance and the main thing it avoids is intimacy. It is attempting to find the objective but is ignoring the observer involved in the actual experiment. Harding specifically focuses on this, particularly pointing out that the observer being part of the experiment is absolutely fundamental and is inescapable in science. That notion has of course been expressed many times in quantum physics and also in psychotherapy. Where Freud and even Jung take a quite objective stance outside of the patient and look from the observer's point of view as a kind of science, conversely Wilhelm Reich essentially gets involved in the process of transference and various other supposed "difficulties" which occur within therapy. This he points out, is the healing, the connection, rather than the hierarchical role of the supposed "well" practitioner and the supposed "sick" patient. In fact it is the connection that heals, the sense of Oneness and the burning up of separateness. Thereby healing occurs not because of but *despite* the healer or the patient, connection is the primary basis of healing. When one goes to the edge of all forms of science one finds a point at which the detached, cut-off observational process has to end.

The scientist's wife is purely a metaphor/story of a situation where you have a very eminent male scientist working for, say, the CERN laboratory, who's completely enthralled with the process and prospect of finding and understanding the fundamental particles of the Universe and the nature of life. Essentially this experiment and way of looking at things is scientist's life work and forms his complete direction and purpose, he believes he's expressing something which is fundamentally important. And in this case the metaphor of his wife is simply someone who wants a sense of connection and feeling with this man. Although she doesn't think in the same way he does, the interesting thing is that she is expressing exactly what he's looking for, which is a need and a want to connect to intimacy, to a blending and union, which for him would be drawing him back "home". However the scientist cannot really see her, he can only see the experiment. The realization of this is described in the song "The Scientist" by Coldplay:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EdBym7kv2IM>

The scientist is the expression of the difficulty of the male's expression in today's world. As with everything described in these articles these are broad-brush expressions, but as a general principle once "self" is involved in the masculine it

moves into the impersonal. This may be a very sensitive impersonal for the scientist, artist or musician, however while there may be a sensing of the world it isn't an intimacy. The intimacy actually occurs when there isn't a "me" or an observer watching what's going on, there is simply a complete union with the environment, there's never actually an observer. Tony Parsons points out ([www.theopensecret.com](http://www.theopensecret.com)) that the nature of the observer, or what people call conscious awareness/consciousness in the Universe, is an impossibility because there isn't anything to be conscious of it- "self". The fundamental issue is that essentially the scientist is always looking from an observational, detached perspective.

On the other hand the yin by nature is without-self, i.e. literally the open expression, which displays an openness and yielding quality to the nature of everything that's going on. In general for the female the process of intimacy can easily be diverted when there is a warped expression of the "self" that is added into the female psychology. So when the female's natural openness, which here is the metaphor of the wife, becomes ignited with the "self", it forms a very personal, highly anxious, trauma-centric experience of the world. However, that is much more open to a situation of a letting go of the "self" because she is deeply intimate with the environment and the nature of what's going on. While there may indeed be considerable trauma, anxiety or tension occurring, she is in a sense closer to a point of ripeness where the "self" simply dissolves.

The scientist is blocked within the glass box of his constructed reality, he feels that he's watching the bigger picture from a very austere and aloof position. He is detached, while his wife is completely involved. Her involvement with the world is one of sensitivity and experiencing it as a traumatic and tense place, with a constant feeling of fear and vulnerability. These situations are both precursors to a point of ripeness where all that is let go of, and a complete impersonalness occurs. Therefore when the female quality realizes the impersonal and the male quality realizes the intimate, there is dissolution of the "self" in both cases, i.e. both selves "die".

The situation of the scientist is one where he doesn't have to change or see anything differently, he can be safe inside the box, and this is actually the nature of science, it is incredibly static, even though it is felt to be constantly progressing. In fact what's fundamentally rooted at its core is not progressing at all, which is the nature of the "self". It is in fact the first premise of science that the "self" actually exists and as a result the observer exists and therefore everything is seen from a seemingly "true" position, but this is merely the appearance of something, it's not a reality. The fundamental reality is when the "self" is completely dissolved which cannot be something that is *known* to science, it's actually an *unknowable* expression and that's really the problem with science. Within this approach the male has corrupted many expressions in the world and has become the main focus, he will utilize any amount of power in order to find that which he seeks, he's the quintessential seeker trying desperately to find the intimate, the ultimate connection.

However, the ultimate equation that's going to unite reality cannot be found on paper, it is actually already within his senses and he doesn't "get" that, although he feels that if he can find what he's looking for then he will gain an enlightenment experience almost. What he's looking for exists already in the metaphorical situation with his wife. The possibility with her is an openness for intimacy which is what she wants,

but he considers her to be irrelevant to his experiment, she is beneath him, not part of the reality of pure science and what that truly means.

You find this incredible arrogance with those such as Richard Dawkins and other scientists such as Brian Cox who express an enormous detachment from the world in which they live, rather than something which is intimate. Though they constantly assert that while they are attempting to “unweave the rainbow” they can still experience it as a human being or even “improve” on this, but wonderment is wonderment...how can you improve on it? The huge difficulty is that experiencing something as a human being, recognising that life is unknowable is the only real possibility, as such science has to question what makes its view as different or “better”, science is not outside of the reality of human sense although it wants to be. So essentially they’re excising science from the human experience, it is actually a warped quality of the human experience, which is fundamental dualism, through a complete ignorance of the nature of what it’s actually looking at. This is what makes science limited in its expression and its practise, it also means the quantum physicist will never find the thing he or she is looking for. It is impossible for them to find the unconditional love or to qualify the unknown, which is essentially what they’re trying to do.

So being trapped within the contraction of a scientist’s modality is also the situation of a contraceptive, which within scientific spheres is probably not really investigated! Scientists and those involved in academia really do ignore their body, their senses and experiential processes until the last. They can easily think of an altruistic reason why they shouldn’t have children and therefore they don’t have them. Of course there are cases where one simply doesn’t find the right situation in life, which can be the reason for not having children, but that is very different from having an altruistic ideology or mental pattern which prevents you from having children, the notion that science is more important than expression through the body or that physicality takes second place, or that the nature of the human animal or child takes second place. Intellect is put on a pedestal, the expression of nature is denigrated, as is the primitive expression of the indigenous person, which gives rise to a huge colonial warped masculinized expression which essentially is a contraceptive, it is within its box, or prophylactic expression, unable to seed itself in the world.

That is very deeply felt by huge numbers of both women and men, who are secondary expressions to the lives of their scientist partners, or those who, even if they’re not scientists are based in a scientific ideology. Of course religious ideology is no different, the belief in the observer is an identical situation to the belief in God. While in science there is the belief in an internal absolute observer that the person who is observing is discounted from. So the absolute observer in a sense *is* God, which is the god of science. In the same sense the absolute external observer of humanity is God in the religious sense. One is about the internal absolute observer, the other is about a presumed external absolute observer, but actually both of these are missing the point, that actually there is no such thing as an observer! God is “I”, or “I am” God, or we could say “I am” are the experiment, the experiment is “I”. Of course this is dualistic terminology but that’s essentially the truth of what we’re trying to arrive at.

So the nature of the scientific modality and way of thinking which is becoming one of the largest widespread ideologies occurring today, is basically infertility, science and

“self” are simply the expressions of infertility in the world. The clinical expression of the dis-eased masculine, be it inside or outside science, is something the natural female expression finds very difficult to connect to and the process of this is expressed in another article, “The Personal versus the Detached.”

The fundamental importance of this within society, which is based on the scientist’s wife, is that this is really a call or consideration to the yin expression of the true nature of femininity, which occurs within both the male and the female. It’s a re-connection to that and a realisation that science doesn’t hold the expression of the female within it. Because this aspect is missing in many ways it is a male-dominated world and science is an expression of that. It’s important to realise that when the female quality moves in the direction of nature, when there’s fidelity to her natural process, when she is led by nature rather than by the scientist or the masculine ideology, essentially she will move out and away from the scientific approach. Then the male will have absolutely no choice other than to follow her, this is a societal “cure”. This is simply how its going rather than us doing it, naturally there is a decaying of what is occurring at the moment to an anarchy of nature. Society is and always has been based in the yin female connection at root. Her nervousness, insecurity and traumatic sense are very frightening to the masculine but these are in fact not the natural female expression either and often the female has a deep sense of this. Inside of this is actually an open acceptance the nature of the true yin. We can see this in the world today where there are connections to the New Age movement, to transitional and alternative ways of thinking which has a vastly larger percentage of women involved in these areas compared to men.

What’s occurring in nature is that the female drops the “self” first, she becomes ripe before the male who follows afterwards. The different quality of expressions of male and female within society can be expressed in four different ways:

the yin female,

the yin male,

the yang female, and the

yang male,

in a sense this follows the order of ripeness and of letting go that naturally occurs with those people. The first to drop away is the yin within yin female, they have the fundamental sense and drop out of alignment with the ideology of science more quickly. The second is the yin male, they drop off next and probably the yang female also drops at the same time. The last to go is the yang male who is the fundamental dominator of human existence today.

David Nassim

05/03/2012