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Dear Reader

HI THERE. This book is a transmission to you, energetically encoded and written in a style to give you an experience, rather than a mind-to-mind, cognitive engagement of the mechanics of thinking, concluding, judging, categorizing and labeling as you go through the book. In fact, it’s been written to help take you out of your mind. Your current mind, that is, and helps you step into something bigger within yourself so we can also step into something bigger as a society, collectively.

The reading of this book is a direct experience of what the ideas are suggesting.

This book is meant to connect to and ask questions of the higher part of you, beyond your everyday cognitive, “ego-mind.” This discovery process has to happen experientially. Therefore, you have to go through it; it can’t be delivered in quick bullet points. Otherwise, it becomes what it is intending to help dissipate.

The first pages of the first chapter will most likely not feel “right” to your mind. The wording will feel strange. Some of my preliminary readers who experienced this said they caught the rhythm around page forty. The ideas won’t be directly delivered, but circular, almost in the obscure way a Master addresses her disciple, but always eventually delivering the teaching. Like a Chinese Chi Gong Master or a Zen Master with his koans. Frustrating at first. And this will cause reactions, judgment and conclusions as the mind acts in its predictable ways, wanting the meat to chew on-the conclusion. It will also possibly react to certain sections with impatience and frustration as
your mind resists the information and the energy behind the ideas because it is in fact challenging this very part of your mind by working around it.

This is key to understand. Cultivate mental agility and flexibility; challenge that conformity to the mind’s rigid demands for sound bites and quick delivery of tidbits of information. Get out of formulaic reading and thinking. Awaken even more, beyond your everyday thoughts and mind. Experience this book as if it is a workshop or retreat-or gym-in how to work with your mind. Indeed, that is exactly what this is.

As I tell my yoga and meditation students, and my clients who come to me for individualized meditation programs, you’re meeting with resistance because you’re just starting.

In meditation when we first sit down to observe our mind, it does not really react well at all. In fact, it tends to rebel. We notice more restlessness, more “monkey-mind” bounding from tree limb to tree limb, or thought-to-thought. Or conclusions about how there’s no clear goal, or how we can’t do this, or how we can’t be this way, and off we go following the mind, quitting before anything in us beyond the mind has had time to be engaged.

There is a reason why you picked this book up. Trust that.

The more steadfastness you exert, the more you can stay right with what’s being said in the line you’re reading right at that moment. So you’ll be more in the present moment, where energy expands and presence occurs, making less room for the cognitive mind. There will then be less clinging to the mind’s judgments. Following your thoughts and going off on one of your mind’s habitual trains of thought will happen less this way, too. This is one of the intended outcomes of taking in this book. I have written this as a meditator of twenty years, and a meditation and yoga teacher of fourteen years. You will feel this, eventually, under the words, if you don’t right away. It will be re-working your cognitive mind’s natural tendencies to be jumpy, easily distracted and busy with its concluding, labeling and judging, as if you were in fact meditating.

However, this is not a self-help book. Rather, it is a commentary on the state of our country, and the West in general, due to the obesity we have allowed the mind to become. However, in order to deliver this message, key aspects to how the mind became this way, and then other ways of being in our human minds with a lot more comfort, are presented.

So, the first part of the book is a clearing process. After a few years into my teaching career, I realized that I did this with my students during the first month of school-when I taught at the high school level. This was apparently not needed at the middle school level. The first part of the book, as you readjust, will most likely challenge your mind’s demands to hurry up. Another key suggestion is that you engage the Observer in you. We each have this ability in us whether we’re meditators or not. The Observer is on top of a boulder raised high above the little personality, “ego-mind “ version of ourselves, looking down and simply observing itself make choices as it
goes through life. Observe your impatience with wanting the point to be delivered immediately. Observe your desire for conclusions to be made so you can feel more comfortable being in the known rather than the question. Observe your mind’s demand for a clear understanding right from the start. Practice the art of allowing. Allow the points being made to develop and unfold.

This is a transmission that is meant to be experienced. Reading this book will take you through a process of de-conditioning your mind from its feeling of being in control. The writing will softly, gradually, but very clearly put your mind in the back seat, while something Higher in your consciousness gradually begins to step forward and receive this book’s content.

This book activates other parts of your human system, your intuitive inner knowing. This happens even though it goes in through your mind. The questions asked of you are connecting to something beyond the everyday mind, asking this part of you to step more forward and interact with the ideas. It does not present issues or problems for the mind to chew on. It instead presents the way it has been in order to understand why it’s the way it is now and gently asks you to consider seeing yourself, our society and our role on the planet in a different way now, here, in 2012 and beyond.

This different way is not from the mind. So, this book is not speaking to your mind. It’s going at your heart, your wisdom and your Higher Self. The writing style is therefore not quick, sharp, demanding nor direct, as the mind is. It is instead, the same energy as where these ideas are meant to go to inside of you. And where it’s meant to take each of you, and all of us. The hope here is to give you access to another energy, another way of being, another way of existing on this planet different than it has been.

So, that means a different way to deliver this message. I am loaning you a set of eyes from someone – me! “who was removed from our country two months prior to 9/11 and returning two years into Obama’s administration. This country has changed. The content of the typical concerns, and the level of fear the average citizen seems to display, have changed. I can feel it so much so that within the first month back here I visualized an astronaut’s helmet around my head. I did not want to absorb the general climate of thought as it has become here in the United States. It has apparently been a decade moving full throttle into fear. This has pulled at my heart, so much so that the labor behind this book increased in order to get this message out to more people. My workshops have increased and changed in their original intent and thus content, upon learning more and more what the everyday person here is worrying about.

Nevertheless, how about turning this inside out? Because that’s what this book is going to do. I was turned upside down, and inside out living in Asia for the past decade and have a mental flexibility and agility to my mind that my twenty years of meditation practice alone would not have given me. This removal of mine from our country appears to have been divinely timed. You can read my bio at www.healing-balance.com to understand that more. The consciousness behind my eyes-me!-has been a political consultant, has
a masters in Public Administration focusing on Public Policy, has been a writer and teacher of English Literature and Administrator, a Yoga and Meditation Teacher, an Energy Healer and a daughter of a mom who needed my energy healing when diagnosed with a deadly brain tumor.

One more thing—this book is written from a deep belief in our ability to change in positive ways in America. I have been involved in nothing but helping people awaken and grow since my first profession as a political consultant. During that work, I used some of the most fundamental democratic practices of grassroots organizing to successfully get the candidates whose campaign I was working on elected. I watched at precincts as votes came in, and watched as my candidates pulled forward in the number of votes, to victory. I enlisted people to go out, volunteering their time, to register voters. I could go on; I won’t.

I taught American Literature in my second career, finding myself teaching the Declaration of Independence, the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin’s “one of our country’s first millionaires “essay on moral perfection, Emerson, Thoreau, Walt Whitman, Fitzgerald’s The Great Gatsby, the Beatniks and on up through to Post-Modern Literature. I read and reread year after year the founding principles of this country. I traced our development of a national character alongside the industrial revolution, some of it with the critiques of the Transcendentalists as industrialization kicked into full gear in the late 1800’s.

I believe in our country’s ideals. The American ingenuity, idealism, passion and belief in something better being possible is what our country is founded on. So are my business, my book, my radio show (“http://www.voiceamerica.com” www.voiceamerica.com), and my belief that something far greater than what we’re currently allowing ourselves to be is possible. Maybe part of my Bostonian upbringing has something to do with this. Therefore, it is with this spirit that I have painstakingly labored at times over the communication of these ideas in this book because it feels somewhat like my contribution to my fellow Americans. Please remember that as you read what are critiques, not criticisms, of our country.

I invite you to get out of your own way even more, allowing yourself to be even bigger than you currently are. Living in a more alive way, living in a more authentic way that you are on fire about, having more vitality, passion and enthusiasm for yourself growing into being more than you ever thought possible. That is my hope for each of us. More health, more wealth (if that’s what you desire, especially if you were tripped up into the mentality that there isn’t enough to go around) and more joy. If we each were to live at this level—with an aware, alive joy—then could you even begin to imagine what it would be like to be in community? And what this would do for the collective good of us in America? And in the West? And on our little planet? Now is the time! And a part of you already knows this; otherwise, you never would have picked up this book. Trust that part of you. And me. Namaste.
Welcome

You’ve made a major decision just by picking up this book. I say the same thing to my clients. It appears, after doing energy healing and being in the holistic health and natural healing field for 20 years, that I seem to attract people who are ready for something much greater than where they’re currently operating. In fact, I have been nicknamed a “lightning bolt” due to the way my work quickly pierces to the very core of what my clients are truly needing. You can view video testimonials saying as much at www.healing-balance.com. I don’t mess around. One client puts it, “What I like about you Alison is that this is not a romance, it’s not a dance. You, like an arrow, get straight to where it is that I was blocked and we went right at releasing it.”

So I congratulate you on being attracted to what is in this book. It says something about you! It will no doubt challenge you in ways that you’ve most likely not been before, challenging your most deeply held, cherished beliefs -many of which you are unconscious of even holding. Many of these same beliefs are at the core of how our society has functioned for the past 300 years or so, and thus what your mind has taken in as “the way things are.”

What you will get from this book are many things.

1. This book is about power. Power for individuals; societal and universal power. You will be able to see how you can have more ease and vitality. You’ll be guided how to restore or increase the “magic“ in your life. You’ll be shown how to directly access this power source for yourself, flushing your life with this power in a very practical way. This book also delivers very clear instruction on how to work with our thoughts to move beyond the mind in order to access this power. Where this power resides according to the wisdom from ancient cultures and the new cutting edge sciences, a.k.a. “The New Sciences” will also be presented. Much of this is from the author’s own experience from living and working in Asia for a decade while researching ancient practices for vitality, longevity and power, working as a successful energy healer, yoga teacher, meditation teacher, chi gong teacher, vegetarian personal trainer and body builder for the past 20 years.

2. You will gain a crystal clear picture of why life in the United States in particular feels so unstable, comparatively, say to about ten years ago. This is beyond the commonly blamed sources. American society in particular, but Western society in general, has been and continues to be vulnerable to losing its power right now. You’ll be given a window to see how our society has been trained to turn away from the power in subtle energy and consciousness while also be given quite a solid understanding
about how subtle energy and consciousness is seen as THE source of power in the East. This comparison will help you appreciate just how much we leave out in our society’s views on life, and what we’re missing out on.

3. You’ll then gain a clear view of how Western culture is in the midst of a mostly unspoken shift that is changing the way we “do life.” This is a massive shift, or “macroshift” from a society structured by Newtonian Physics, based on denser energy and a more physical understanding of our world. The times we’re heading into are more of Quantum Physics, based on a lighter, more fluid, quicker, more random energy. You’ll learn how Newtonian Physics deals with the physical, while Quantum Physics deals with consciousness. The understanding that old structures society-wide are crumbling because they are based on doing things in this old way, and this is no longer possible will calm you. Hence, they’re crumbling. This is not bad. This is change. In addition, it’s where we are. Anything too dense is being forced to change. This appears to us as breaking down, or crumbling. It is at both the individual and societal level this density is being broken down. You’ll also have a sense of how this all coincides with the nature of the years immediately preceding and following 2012, a time predicted to be The Great Awakening for humanity.

4. You’ll see how this translates in a very real way to how we in the West, particularly America, are being commanded to adopt a new fundamental way of doing things. The discussion will show you how at the start of modernization and industrialization Western science had its focus more towards the physical, in reaction to the main sentiments of their times. You’ll gradually have the picture painted for you of how this old model, or metaparadigm, is no longer relevant to our times now. So you’ll then understand a great part of why it feels so unstable today in the USA and the West overall. We are at a turning point; there is a global macro-shift underway. These changes are causing us to feel unstable, individually and collectively, throughout the top organizations and sectors of our society.

5. Very clearly, you will be shown that in order for us to remain competitive and viable as individuals and as a leading nation on this planet we must deal with the most basic aspect of being human, our minds. You’ll see how this connects to consciousness, the period we’re entering into. This means dealing with our thoughts, beliefs, emotions, behaviors and choices, rather than focusing mostly on the physical. Globalization has given us
a new world. Equally, the very nature of 2012 is as a turning point.

6. Finally, it will be absolutely redundant that you see it is time to take your power back from wherever you've given it away. And you'll be shown how. This may be from clergy to tell us about our own relationship to divinity and to our own souls. You'll come to distinguish where you've given away your power to doctors to tell us about our own bodies as if they know them better than each of us do (or can), the food industry to trust with such an intimate aspect of life, the medical system that we hope has our best interests at heart, or the government to take care of you. So, in order to do this, this book is also focused at a very personal level, examining how our choices have been shaped by our society's metaparadigm. Meaning our core beliefs, since the start of the modern industrial era, have been very much influenced by what our society's authority figures have told us is real and true. You will see first hand with practical examples of how these ideas have become outdated in this emerging age of consciousness or holism. These very foundational ideas have shaped how each of us frames what is and what isn't possible. So as we work backwards from the societal beliefs of our metaparadigm, you will be able to see how and where to work with your own thoughts to take your own power back.

Wow! Right? This is huge! This book presents both the macro and the micro, weaving them together as if a dance between the two. In order to do so, the ideas take a while to come to shape for you, my dear reader. So please engage patience. The complexity of these many ideas does come together, however you just have to wait for it to unfold for you.

To help you better grasp some of these ideas that may erupt your world, you have access to my online radio show. Go to voiceamerica.com and put, “Create Your Best Life Ever!” in the search and you will get to my show. On it are the leading thinkers, movers, shakers, and doers of this time interviewed by me, as well as myself on the show helping to drive these points home. There are also loads of free clearings, healings, holistic lifestyle tools and tips with which to test, apply and work with the ideas presented here.

This book came from a decade that rocked my world. That is, more so than the other decades of my life. Ask any of my long-term friends, or even my newer friends, and this is something that one gets quite quickly about me. “I could sense there was something alive over there in the corner, and I realized it was you once you got up and walked to the podium to speak,” said one of my more recent acquaintances-and client. My life has not been one of status quo, choosing along with what everyone else has done. And feeling comfortable.

I have traveled around the world, lived in Asia for a decade, living in
all regions of our globe and all regions of the United States for shorter time periods than that. I did not have a bucket list; I was living a bucket list before the term got trendy. I visited the very same aboriginal healer in Bali that Elizabeth Gilbert writes about in *Eat, Pray, Love* before she did. I had already written much of this book when I completed my PhD, moved back to the United States and started my business. Elizabeth just got it penned and submitted quicker! You can see pictures of me getting the actual treatment on my content rich website, alisonjkay.com (go to the “A Note From Alison” page under the About tab http://www.alisonjkay.com/Note.php)

In fact, suffice it to say my truth is that I have lived the life of a pioneer, having ideas in me usually about ten years ahead of the curve. This has caused my family to refer to my food at the dinner table as “jungle food” back in the start of my now 20 years of being a vegetarian. It has caused me to from college on seek out the most progressive pockets of our country and planet to live in so I could thrive. Otherwise, my constant existence of expansion as if a growing tree would have been stifled. I have never been married, I have never had kids. I have been a leader my entire life, and not realizing it until about my late teens. I have always been a soloer never a member locked into just one group of friends because I have always wanted to be able to change at my rate, and not be locked in to the group rate of change, nor group think.

I have lived what I write about here. This includes my own personal story of seeing how the natural healing world conflicted with the biomedical system’s delivery of healthcare when it came to my mom’s diagnosis of a brain tumor and a prognosis of three months. This prognosis I did not know when I packed up my belongings and le’ my logjam in Istanbul, where I was under contract as the Middle School English Department Chair and 6th-8th grade Humanities teacher at an international IB school. I came back to Florida and immediately got underway to treat my mom with energy healing and the reconditioning of her beliefs that this brain tumor was not going to take her in 3 months. I backed off all of my family members including my Dad somewhat, telling them to stay away until they could get their fear under control. I acted as the proverbial brown bear wrapping her protective arms around her cub with my mom’s head, containing both the tumor and the thoughts and beliefs that could either help her or hurt her. In the end, we were successful. The brain tumor was wiped away and off the MRI, leaving the doctors at the local cancer center, Mo9t, to declare my mom a miracle case.

This book is born from living a very different life than most of the people I meet. And it is my gift to you, dear reader. It is a way for you to stop allowing yourself to just be ordinary. Because that somehow is not the nature of being alive here on this planet in 2012 and beyond. It seems we are being asked to be the fullest version of ourselves, individually and collectively. And it is with this in mind that I do the most basic American thing I can: express my ideas within a democracy that has citizens who have freedom of choice.

Know that you can make very different and slightly different choices in each moment. Know that your choices in the way you spend your time, your
money and your thoughts are actually choices too. Know that this is where your power is. And truly-let freedom ring! You can do this, it is more than just possible, it is the single most liberating thing any human can be shown. And it is within these pages that this expansive energy will be explored, unraveling for you the way it has been tied up, and freeing up space for a new way, a new moment, a new day. Welcome to your best life, our best life, ever! Choice is frequently underrated.

---

**Chapter 3—Becoming**

**Reasonable, Yes? Scientific**

**Materialism’s Metaparadigm and**

**the Emerging Industrial Era**

*The West’s Strengths are the East’s Weaknesses and Vice Versa*

Back in the west by the end of the nineteenth century, with both the modern era and the industrial age firmly geared up, two centuries after Newton, there was widespread certainty that the overall program of scientific materialism and Newtonian physics had been a general success. In the realm of physics, a tremendous amount had been explained by Newton, and in chemistry the theory of atomic activity as the basis of everything had been considered to have been proven valid. There was strong confidence in the scientific approach because so much of its program had been carried out, at least in the realm of physics and chemistry, in application to objects believed not to have life. This completely and perfectly fit the Industrial Age’s needs, as well. Objects were created from scientific discoveries, with practical application to mechanizing many, eventually most, aspects of life so these processes could be quicker and more uniform. Massive improvements in the time and means for travel were gained, as well as improvements for the lifestyle of Westerners, particularly in America, thereby bringing us into the modern age.

The analogy of a “clockwork god” became prevalent, as many in the time period in the mid to late 1800’s—which is deemed the start of the modern age—analogized the increasing sophistication of their ability to craft precise machines, with the universe being so, or nature and the skies, also seeming to run in an orderly fashion, like the smooth functioning of a clock. Therefore our understanding of the universe, as well as our material creations using this
same science both created the sense that it all runs like a machine. Science seemed to fit together all the pieces of the universe as if it were a clock whose individual parts all have a function, functioning precisely and orderly, and then creating machinery and technology based on this same idea.

The machines and other inventions helped to create the appearance and unconscious feeling over time of facilitating and keeping order by the consistent rhythm the mechanization created as a background, or undercurrent to life, and by the uniformity contained within mechanization’s processes and products, as well. These inventions also expanded potential and opportunities, some of which had never before been thought possible for humans to mimic nature. Once the general public then began to increasingly have access to and use these inventions, they too began to gain this same feel that the scientists had already had; mechanization and smooth running. This stability that permeates through almost all aspects of society is one of the most distinctive, differentiating characteristics between the Western and Eastern hemispheres—up until the last decade or so.

In other words, this was a good, comforting feeling from this perspective of everything having its place, neat and tidy. In fact, it was so precise in its tidiness that it did indeed resemble the finest sense of subtle measurement and precise mechanistic functioning of the clock. This was a clean, objective feeling of order. Everything being able to be figured out with reason. This rendered the Church seen not to be needed as much anymore as a force of authority due to the influence of reason.

Further adding to the changes the use of reason and the Enlightenment brought was that each individual had their own rights, intellect, and will and could compete to use them to his or her highest advantage without limitations set by a theocracy or monarchy. Instead, each individual could have a voice in their own republics/democracies/parliaments. Both these factors thereby made everything feel cleaned by the end of the Enlightenment. All was then cleaned up, after the near millennia of chaos and irrational, unpredictable, mysterious phenomena from the “Dark Ages, “or the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages had still allowed for an acknowledgement of the subtle. But that had also been dominated by the Church’s hypocrisy and abuse of its proclaimed power, particularly in the realms of what had been considered unexplainable, or “supernatural,” as the subtle was categorized in the West.

The scientists and intellectuals of the Enlightenment were able to do this through the belief that there is a mathematical foundation to the universe. This has become a cornerstone of science, within the scientific materialist metaparadigm. This belief is an essential aspect of metaphysical realism, one of the key principles of scientific materialism. Metaphysical realism states that the universe is ordered by ideas, such as mathematics, that lies beyond or transcends the senses. According to this view, these ideas are the very ideas that are implicit in the actual nature of reality. Meaning, that it’s what the universe really boils down to. Even though it has the word metaphysical in its label, metaphysical realism as it has been applied within the greater scientific
materialist paradigm has seen matter as the fundamental building block. Mainstream science still does operate under the principle that everything in the universe is ordered by ideas such as math, even with quantum physics proving differently. We can now see this order reflected in the resultant mass-cleansing and ordering that the Enlightenment’s scientific discoveries and revolution provided, using reason as a basis for society. The previous chaos had taken place without this order successfully projected onto external, physical phenomena and onto and within our societies. Chaos after the Enlightenment had been successfully and strategically ordered right out of the metaparadigm “or so it seemed.

Another main aspect of what the Enlightenment provided for the West was based on the understanding that each person differs and so their views and perceptions are different, to varying degrees. This wasn’t necessarily a positive view. Something was needed to help regulate against this rampant, inconsistent and at times irrational subjectivity so the irrationality seen in the previous “Dark Ages“ would not continue. Thus, one of the key designs behind the scientific materialism model is the use of reason because it was viewed as a panacea to be able to both guard against, as well as override, this human tendency commonly understood in our culture as the subjective world; presumed to be irrational and operating by wishful thinking.

Meaning, we may each have a different perception, or interpretation of the same things, such as colors and fruit and music—but this is the land of the so’ sciences and art, like psychology, sociology, and literature. The hard sciences, however, are where we can go for clear, unambiguous, certainty that this is the way the universe is, because it’s been proven with reasoning and mathematical formulas. Opinions by the human with their own subjective perceptions affected by their own personal beliefs, histories, cultures, gender, general mental makeup—i.e., optimist, pessimist—etc was not intended for the sciences.

According to the principles of scientific materialism, science can show us what these external objects are really like in an objective way, separate from and independent of any human’s perceptions, feelings or beliefs. They saw this as a way that we can all accept and agree on and acknowledge as reality, because these are scientific facts, proven with the scientific method. Because of this and because rigorous, solid methodology was developed to obtain these understandings, it became understood, it became the consent, that this is reliable and consistent information. This is otherwise known today as the facts. Whatever science produces that has used the rigor of the methodology accepted within the field, such as replicable results, then it is another fact for us to believe in, trust and know.

We, the general public, are in agreement with this system. Remembering that initially, this reliability and consistency was deemed needed as well as desired by the male scientists of the Enlightenment, is quite important here. Because, again, after such a long period of instability that included the witch trials, they felt they were doing a service by stabilizing life for society. They did provide quite a service, indeed, at that time.
This is what is meant partially by saying that the East differs from the West in both acknowledging the subtle energy(ies) in life, and by actually placing it in primary position over the physical–metaparadigm wide. Comparatively, the West places more of its primary emphasis–metaparadigm wide–on the physical, or that which we can see and thus believe in, because it’s tangible, quantifiable, measurable and hence able to be proven to be some thing. Because of this form of tangibility that yields measurement, science has been able to verify nature and existence. This has been our measuring bar in the West for anything whose credibility is in question. i.e., “What does science have to say about this phenomena? “ We now yearn for solid reliability—the facts, proven.

There is another major factor at play here distinguishing between the way the two hemispheres seem to have divergently split at this point post–Enlightenment. The West, from what was just described, has the societal/hemispheric sense that life is more ordered and less chaotic, compared to the East’s feeling that is chaotic. However, this chaos, after a bit of time and closer examination, can be understood to be some type of a harmonic relationship. It’s just not as obvious, or direct, and it is different from the order within the West. This second major factor of chaos vs. order is built off of the belief of what has primary positioning of influence in life—the physical or the non–physical. And it is resultant from minds that were desiring order. Order and control are creations from the mind. The spirit, or soul, knows and is comfortable with chaos. This will gradually become more clear.

By acknowledging subtle energy as an integral and primary part of life, in the East this shows up everywhere throughout their culture. It’s in their main cultural beliefs, institutions, organizational structure, values, and behaviors “as explored within the Chinese culture. Yet accompanying this structure for their valuing subtle energy, they have “some “ work and wisdom produced through millennia of attempts at understanding both subtle energy and chaos.

So this yields different societal priorities, laws, structures and rhythms. And this is perhaps where life in the East to a Westerner’s eyes can be seemingly chaotic. Whereas in the West, by placing the physical primary this creates a contrast–society wide–that is polar opposite in its organizational structures and rhythms. In this case, we’ve built upon order. An important question here to ask, then, is if this order in the West is natural, or is it being imposed from humans’ minds using reason? Is chaos actually what is more natural? Or are both natural, but each is at different levels of the evolution of humans and human consciousness?

We could ask, is it as simple as just different perspectives? But the differing perspectives are what they are due to what’s been previously discussed. By following the scientific materialist paradigm, it has yielded our perspective. So we focus on what we do and leave out what we don’t focus on. Both of these factors creates our perspective. This can be appreciated when only having access and understanding to another perspective that does not operate from this
cultural, society wide metaparadigm. And this is what is being given to you from this book.

So, for example, within the Western metaparadigm of scientific materialism, take gravity, the very phenomena Newton worked with. It is in the transcendent reality—meaning that which exists beyond the five physical senses, and so the phenomena of gravity must be either inferred through a process of reasoning, (the scientific method of scientific materialism) or accepted on authority, (scientists). Science had accomplished this by modern day, the ability to be both—a source of reason and authority. Science is able to do this because the general public, including the Church now—us—we believe what science does, and what it can do, what it proves, and what technology it creates. On a daily basis, we are in consent with this system being our metaparadigm. We continue to rely on it as our source of validation and proof for what reality is. Our consent is also given by investing in the technological innovations that this system produces.

Because we are so used to operating within our metaparadigm, life just appears to us to be the way it is. Attempting to pull out of our system and analyze and discuss it appears awkward and challenging. In order to better appreciate this key distinction, here is a bit more to help. Let’s use gravity because it’s such an outrageous example, it’ll help make the point. Gravity has been taken to be its own separate entity that can be measured and understood in our metaparadigm. Yet if we lived in Asia, gravity could be viewed as part of a larger system, functioning in some level of coordination within the larger system. By it being unable to be extracted out and reduced to its own entity, we are unable to make it more tangible. Instead, we’d have to examine how the whole system worked together. In our metaparadigm in the West, this reductionism feeds into a greater system, over time, of living a more physically based life.

Put another way, gravity was seen to be its own force, and many other discoveries and inventions were made based on the one understanding about gravity. The holistic approach might instead see it as part of a larger system of forces at work, where there is gravity in some parts, and a lack of gravity in other parts. What might also happen from within this holistic view is observing this whole system from a more passive, detached observant role, where we don’t believe that we fully understand it and can therefore not fully work with and manipulate it on its own. We must instead approach the whole system that contains gravity within it.

But the key difference in perspective here is that in some way this force “gravity” was relatively beyond our reach, if we came from the holistic perspective. We were limited in some way of what we were able to do with it. Or we were not of the same level that whatever this force was, so we didn’t have the ability, nor right, nor were we meant to, be able to understand it enough to then “own it” enough to then create from it and with it. And thus the technologies produced from this understanding would be working from the whole systems approach, not just with technologies using gravity reduced out from its context. We could work with its natural
tendencies as it exists in the larger whole system. This would be another way that we could possibly approach the universe and its phenomena in a non-scientific materialist approach. Perhaps it would lead to more sustainable technologies in the long term? Isn’t this where we need to get to in today’s post-modern world?

So by approaching gravity with the scientific materialist approach and its five principles, it has been reduced to be its own phenomena with reductionism. Gravity had sophisticated mathematical calculations applied to it by using both objectivism and metaphysical realism. These are the combined beliefs that the objective universe can be known by the subjective human mind, but the external universe exists above and beyond the subjective human mind and is “out there,”—objectivism. Because the universe is ordered by ideas (such as mathematics) that lie beyond or transcend the senses, these ideas are implicit in the very nature of reality “metaphysical realism. In this case of gravity, the efforts are the subjective reason of the human mind using mathematical calculations to know the objective world’s phenomena, gravity.

This force of gravity, when applying the closure principle, central to the scientific materialism paradigm, takes out any and all possible metaphysical or supernatural causes or forces—because the closure principle declares that anything other than material influences can not impact and affect any part of the natural world. Once understood, inventions using the same principles of gravity soon followed based on universalism, the last one of the five major tenets of scientific materialism. It contends that these rules are universal and that they are the same in any and all parts of the universe whether it is a physical entity such as a cell, a gun or a planet.

As a result, because gravity is a part of how the unseen, or intangible, dimension of space works, and it is only one part of it, by taking this one part and applying mathematical calculations to it, we have turned it into something tangible, by making it something that can then be discussed, manipulated, understood, worked with, and used for our own purposes. Rather, than say, le’ alone within its larger system, and then us understanding the larger system of space at work, without dividing out the one phenomena of gravity. We have then further made it tangible by the common pool and cue ball example: that if one takes a cue ball and pushes it towards the pool ball—say the nine ball—it will then, with the force of gravity, impact the nine ball with a predictability expected from applying the universalism concept of the scientific materialist approach. From this, we can then base other understandings, and create physical machines that operate on these same premises.

There is one other key point here, with scientific materialism’s metaparadigm. The closure principle denies that anything other than material influences can impact and affect any part of the natural world. If there is a larger system at work here that gravity is just a part of, and then if this larger system is unable to be reduced, or broken down, to be measured and quantified, then we are negating the possibility of its existence, particularly
by this one principle from scientific materialism of closure. Also, what if there is a larger system, or force, at work behind gravity, that is metaphysical or supernatural, not even necessarily of a divine sort such as a punitive god watching over everything we do, but just a force that is not able to be considered of a physical, or material, essence?

This latter concept seems to be much like the subtle energy of prana (from India) and chi (from China) that permeates through all animate life forms as the Indians and Chinese–not limited to only these cultures who hold this belief, but as the two explored in depth here–believe. It seems important to consider that these two cultures have each developed complete medical systems–including diagnostic tools on through to treatments. Not only their medical systems, but also their sciences of the mind (Buddhism and meditation; yoga and the chakra system), and their using food and nutrition medicinally are all geared not towards hitting a problem once it has become a problem. Their holistic medical models do not view physical symptoms as the only indicator. They are also working within a framework of what health, vitality and well-being is, meaning in Western terms–preventative medicine. Do you see the parallel to what scientific materialism has done with gravity?

By acknowledging the subtle, they have been able to acquire this vast bank of knowledge and have a working definition metaparadigm wide of what vitality, stamina, longevity, health and well-being all mean. By operating from within the metaparadigm of scientific materialism, is it possible that we are limiting what we’re able to see? Are we possibly therefore, limiting what we’re able to believe? Why does the East have this system of preventative medicine–again, a label we’ve given to practices focused on, in their terms, words that translate to, “vitality,” “stamina,” and “longevity”–at such a metaparadigm level? Whereas we are only just now even beginning to incorporate this concept of longevity into our American culture. And this is only at the levels of those who are working outside the metaparadigm, in either the new sciences, or as “natural healers” of some type (nutritionists, chi gong practitioners, yoga teachers or practicing students, or energy medicine practitioners). What are we missing?

What is seems like the scientific materialism paradigm has given us is an outstanding ability to produce useful, tangible technology that makes life more convenient, indeed. However, this metaparadigm coming to us from the sciences keeps us locked into a certain way of seeing the world. With globalization and increasing crises over the past ten years, we’re only starting to get glimpses of other ways to approach life that are more focused on the subtle in life, such as our emotions and the role they play in health, our general mind set, tone, mood and the role it plays in our lives. Breaking things down, reducing the whole into parts has us focusing more on the parts than the whole. And at this point it seems a detriment.
Our Beliefs Are Our Choice and How Many Are Inherited?

As B. Alan Wallace says in *Embracing Mind: The Common Ground of Science and Spirituality*, "So, just as God transcends the universe, his divine language allows the scientific mind to transcend the senses and reach true understanding of reality. Often, according to this perspective, reality can be reduced to a mathematical formula, " (italics mine) (Wallace 2008). And so, this metaphysical realism aspect of scientific materialism—that there is a mathematical foundation to the universe—seems to us, by now, just as natural as that there is an objective world—some of it animate, and some of it inanimate—that we can know experientially through our five senses. That is separate from us and our perceptions, as we have been taught to believe by these very principles of scientific materialism, goes without saying. Right?

This ability to calculate, this belief in the fundamental utility of mathematical calculations in application to universal phenomena that is “out there” has enabled scientists to be able to create materials and machines—technological innovations and products—due to their use of mathematical calculations, like electricity and the tangible light bulb. The average citizen also takes the abstract phenomena and brings it into a more concrete concept. For instance, calculating our expenses for the month against our income is one way that we don’t have to just rely on our senses, instead we can reason, using math; it’s the same when we want to estimate how long it will take us to drive a certain distance, based on our expected speed we’ll drive and the length of time spent driving. These examples are abstract, right? I have never touched my percentage of my salary that is spent on expenses, it’s an abstract idea of thirty-nine percent. This then represents a certain physical phenomena—how much cash I have to spend after expenses. But typically, with these abstractions derived from calculations and mathematics, scientists have then used these formulas towards practical applications of science. Thus, giving us industrialization and technology, rather than stopping at general understandings of the world “out there.” And this has been what the West has been appreciated for.

This reflects how the abstractness of scientific calculations has been used for tangible, physical goods and services, like electricity, the internet, and wireless technology. It's historic since its inception. The USA more so than any other country has excelled at applying science to inventing technologies and machines we end up taking for granted and relying on. Steam power, the train, the refrigerator, the oven, the television are all examples. Again, B. Alan Wallace helps to paint the picture, “Of course science in the Renaissance [and more so, the Enlightenment was not propelled merely by the curiosity of talented intellects. Expanding commercial interests demanded improved technology in the field of navigation, and governments needed better military engineering to protect commerce and advance the interests of their domains. As science provided this technology, it gradually gained enough credibility to prevent the church from censuring it each time a new theory or discovery contradicted religious doctrine. Rather, a delicate balance replaced the
previous religious dominance over scientific ideas. Once the prestige of science had grown, theologians themselves began to rely on it. For example, science could be used to determine what was and was not a miracle: if some phenomena could not be accounted for by a scientific law, it could be declared miraculous. Over time, as scientific knowledge expanded and God’s role diminished, he would be called on merely to fill in the gaps in scientific knowledge–gaps that grew smaller and smaller as science advanced, “ (italics mine) (Wallace 2008).

As the Industrial Revolution progressed, in order to be able to produce relevant technology and a more perfect understanding of the heavens, laws of motion needed to be more specific. Captains in the military needed to be able to calculate the best angle to point their canons in order to destroy the enemy. According to the principle of universality, the same laws of motion that the planets followed should also be followed by canons, and bullets. This was of major interest for such leading scientists as Descartes, Leibniz, and Newton. So what had to then be worked out was whether any nonphysical factors played any part in the motion of objects. Descartes was the first to theorize that there existed nothing in nature that could not be explained by purely corporeal, or tangible, causes. This is the closure principle of scientific materialism. It successfully closed off nature from all but physical influences. “Frightened soldiers couldn’t cause cannonballs to fall elsewhere by wishing or praying. Nor could demons start fires or cause objects to levitate. Only matter could move matter,” (Wallace 2008).

Wallace then cautions that Descartes was careful to make two exceptions to this principle: biblical stories and the human soul, both of which he believed could affect the body–and the physical world of matter. “But the influence of the church had already weakened considerably. Leibniz, born only four years after the death of Galileo (1642), boldly theorized that mind and spirit had no effect whatsoever on nature, “ (Wallace 2008). Clearly, this is central to the deepening of the mind and body split in the West. The mind is of the non–physical and matter is, well, physical. This is also where the departure from Descartes’ acknowledgement of the soul and mind, the nonphysical, get le’ behind, as scientific materialism gets put more firmly in place, alongside the growing industrial revolution.

Interestingly, though, Isaac Newton was deeply religious, and believed that the physical universe was composed entirely of inert matter created and put into motion by God. And the universe had God’s laws imposed upon it. So Newton argued against Leibniz’s view of a universe completely self–contained and isolated from spiritual influences. Newton claimed that this would lead to materialism and atheism. Yet, in another irony within the field of science, it was Newton himself who laid the groundwork for a totally mechanical model of the universe, one that God may have set in motion, but was no longer required to be kept around for the upkeep and management. It seems that the scientists who succeeded Newton
grew further away from Descartes’ acknowledgement of the mind and soul and Newton’s acknowledgment of God’s role. This was replaced by the deepening emphasis on the mechanical model. Focusing on the physical at the exclusion of anything subtle enough to not be classified as "physical" grew alongside the growing metaparadigm of scientific materialism and its marriage to industrialization.

The theories on the laws of motion then led to Newton’s theory of gravity, and this then “put science on a roll for over two centuries,” (Wallace 2008). In fact, much of the ongoing resistance—as we’ll soon see—once quantum physics hit the scene with its theories that again seems to take us back into what seemed like chaos, is because of this very stability and reliability of these tenets of the mechanical, solid world of matter based around these very laws. This resistance is at an almost unconscious level within the masses. This belief, and the conditioning resultant from the mechanical universe as presented by these Enlightenment scientists using Newtonian physics has been what we’ve built our physical world and our understanding of the way the physical world works around since the start of modernity and industrialization. We are deeply steeped in both, by now.

This conditioning runs so deep that these laws feel almost intuitive. So that to state that the world is not really as it seems, that the physical world breaks down to what some modern day physicists refer to as “energy soup” or quanta, or particles, or waves, or a bunch of energy pulsating beneath the surface of solid, physical matter that is waiting to be collapsed into matter, seems to sound more like science fiction. It feels not right according to world given to us by Newtonian physics—another label, realistically, for the metaparadigm of scientific materialism. If it is not science fiction it is, at least, incredibly destabilizing. Then what do we do with the certainty we’ve gained from “to see it is to believe it?” What about how the physical world seems to be so solid and reliable? What do we do with that? Is this starting to reflect a bit more of what life has been like here in the United States over the past decade? It should be. What we once relied upon as steady and stable is breaking down at this point of massive shifting from one era to the next.

**Our Fears Are Our Choice, So if We’ve Inherited Many of Them...?**

There’s one more major factor at play here that reinforced this emerging metaparadigm’s dominance: the Renaissance and Enlightenment’s Europeans’ increasing tendency to mistrust the subjective, imaginary, mental realm. This heightened even more with the Protestant Reformation at the start of the 1500’s. This birthed the Puritans. They then in great part birthed our American, Anglo-Saxon nation. Particular to this final point, Wallace states, “The new religious reformers condemned the priestly magic of the Catholic Church—the sacraments and saintly miracles—and warned of the dangers of diabolical influences of the mind,” (italics mine) (Wallace 2008).
This view is central to how the majority of us today still unconsciously and typically unbeknownst to us, view the mind. It is a dangerous place, the depths of which we should avoid because contained somewhere within it is a sense of darkness, or irrationality, or even madness. There is still much conditioned, deep-rooted hesitancy and resistance in our culture with examining the mind, so that the mind body connection remains held at an arm’s length, pushed away. This is obviously fear-based, as our Western tradition has taught us to be of the mind, and it is reinforced by the avoidance and absence of any real science of the mind with the subjective world not taken credibly—as credibly as the “hard” sciences, as psychology struggles to be.

Not only that, but what about the West having an understanding of the mind that goes beyond focusing mostly on the madness, or the maladies, or the diagnoses, disorders, and problems with the mind? Rather, one that is informative, instructional and helpful to people who seek guidance about how to better use this primary tool that is central to every aspect of our lives; this seems most functional. How we view, value and perceive anything from behind our eyes influences every aspect of our lives, in every moment. We just don’t typically hold this awareness as we are busy having our perceptions concluded for us by the mind; we just think it’s us as we go about life. This is a turning point; to recognize this is key.

“The most important choice a human being can make is whether they view the universe (outside world external to one’s mind) as a hostile or friendly place,” said our much beloved genius and philosopher, Albert Einstein. This speaks to the importance of how our perceptions are formed from our beliefs and how we then see the world the way we do based on our beliefs. This discussion also reflects how we’ve had our collective perception of the mind created for us in our culture, by our cultural values, practices, and ethos.

As we have seen, other cultures do engage in this type of instruction and focus—the opposite of what our value system is. So it is not “the way it is,” rather it is cultural, and it is value laden, and it is a choice. This is a choice that human minds make. And it was made for us by our science’s founding fathers due to their own beliefs influenced by their own experiences, their grandparents’ experiences, and their time.

Also, this cycle is a circle of no escape. Meaning in this choice, avoidance of the mind is inherent to it. But it is the very mind, and fear of the mind, that leads to this avoidance, allows for this avoidance, and reinforces this avoidance, creating all sorts of diversionary tactics to perpetuate this avoidance. As the avoidance gets fueled by fear of the madness in the mind and more fear builds, we move further and further away, fueled by fears from the very thing creating this fear—our minds.

Further, it has become, for many, a chosen tactic to disbelieve that something so potentially diabolical could also have control over our health, or at least effect our physical health. That could then mean a lot of things. Namely, that we would then have to deal with and face what is inside our minds. So, interestingly, this is cyclical—or the circle of no escape just mentioned—in
that the fear is mind based. It is this very fear that keeps the status quo of ignoring the impact and effect of the mind locked into place.

To get beyond this fear, and begin to actively question the content of our minds--our thoughts--means to have to eventually, or even initially understand consciously that we have this fear and admit to it. Think of how painful reading this discussion may have been for you. Which means another list of a lot of things, including again, going into the mind at least enough to observe it rather than let it run every moment by the thoughts in it and thus believe the thoughts that it produces. This means giving it some higher level of prioritization for study. To do this, we need to deprioritize some other things. Which means possibly, making some changes? And the mind doesn’t like that. Especially when there is a lot of change needed or a fundamental change needed. So, avoidance and the status quo becomes the chosen tactic, achieved through a range of superstitions, fear and distractions.

Ironically though, this metaparadigm is originally built upon and centered around the use of reason. However, what was just examined to see how we got where we are today culturally with our avoidance of genuinely studying the mind and subtle, unseen energy, uncovered fears and laziness. It was not solely reason. This deserves repeating: the choices made were based in large part on emotional reactivity to the chaos of the Dark Ages. They wanted order. Ironically, emotional reactivity is one of the key aspects that lessen once the mind is worked with in a meditative practice. To allow for things within one’s life, or one’s self, or one’s society to become uncomfortable to the point of a nagging feeling that change is needed, or a nagging feeling of running away from something out of avoidance takes a lot of effort. Yet because the effort goes unexamined, it becomes habitual, coped with, and just ends up feeling like “well this is just the way it is.”

This is frequently labeled “resistance.” This resistance happens within individuals as well as societies. It represents a divided individual, or a divided society, somewhat at battle within itself, however unconsciously. Specifically, this behavioral cycle of fear, leading to the checkout reaction of laziness masking avoidance, in resistance are all actually resulting from mental behaviors. But they became infused--as a reaction occurred to the initial observation and judgment--with an emotion, say of resistance, and then a behavioral choice, say of avoidance or laziness. Again we’re talking about behaviors within a system that is modeled around reason, and believing in and relying on the reason contained inherently within each individual. There is a contradiction here.

It is culturally accepted, as if this fear and then avoidance is acceptable because others are avoiding themselves and this internal work as well. We see signs of reinforcement within most aspects of our society. The entertainment industry and pop culture, the internet, and computer games are easily accessible examples. Group think is at play here. An example is the cultural acceptance--read the word “approval” here--of participating in following team sports, and attending team sporting events at stadiums, and even giving tax dollars towards new stadiums. This remains acceptable at a
mass level. While self-examination of this type, observing our thoughts and questioning where they come from is not. The validity or truth contained within our thoughts, and acknowledging some level or responsibility over our typical state of mind, also is not accepted at a mass level. It is simply not what we in the majority do.

Getting to know ourselves in this way is banned by the group think mentality because of these cultural choices made by our ancestors, who set up this, our inherited metaparadigm for us a long time ago, based on their needs at the time, and their cultural, historical, current circumstances within their lifetimes. Again, they made a choice what to focus on, and by doing so also made a choice what not to focus on.

Changing this means a whole lot of rethinking that needs to occur, and some re-working of what we value as individuals and as a group culturally. It very likely could lead to some initial inconvenience and discomfort. It could also lead to the question as to who or what is responsible for one’s health. Is it each individual’s contents of his or her mind, our minds connected to a god in the sky, a divine being only, biological factors only, or a combination of any or all of the above?

Then there’s the factor of who is benefiting from the current model? If the individual and his or her mind is not affecting the body, who is benefitting from this view? If the lack of health gets diagnosed and treated as biologically-physically-based, then who benefits from this view? Just as importantly, who does not benefit? Considering what the holistic models discussed in the examples of India and China’s medicine use for their diagnoses and prescriptions, and the level of importance they place on the patients’ daily lifestyle choices, what happens when we don’t have that emphasis in the Western medical model?

This leaves the field of medicine very busy, and in a very integral, heroic role.

If there were to be a more substantial focus on health, wellness, well-being and preventative medicine, then this would yield a different configuration to the way disease and health are dealt with. Our scientific materialism metaparadigm of an industrialized, technology driven culture used to a certain level of convenience replaces a certain level of self-discipline. This type of self-discipline is part of the yogic path, and the Buddhist path. In these same cultures’ metaparadigms, it is understood that tending to one’s own state of mind and well-being leads to one’s health and longevity. Yoga, Tai Chi, Chi Gong, acupuncture, and using food as medicine, are just a few examples.

Buddhism’s science of the mind terminology shows the less functional parts of the mind as “afflictions” which implies understanding that the mind has states that are less than optimal. Beyond focusing on the afflictive states, Buddhism then provides volumes of concrete remedies for these afflictions, as well, throughout the Buddhist scriptures. While Buddhism does not have the Freudian view of a wild beast of darkness hidden in the subconscious, it does have a model for “the neurotic mind, “which is quite simply, the average
human being.

Everything in the mind needs to have light shed on it in the Buddhist model. Once it does, it can then be worked with. First, there is the stopping and facing of one’s self rather than running from one’s self and the thoughts driving one’s mind. Then the ensuing shining of the light into the darkness to expose these thoughts creates understanding, dispels darkness, and provides clarity, light, and health. Sounds like a simplified model, and it is, but that is the long, arduous process of facing one’s self through the Buddhist model, in a nutshell.

Remember the Dalai Lamas’ definition of the mind body connection? “The mind body connection is the idea that the mind affects physiological functions in the body, “ (The Dalai Lama 1991). So if the mind is clear, light and healthy, then in this equation of the mind body connection, the physiological functioning of the body should be clear, light and healthy. Likewise, the inverse: with an unhealthy mind, then the physiological functioning of the body then follows this lack of health. It also works that following the lack of clarity and light, there is less vibrancy and vitality. A simple way to understand this theory is when do you have more energy, when you are happy or when you are a little down? What about when you’re exercising verses when you’re depressed?

As Wallace continues to discuss the splitting apart of science from anything metaphysical and also, the Church, he helps to conclude this section of the discussion: “Moreover, the Protestant ethic, aimed at humans improving their lot in the world through hard work, mistrusted magic, (they had just witnessed the witch trials, so they’re meaning earth based spiritual practices, or paganism) not only because it was an inner phenomenon but also because it was a kind of easy way, a shortcut to achieving one’s ends. If a magic spell could bring one wealth, why work? It is not surprising, then, that three centuries would have to pass before an experimental science of the mind, psychology, would emerge in the West. “ As Wallace continues to describe the times and sentiment when science began to carry equal weight as the church, this sword of mistrust cut both ways. The increasing decline in this belief in magic paralleled a questioning of God’s role as this supposed miracle–worker. “It was a painful dilemma: If God could intervene at will by magically producing miracles, a universe of consistent natural laws based on the closure principle, universalism, and physical reductionism was illogical. On the other hand, if this mechanical model of the universe didn’t need God, it was heresy. Even so, science was soon to squeeze everything nonmaterial out of the universe–spirits and demons, the human mind and God himself. Before long, the astronomer Pierre Laplace (1749–1827), when asked about God’s role in the world of nature would say, 'I have no need for that hypothesis,’ “ (italics mine)(Wallace 2008).

Wallace’s insightful commentary reflects the mutual exclusivity historically deemed to the two institutions of church and science, since modernity began. It further reflects the focus on the physical, while leaving behind a focus on anything deemed subjective, metaphysical, or whole
systems focused. *Caught up within what got left behind in the West since the industrial and modern age began, comparatively, is also the spiritual. For the spiritual is encased within the subtle and is beyond the Church and Synagogue. It is not measurable, perhaps not reducible, is different within different moments so is not predictable, and perhaps a bit too elusive for science to get its calculations to prove, as we shall see in the quantum physics section. Besides, quite frankly, what does studying the subtle energies, or the metaphysical, or spiritual, help us produce and consume?*

---

**Chapter 4-The Modern Industrial Age: How Did We End Up Where We Are?**

**Survival of the Fittest-How Much Have You Bought Into That One?**

So, by the beginning of the 1800’s, it was classical Newtonian physics without any obstructions from either philosophy or religion anymore that provided a string of important discoveries, causing scientists, and therefore society increasingly, to believe in this power of science to account for the entire universe using sophisticated mathematics. First, there’s Joule, Mayer and Helmholtz in the physical sciences, who devised the principle of the conservation of energy, which evolved into the first “of what was to be three “laws of thermodynamics. This law revealed the relationship between heat and energy, via mathematical formulations. Next came the wave theory of light from Augustin -Jean Fresnel. After this, Lord Kelvin and James Clerk Maxwell ascribed precise mathematical formulations to magnetism and electricity. Electromagnetic waves, it was theorized, caused magnetism, light and electricity.

Radio waves were then detected. Mendeleev’s periodic table came in next with the elements based on the assumption of subatomic structures underlying all chemical qualities. The earth was not le' untouched by science in theorizing and formulas, either. Charles Lyell probed the earth’s geological past via rock studies in the then embryonic field of geology. Next, the classical principles regarding the physical properties of matter and the mechanisms of their interactions “which were derived from Newton “ were then applied to the life sciences. The cell theory was formulated in 1838, which revealed at the microscopic level a basic structure of life. This then opened up into the study of cell structure, where chemical principles were seen to govern the activities of cells and therefore, all living matter.
Chemistry, remember, is the interaction between physical matter that can be measured, either in gasses, solids or liquids, and minerals. Jacques Loeb then took this reductionist view a step farther, claiming that the instincts of lower animals are simply physiochemical reactions. Then there’s Darwin, who proposed his purely mechanical explanation “natural selection “for the evolution of animals and plants, and us.

Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution appeared in 1859. Darwin asserted that over a long period of time the more complicated kinds of living things developed mechanically from some very simple kinds of living things. Darwin’s theory suggested an even more mechanical, automatic process to life and nature than what Newton had. According to Darwin’s followers, all natural processes are simply mechanical. Darwin’s theory helped along materialism. Not only scientific materialism, but now also the materialism of society, or individuals engaged in competing. It became as if it were survival of the fittest for not only basic survival needs, but beyond, into physical goods at a level above basic needs. These have become today standard measures of success and gratifications possible within a modernized market economy.

These and many other scientific discoveries of the later nineteenth century led to practical knowledge and inventions that rapidly transformed human life, as well. Understanding the role of bacteria in disease ushered in dramatic advances in medicine, bringing the biomedical model firmly into place, along with pharmaceutical prescription drugs, and the eventual overriding of its competitor, homeopathic medicine. Today, our biomedical system is quite a bit different from the earlier biomedical model. This is due to the current emphasis on biotechnological innovation, featuring new technologies for surgical and diagnostic use. The research and development from the pharmaceutical industry for drugs is also a part of this.

The Historical Battle in Medical Care: Did You Know

Our Medical System Started with Homeopathy?

Nonetheless, the growing practice of prescribing medications from the pharmacy had begun to push out the practice of the earlier forms of other therapies. These other therapies were natural, such as homeopathics. Healing through the diet and lifestyle, hydrotherapy and even a rudimentary acknowledgement of the mental and emotional state affecting physical health existed. Particularly the emotions of hysteria and other stress induced emotions “were, in what was even then in the late 1800’s, termed the wellness field. In fact, it wasn’t until up through the turn of the century, through World War I and then the Great Depression that pharmaceutical drugs really began to be used.

There was awareness and resistance to prescribing pharmaceutical drugs during the introduction of and growing reliance on them. However, not from the general public. At first this reluctance and skepticism was from the then current doctors. They were aware of what the shift towards reliance on pharmaceutical drugs was doing to their profession and their patients.
In fact, there has been a long-standing battle over dominance of health care by two sides. One side has been elitist, educated doctors, and the other side has been known as “folk healers.” These folk healers could be equated historically to homeopathic doctors; present day to naturopaths, holistic healers or energy healers.

Yet prior to the biotechnology industry of today as we know it, which really kicked in around 1950, even trained medical doctors had a belief in and prescribed varying degrees of folk remedies for keeping healthy (preventative medicine), and for healing illnesses, including homeopathic prescription medications, and prescribing lifestyle adjustments as their prescriptions. In fact, this system existed before the trained medical profession in both the USA and in Europe “homeopathy. It is still presently used today by Western M.D.’s in the European Union.

Dr. Dana Ullman is one of America’s leading advocates for homeopathy. He has authored ten books including the best selling Everybody’s Guide to Homeopathic Medicines, with Stephen Cummings, M.D. He is the founder of Homeopathic Educational Services, America’s leading resource center for homeopathic products, and considered the leading authority in the United States on homeopathy (www.homeopathic.com). He says in an interview for the Wellness Revolution Summit web telecast in August of 2010 that, “in the 19th century Americans were using homeopathy; it was wildly popular in both the United States and Europe, but it is not frequently known just how popular homeopathy was in the United States. By the turn of the 20th century, America had 22 homeopathic medical schools, including Boston University and other prestigious medical schools.”

Ullman describes just how big homeopathy was until the early 1900’s. “And because those using homeopathies were the wealthiest and most educated people of the country, like the Transcendentalists, i.e., Emerson and Dickinson “almost all of them were advocates of homeopathy. This includes our literary greats; eleven American presidents were advocates of homeopathy, as were the monarchs of Europe, (i.e., Queens of England), czars of Russia, Mozart, Beethoven, and the list goes on. If you’re interested, consult my most recent book that traces the history of homeopathy in the West, “ (Ullman, The Wellness Revolution Summit with Adoley Odunton, 2010). His book that he is referring to is The Homeopathic Revolution: Why Famous People and Cultural Heroes Choose Homeopathy. Ullman’s implication is that this shows how the “educated and sophisticated “ people were the ones who knew enough to know good medicine. The other implication he’s making is that this very fact antagonized the AMA (American Medical Association).

Ullman then goes on to tell a true story about what happened on the night Abraham Lincoln was assassinated, “Lincoln, on the night that he was shot, his secretary of state, William Seward’s, personal doctor was a homeopath. Seward was Lincoln’s most trusted advisor. Booth not only shot Lincoln, but also had someone go to Seward’s home and stab him (Seward) seven times. To help Seward, once he was discovered, they tried
to get in touch with his homeopath, but the closest surgeon was the surgeon general. So the surgeon general treated Seward, and was then reprimanded for that by the AMA. Because he chose to treat the patient of a homeopathic doctor and because the AMA was so antagonistic to homeopaths, that just to talk with, refer, or to take a patient that was a homeopathic patient was considered unethical, “ (Ullman, The Wellness Revolution Summit with Adoley Odunton, 2010).

Providing further historical description of how we lost out on homeopathy, and inherited the AMA backed, scientific materialist biomedical model as our metaparadigm when the 18th century gave way to the 19th century and industrialization deepened, Ullman explains, “So we also know how powerful and how tremendously antagonistic the AMA was and the medical drug establishment, right? [Well] the AMA had a very clever president; he created an AMA seal of approval on drugs, and a drug company without doing any research about safety or the efficacy of a drug, see, all they had to do was advertise in every national publication that the AMA supported, and they would get the AMA seal of approval. [It was] Basically a type of legalized bribery. [And this] made the AMA rich “they got a lot of advertising money, and they were able to coordinate a very consistent effort to attack homeopathy. " Ullman goes on to complete the historical explanation of why we’ve been without homeopathy for most of the modern age, “And the AMA was so antagonistic to homeopaths “even though the homeopaths were graduates of the greatest medical colleges. It was unethical, according to the AMA, what the surgeon general had done in helping Lincoln’s secretary of state. It shows you the antagonism was irrational; it was economic. I am now quoting a member of the AMA, as I do in my book: ‘We have to admit that we never fought the homeopaths on a matter of principal, we fought them because they came into the community and got the business.’ “ (Ullman, The Wellness Revolution Summit with Adoley Odunton, 2010).

Ullman explains that homeopaths spend more time with a patient, because in order for them to get beyond the symptoms and not just prescribe pharmaceuticals that treat at only the symptomatic (or surface) level and get to the root syndrome that is being announced by the arrival of the physical (or mental) symptoms they need to interview the patients. This also had them in a more nurturing role than the biomedical doctors. And, it made them more successful. The AMA obviously knew this, hence their feeling threatened and the need to expel homeopathy from the metaparadigm. This continues up until today, even with homeopathy’s increasing usage “again.

Ullman also explains that European biomedical doctors do embrace today, still, to varying degrees homeopathy. He gives the example of France, saying that in France you can go into any pharmacy and also buy homeopathic medications. The author has observed this to be true, in Western Europe overall. He also states how most European biomedical doctors work with homeopathy by using at least an herb or two in their general practice of prescriptions to patients. This obviously reflects some general knowledge
and a basic belief in homeopathy beyond that of the majority of American biomedical doctors.

The website Natural Health Perspective also helps explain a bit of this history as to how the AMA and pharmaceutical backed biomedical model became our dominant medical paradigm. “Throughout Western European history there were two major trends: the professionalism of physicians who belonged to the upper classes and the folk healers who lived among the peasant population. The professionals developed in order to enhance their status in life, while the folk healers developed out of a necessity to survive,” (Natural Health Perspective 2010).

In addition, as Natural Health Perspective’s website discusses the history of natural healing and biomedicine (allopathic medicine, as they refer to the biomedical system); they report that this division between the two goes back to the Church in Europe playing a central role. They also say that natural healing perspectives developed differently in the Old World (Europe) than they did in the New World (U.S.A.). Ask any person in the natural healing profession, or simply an informed citizen/consumer who shops at health food stores, and/or uses some of the natural healing therapies for health and well-being as their own self-prescribed preventative health care system and they’ll know this. They’ll acknowledge that European countries are more accepting and open to natural healing, homeopathy, and some of the folklore healing remedies passed down through the ages than the United States. Germany, England, and Switzerland are all examples. Statistics thoroughly discussing and supporting this are in a forthcoming book of mine specific to the biomedical industry’s monopoly-and its corresponding ineffectiveness in delivery of health.

This book’s intention is not solely to focus on the biomedical model. The biomedical model is only part of the overall picture “albeit it is a main area that could benefit, should we reconsider our unexamined assumptions about how the world works. This is, in fact, the bottom line issue: we are operating from assumptions handed down to us from our forefathers’ choices and are living lives based on some outdated ideas about how the world works. So this discussion is meant to help us all see that one of the main inheritances is the central role our sciences, and thus technology, have played and continue to play in the West, American society in particular. This is not inherently bad. It’s the focus of our science and technology, and how it has been directed and used that is in question for its functionality, today.

This inheritance has framed the world as the physical is what are the more important phenomena in our world. This basic premise we’re still operating from has created the society we’re still living in. Every part of our society is structured based on this, as is being suggested in this book, unexamined belief. The impact of our science and technology centered society of today, is a result of choices made from beliefs of yesterday. This does include our “evidence based medicine. “ We’ve been exploring how we got here, and are about to look at the overall picture of its impact on us
today “as we struggle to maintain some semblance of the solid footing we once had as global leaders. So after seeing how we became this way, ultimately I am then asking the question what, if anything, is still working for us based on this model of scientific materialism we inherited from the Enlightenment and Industrial eras.

**Frequently Unknown Statistics to Wrap Your Mind Around**

For now, to limit this discussion, a few of the key statistics “which are eye opening when added together “will be provided to see where we’ve gotten to today with this marriage of science and technology that brings us our biomedical model. Also, on PubMed’s website (U.S. Library of Medicine’s listing of published medical studies’ abstracts) you can also view some of this discussion’s stats and many others. I highly recommend spending some time there; it’s worth the visit. The intention here is not to point out the dysfunction of our medical system from the health care reform perspective. Rather, it is to present information that leads to the observation that it is the basic premises within the actual philosophy behind our medical system that is the problem, at this point. Then to understand the vested structures that benefit from the system as it is kept in place. Exploring how our consent as consumers locks that in is also presented with the statistics, so you can observe for yourself. You’ll also probably end up seeing how much we’re wasting by preserving this status quo. It seems impossible not to gain this awareness from reading these statistics as a whole picture. Yet frequently, they’re not brought together; they are usually treated separately. Science is one aspect; medical care another; natural healing another; our thoughts and how they influence our health - yet another. Therefore, the result here - are you ready to see what else is possible?

The mainstream option for health care, or the metaparadigm that is legislated for us by our leaders, endorsed by our governmental institutions, and presented to us through the commercialization of it all, is the biomedical one. It is the only option, so it seems, for our health care. It is the option provided by any employer. Insurance companies’ incentives motivate employers to get more employees on the biomedical care they cover. It is not that well known as an option not to actually choose this mainstream health care system at all. The one provided by our biomedical, western trained AMA doctors is what we know as our health care system. Period; end of discussion, end of questions, end of options. However, for a growing number, the replacement they are using is a team of “preventative” health care practitioners. A typical team could look like an acupuncturist, a naturopath or some holistic health care practitioner, an energy healer and a yoga teacher, while shopping at health food stores as one’s main supply of food. People making this choice, for example, would only use this mainstream biomedical model for what it’s best at: trauma. Others who are choosing differently are
gravitating towards an integrative team of both western trained, biomedical doctors who team with holistic practitioners. We’ll discuss this more in a bit.

The scientific materialist metaparadigm was put firmly in place for reasons already explored. However, when discussing the American medical system and its sole use of the biomedical model, it is not usually explored how it is founded on scientific materialism’s principles. Nor is this then connected to the increasing level of awareness, usually, that this paradigm of science is increasingly becoming outdated. These two factors typically have been kept separate in public discussions, and certainly public policy.

Another biggie is that our mainstream biomedical system is the major sector profiting from the scientific materialism metaparadigm. It has to be understood that this has been kept firmly in place by an organized, financially and hence politically powerful group of lobbyists, who are some of the wealthiest taxpayers and CEO’s in the country. Meaning: leaders of the AMA, the pharmaceutical industry, the biotech industry, the insurance industry, and the university research and development industry that is geared towards medical and biotech research. This also includes the politicians who support these industries, either directly or indirectly. All of them combine to be industries and individuals who give the government huge tax revenue, the country much prestige as the global leader in scientific research and development and medical technologies—up until most recently. This will be discussed soon, as well.

This conglomerate of merged industries in our market economy are also the ones who bring citizens its surgeries and rapid solutions. They deliver these services through prescription drugs and surgical devices using the latest and most innovative technology based on research that is a result of applying our scientific materialism’s science. Our science’s paradigm, as has been shown, is focused on the physical phenomena of life. Our biomedical model, thus, is based on symptomatic diagnoses and treatments at this physical level only, looking to no sources of anything outside of the physical causes as sources for illness, depression or lack of health. Biomedicine is obviously not working within a whole-systems based approach “diagnostically or in an ability to cure. Instead, through the latest technological advancements that aids surgery, diagnostic imaging, the soothing of any and all symptoms that cause discomfort through pharmaceutical drug use, and the biggies “chemotherapy and radiation “they are working at a reductionist level of “spot “ fixing, coming from scientific materialism. This system is focused on quick, tangible results that the patient can see. It’s very much what our science’s reductionism in practice can deliver. And, it’s precisely what we’re used to, particularly in the United States. We get quick, tangible results from our customer service whether at a restaurant or at Best Buy, and if something doesn’t appear the way we expect, we get our service adjusted, usually free of charge. I have frequently said we have the best customer service on the planet. What this also does, however, is produce quite demanding consumers
for results - we want it now!

When living outside our country, even in Western European nations, there is a bit of a different pace and delivery around customer service. The anticipation that any perceived inadequacy can be and will be rectified as soon as possible does not translate into other country’s market economies. When leaving the West entirely, it can be a mild to deep reconditioning of our expectations as to how quickly and efficiently things are done. To people who live in these other countries that we visit or live in as expats, it makes us seem spoiled and demanding. Yet they also appreciate it, it seems, because others aspire to our levels of efficiency in delivering goods and services. And others not. They instead, appreciate their pace to life, including afternoon siestas and things being done when they are done. We have a unique consumer driven culture here in the United States, and this absolutely affects the delivery of our health care services.

In an article published on September 20, 2005 on www.medpagetoday.com, entitled, “Medical Research Spending Doubled Over Past Decade,” by the Senior Associate Editor of MedPage Today, Neil Osterweil, says, “...funding in the U.S. for biomedical research doubled “when adjusted for inflation “from $37.1 billion in 1994 to $94.3 billion in 2003. Industry is picking up about 57% of the tab for medical investigation, with the National Institutes of Health kicking in another 28%, reported researchers in a special issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, (JAMA), previewed at press briefing time. Overall industry spending on drug, biotechnology and medical device research increased by 102%, from $26.8 in 1994 to $54.1 billion in 2003. The decade was a heady one for medical device researchers, who saw research funds from industry in that sector rise an impressive 264%. In contrast, pharmaceutical companies and biotech firms were somewhat less bountiful with their support, at 89% and 98% growth, respectively.”

Again, this has something to do with the “American ingenuity. “ It’s embedded within our national character “that practical application of science to technology, the long history with, and the expensive investment in the scientific materialist paradigm. This is quintessentially American; our reputation for producing “all things science. “ The cumulative, ensuing American love and pride for technological and industrial innovation and development, and the resulting reliance on our technology for stunning quick fixes. We want it, apparently, and are willing to pay for it, both as consumers and with our tax dollars subsidizing these industries. Moreover, Wall Street knows this, and builds on it. This is us, here in America. It’s what we’re known for around the world and here at home in America. Until recently. Keep reading.

as he changed titles. Trained in the biomedical system, a Western educated and trained doctor, he says “Our current worldview of medicine does not consider consciousness to be an important causative factor in illness but, instead, merely a by-product of the neurochemical and electrical reactions in a person’s brain. In the old school, consciousness was seen not as a cause but as something that was an affect by a person’s state of illness. True the existing medical model recognized that being chronically ill could make someone feel depressed, but depression was never seen as playing a contributing role in bringing about physical illness. Newer insights gleaned from research into the effects of emotional stress on the body and its potential to inhibit the body’s immune system are gradually affecting medicine, though. As the reader will see, stress, consciousness, and our attitudes toward life play key roles in the new world theories of who becomes sick and who stays well. Just exactly how consciousness and the human spirit affect our susceptibility to illness by enhancing or inhibiting our natural immune defenses is a complex subject, but it is one we will endeavor to tackle, “ (Gerber 2000).

There is a growing awareness within the biomedical community now that admits the connection between stress and the body’s illness or health. This has been begrudgingly and slowly admitted to within the biomedical field and the orthodox sciences. These two fields "biomedicine and the orthodox sciences “who are slow in admitting to this connection “are the ones who have lead to and continue to perpetuate our AMA backed biomedical model. Obviously, there is a reason for that resistance to what the new sciences are showing, even when it’s good science, using sound methods.

To be clear, the admission within these two fields “science and biomedicine “perpetuating the current mainstream metaparadigm is that there are physical effects of stress on the physical body. In the biomedical model, the brain is not the mind that contains thoughts that cause stress. Instead, the brain is hardwired to send different neurochemicals to the body when it is under stress. It is purely mechanical, with the mind and thoughts having no relevance in the discussion. The question doesn’t get asked what is the cause of the stress. It’s not a part of this metaparadigm. The science that this model practices through biomedicine is based on not looking at consciousness, thoughts and emotions, right? Therefore, the only conclusion they could come to while still working within their paradigm, is that only the body has the ensuing disease. They do not admit to the thoughts and emotions and level of consciousness influencing the body via the perception of stress, as of yet. Because that would then be the mind body connection.

This is a key distinction. It needs repeating to make sure you catch it: it is actually our own reactions seen in our thoughts and emotions that are in response to something in the external, physical environment that produce the stress our bodies show the effects of. The conclusions we make from these potential stressors in our environment as stressful or not, is what creates -or not-a biochemical cascade of responses. So if we perceive something that we then label and conclude that this is something stressful, there is a stressed
reaction within our bodies’ physiology. It is not the actual stressor itself. Because we could perceive one thing, and then label it as non-stressful and we’d have no corresponding biochemical reaction in our bodies. Whereas, we could perceive another thing and then conclude, “Oh this is something that always causes me stress. It’s bad, it makes everyone stressful “ (i.e., the economy) and then have our bodies’ respond with the stressful biochemical cascade of events that follow a conclusion that something is stressful.

Our biological chemistry is created by our thoughts, beliefs, emotions and then reactions “or non-reactions” as to what “should “ cause us stress. And it is our beliefs guiding that “should “ judgment of whether this event “should,” stress me or not. Are you prone to frustration in traffic? So then, your thoughts, beliefs and ensuing emotions and reactions are geared up anytime you’re in traffic. But what about people who love their time in their car as their own time to listen to the audio books on topics that enrich their lives, so they relish this time? Do you see? Our perceptions “beliefs, thoughts and emotions “of the outside event are the turning point to whether we react with stress or not at all. So, this becomes the turning point for whether our bodies then produce the physiological response of stress. Do you see how this turns everything inside out to what we had previously thought? We are not at the mercy of our external environment, or the physical. Instead, the power is in our perceptions.

This is huge, because it’s pointing to the power in our thoughts. This means that we have the power to change the perception of the stress. Then our bodies won’t be in a physiological state of stress. The implications of this are “you guessed it “the beginning of the mind body connection being proven, albeit within the new sciences. Furthermore, our levels of vitality, strength, and resilience in our underlying consciousness are also a factor in how well we are able to withstand higher levels of stress, and not react with a physiological reaction. This of course depends on how much we’ve worked with our own consciousness. If my consciousness is strong and optimistic because I am aware of the power my perceptions have, and have chosen yoga and meditation, for example as a way to build resiliency in my consciousness over my mind’s tendency to think, think, think, then I am most likely going to choose not to allow potential stressful events to be concluded by my mind as stressful. Or, if my mind is producing thoughts and conclusions labeling something as stressful, with these lifestyle choices of having practices in place that help me create a more resilient, aware system then I am going to have developed the habit of not listening to my thoughts, whether through my meditation practice or another practice I use, geared towards not listening to every thought I have.

I am going to instead, work to reframe my perception, typically with getting a sense of perspective within the situation. Or even by talking back to my thoughts, as Access Consciousness teaches, by asking the question of ourselves in response to a conclusion our mind has made “say that this person was insulting me by not saying hi as they walked by “ “Huh. Interesting point of view I have that point of view. “ Or in cognitive behavioral
therapy, the practice is to talk back to the self-talk within the mind. Self-talk is another way to say inner dialogue. Or with yoga and meditation, to help me develop the habit of pulling off of my thoughts no matter the content and coming back to my breath. This way, my mind and its thoughts do not have the same level of power they typically do “where we think we are our mind and our thoughts. These practices all breathe some space into our human system between our mind’s thoughts, conclusions, judgments and perceptions and our spirit, heart and Higher Self. Meaning, our mind is not allowed anymore to be the dominant aspect of our character. This typically looks like someone with a rather toned down personality.

All of this means I wouldn’t be as ready to, or some might even say poised to, conclude and then label something as stressful, because I’ll be humming through life with a consciousness that has more capacity to stay balanced, rather than tight and closed, or jumpy and erratic.

On the other side of the spectrum here, pharmaceutical prescription drugs are designed to work neurochemically, to help one’s brain chemistry. In this example, the drugs prescribed would be to counteract the stress, typically by addressing what’s construed to be a lower level of the “feel good hormones” or chemicals, such as serotonin. All of this is at the physical, measurable level. The pharmaceuticals chosen by the doctor could also be to increase the chemicals that make us calmer. However, these are targeted at the brains’ chemical releases. It is not addressing that these chemical releases that occur in our brain that do stress us and thus shift our body and brain’s chemistry is a result of our thoughts. If it were acknowledged that it is from the thinking or perception itself, it seems we wouldn’t need these prescription drugs if we can achieve this through our thoughts. If we chose to breathe through something that usually gets us to react and then be stressed, or we chose to purposely think of the other person’s situation and chose to understand that they may have had a challenging day “or life “then we wouldn’t choose to defend ourselves with a perception of their blatantly rushing out in front of us in traffic as a personal offense, and then react, then we wouldn’t have the body chemistry of stress. And we’d have smoother, more comfortable interactions in society as a whole.

As one example, a friend of mine was taking care of a foster child who happened to be throwing a temper tantrum at a restaurant. She had taken him outside to help him calm down, being aware of his seven year old mind trying to deal with the recent loss of his mother and baby sister, who he would not see again. He had just shared a day or two earlier for the first time, how hard his life was because of this loss. A woman on the phone walked into the restaurant, visibly annoyed because this child was acting out and this adult, who she assumed to be the child’s mother, was not controlling the situation better. If she had known the full story, would she have still been annoyed or would she have exhibited more compassion and generosity of spirit?

Perhaps we have the view, in this case, that the universe is unfriendly, and people are in general, out to cause us harm? Or perhaps we’ve had the
lifelong practice of being the strong one, who allows others to get what they need, while we suffer silently although feeling like we are doing our job of being the strong one, and then we let it out in traffic. Again, these are examples of this aspect of working with ourselves for our own freedom, and not spreading our pent up, unmanaged emotions in reactions onto others, causing more stress in both people.

Nor does our current biomedical system admit to the connection between the quality and texture of one’s consciousness (our typical emotions and thoughts) to our daily lifestyle habits of proper nutrition and rest. Although there is growing awareness of the role nutrition plays, it is not part of this biomedical model’s paradigm. We’ll look briefly soon at some of the typical curriculum offered at med schools, and see that nutrition courses are most frequently if offered at all, as electives. For now, another central weakness that results from our biomedical model being based on the science that it is, also leaves out this component of food’s effects on our bodies and our mind’s texture of thoughts. Such as carbohydrates have a component in them to make us feel better, emotionally.

We’re not talking here about the classification of the different food types, carbs, proteins and fats; this our science does just fine. And I am grateful for this information. Again, there is lack in the current science our country is still functioning from, and it serves to weaken us. That is the point of this discussion. Where is our power, and why has it been weakened, and how do we go about infusing our lives with this power so we can all thrive—particularly at levels well beyond what the current, mainstream metaparadigm offers us for models of wellness, health, vibrancy and thriving? Again, that is why we’re asking these questions.

The mind body connection paradigm of healers and scientists do acknowledge these very essential factors, as was evidenced in the examples of TCM and Ayurvedic doctors. A key point here is you can see the lifestyle and individual is either completely disregarded or completely involved, depending on whether it’s the biomedical system, or the holistic system. And you can see where the responsibility lies within each system. And the power.

If I am going to my biomedical doctor complaining about a chronic pain and he gives me painkillers and an anti-inflammatory as the only routes towards relief, and then I am told that my chronic pain is due to a “degenerative issue” (in quotes because with my background and training, I don’t believe in such a thing) and there is nothing more that he/she can do for me, then I am relying on my doctor and these drugs. While these drugs make the pain go away, what side effects do they leave me with and what other medications may I end up on to deal with these side effects?

Chronic pain, in the holistic model, can be dealt with in a variety of ways. One example is I use energy healing for chronic back pain to alleviate the mind body connection at the appropriate chakra and its unconsciousness within. For example, sacral and sciatica pain both are frequently associated with worries over basic survival, money and not feeling safe or supported.
I can also use supplements known to help flush any arthritic pain, which is viewed as calcium deposits in the vertebrae (joints). I will also show the client yoga postures to strengthen that area, progressively challenging their core. Pilates and core strengthening from the personal training and fitness element usually are brought in as well. So this is restoring the power to the client, gradually. Eventually they're free of the pain, off painkillers, and have remedies they can do to relieve the pain if they ever have it triggered again. You can view testimonials saying this has happened with many of my clients on www.healing-balance.com.

The newer insights that Dr. Gerber mentions are from the studies conducted by the cutting edge scientists who are not as steeped in the old metaparadigm's conditioning, such as Candace Pert, from the new field of psychoneuroimmunology. Or they are “more typically” from the new sciences, such as Bruce Lipton. Lipton is another scientist like Tiller, who was once a microbiologist working on stem cell research within orthodox science, but le’ the field due to the system’s limitations and “the way the ‘game’ has to be played.” (Lipton 2010)

This transition of letting go of the scientific materialism model still has not been at all made. They're holding on tightly within the biomedical community as well. As Gerber said, “newer insights are gradually affecting medicine. “ Translated, this is the denial stage within the three-stage process of scientific revolutions as paradigms shift, as will be shown in the next section. Or this is one side of the conflict: biomedicine, scientists themselves of the scientific materialist paradigm, the research and development industry, the academic research institutions funded mostly by the government, biotechnology including the pharmaceutical industry, and the insurance companies, and more, including the food industry using pesticides, additives and preservatives produced by the biotech companies, or “big agriculture. “ All with the government’s financial and/or direct or indirect political support of this entire system-metaparadigm -and the investments on Wall Street in these massive industries. All are focusing on the physical dimension of life as dominant. And our tax dollars help to keep this metaparadigm in place. Who is benefiting from this as it is?

The “other side “ of this conflict is those already working within the newly emerging metaparadigm: the new sciences’ scientists, natural healers working with and acknowledging subtle energy, concerned citizens, informed consumers, innovative entrepreneurs coming up with new options, and our federal government’s NIH’s NCCAM “who also funds “the other side.” This is the breakdown phase of Laszlo’s macroshift theory, as well as the denial stage within Kuhn’s scientific revolutions model of paradigm shifts. Both will be discussed soon. We’re still exploring what's really going on.

The admission that stress effects health has been made, yes, but there is still the crux of the conflict over the mind body connection existing or not. If the scientific materialist metaparadigm admits to the function of thoughts, emotions, consciousness and subtle energy overall, the system crumbles. The status quo changes. And their profit margin and monopoly lessens.
In our discussion, "natural healers" are the ones working within any of the therapies using subtle energies including meditation and yoga, but also well beyond these two. There are many more methods of natural healing or vibrational medicine "i.e. acupuncture and reiki, to name two better-known methods. Some, typically those within the field, know energy medicine is the vibrational medicine methods Gerber's book goes into. Interestingly, the National Institute of Health's National Center for Complimentary and Alternative Care (NCCAM) stops at only the most well known “because they are the ones the majority of consumers are choosing as “alternatives “ or “compliments “ to the biomedical model the most. So, this is money being taken out of the biomedical health care system, and it became noticed once it got to above 40ff. Again, this is reminiscent of the AMA's behavior when the threat of homeopathy took away their business. This is this conflict building into the breakdown of the old metaparadigm.

The link between the pharmaceutical industry and the medical system is well known by now. In fact, it's so well known that it's part of the conditioning that most patients still do not question, meaning this relationship is "a given. " However, the dynamics behind this relationship aren't necessarily what are well known. The exception is within the informed consumers, and/or people who have had experiences that have caused them to question the industry.

Pharmaceutical drugs are one of the physical approaches that the biomedical field uses in approaching disease, yes. Specifically, they look at the symptoms and help those symptoms "go away." The pharmaceutical industry is part of the larger biotech industry. Stay with me, we're just starting to build now. Biotechnology also covers other areas that include the surgical devices used in the other main approach our biomedical system has towards disease, to cut out the problem using more and more sophisticated devices and technology created from the biotech field. The two combined, pharmaceutical drugs and surgery, are the two main ways any and all illness and disease are handled within our current health care system. The biotech field also is responsible for creating the incredible devices that are used for the high quality diagnostic equipment that the biomedical model offers.

B. Alan Wallace states, “Furthermore, traditional approaches [biomedical] do not always work. For example, drug therapy for attention deficit disorder effectively suppresses the symptoms of this problem in only about 50 percent of the cases, and the widespread use of antidepressants among children has been linked to suicide. The discovery of dangerous side effects of pharmaceuticals is a common occurrence. “ This last idea is well known, the side effects of pharmaceuticals.

However, in treating the physical symptoms only, this does not require knowing about the patients’ lifestyle, moods, diet and other influencing factors on the patient’s diseased state, or illness. We've explored that; more than that, it does rely on tests and diagnostics from hi-tech devices. Furthermore, the scientific materialist metaparadigm is perfectly suited for mass production based on the very principles it founded its methodology on. Antibiotics come from mass production; a generic product used for general
infections. Thus, the biomedical model was able to create separate laboratories with separate scientists from the prescribing doctors creating the drugs. Furthermore, this has now become the pharmaceutical representatives then marketing their companies’ drugs to doctors, with the perks on the side for the doctors using their prescriptions that begins when the doctors are in medical school as first year students.

As the model of the pharmaceutical industry has become today, this leaves the doctor totally removed from the contents of the prescribed medication for their patient. This is unlike, for example, how homeopathy can individualize its treatment for each person’s treatment, as Dana Ullman pointed out in our earlier discussion. A biomedical doctor’s choice of which medication to prescribe is based on what knowledge they have of the possible pharmaceutical products available, and on the doctor’s possible biases. Their knowledge is not based on an individual patient’s particular circumstances. This is exactly how our science has translated into our medicine. It’s that mass-production, assembly line approach. It comes from universality and reductionism, two main basic principles of scientific materialism, where all things have the same fundamental properties, and all things can be reduced down to these fundamental properties. There is no room for the individual there. Nor is there room for any exceptions or irregularities. Instead, it requires a uniform approach. And it is an approach that has historically yielded much industriousness. It is of extreme importance to note that prescription drugs are our medical system’s number one treatment, as it is with consumers’ prescription drug use within our country “apparently, our number one choice. To gain a realistic flavor of what this industriousness and commercialistic approach actually means in our medical system, look up the history of ADD; Ritalin was actually created before the diagnosis of “ADD/ADHD. “Dr. Peter Breggin, Director of the International Center for the Study of Psychiatry and Psychology (ICSPP) and a practicing psychiatrist testified, saying this and much more, in front of the United States Congress in 2000. Dr. Breggin also presents other commonly unknown information in this testimony (Breggin.com 2010).

The Wall Street Journal, on January 8, 2009, published an article entitled, “FDA Scientists Ask Obama to Restructure Drug Agency,” authored by Alicia Mundy and Jared A. Favole. In this article they say, “A group of scientists at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on Wednesday sent a letter to President-elect Barack Obama’s transition team pleading with him to restructure the agency, saying managers have ordered, intimidated and coerced scientists to manipulate data in violation of the law. The nine scientists, whose names have been provided to the transition team and to some members of Congress, say the FDA is a ‘fundamentally broken’ agency and describe it as a [sic] place where honest employees committed to integrity can’t act without fear of reprisal. ‘There is an atmosphere at the FDA in which the honest employee fears the dishonest employee,’ according to the letter, addressed to John Podesta, head of Mr. Obama’s transition team,” (Mundy 2009).
The marriage between governmental institutions of power and policymakers to the biotech industry "particularly the pharmaceutical industry" is a central part of our metaparadigm. This government and industry marriage has a historical tradition in our country due to our metaparadigm. We're so used to it that it just seems the way it is, and therefore the way it should be. Scientific materialism became established alongside industrialization, as has been mentioned. We'll soon trace through the key ways this historically developed. For now, it is important to note that taxpayers fund these governmental institutions.

Richard Gerber, M.D., says, "There is a kind of cultural bias, a scientific ethnocentrism, if you will, tending to follow research only in the mainstream sciences. "This is the view that helps science to be married to both our medical care system and supported by our government. Gerber continues to dismantle our ideas, pointing out the humanness of scientists and doctors, "Perhaps this reflects the fact that scientists are still people, with personal biases, egos, political affiliations, economic needs, and personal belief systems. And scientists, just like people everywhere, are slow to accept change."

Gerber then provides another voice pointing out how supportive our culture is for science and technology, "In our culture, one of our biases is that newer information and techniques are always better than older belief systems and technologies. Doctors often dismiss older medical approaches as outdated and useless. For example, many physicians don't fully appreciate that the roots of modern pharmacology lie in the older approaches of herbal medicine and homeopathy. Most doctors would rather prescribe a synthetic derivative of an herb's active ingredient than give the patient an herbal capsule, even if the two possess similar therapeutic actions. "As we have discussed, this is different in other parts of the West, for example the European Union.

Gerber shifts gears a bit, here, and introduces the opening into the new metaparadigm. "Modern scientists assume that older approaches are too outdated to be valuable. However, mounting evidence supports a variety of ancient healing systems based upon views of physiology very different from the current mainstream healing paradigm. Perhaps revisiting ancient wisdom may supply important missing information that could result in a revolution in the field of medicine and healing, " (Gerber 2000).

On the other side of this issue is the consumers'-our-demand for quick fixes. We live in a culture that has been groomed for this demand. We are not victims to it, but are heavily influenced by it, realistically. The advertising is just one leg, as massive as it is, that contributes to our conditioning for this quickness of being able to get the desired results we want. B. Alan Wallace says, "The materialist approach to medicine has led to the desire for a 'quick fix' "just pop a pill and let chemicals take care of it. Drug, tobacco, and alcohol addiction follow the same logic. There may be more to mental and physical illness than just chemicals, but the physical bias of scientific materialism has largely marginalized alternative therapies that show
Wallace himself a scientist seems to be a voice worth listening to when understanding how our scientific paradigm has become our society's view of how the world works.

Wallace then goes on to provide another example of the current conflict, “The slow, grudging acceptance of acupuncture is just one example of this. For example, even though the ‘channels’ used by acupuncturists, shown vividly on their charts, have not been detected by modern anatomy, acupuncture is often effective in cases where physical medicine has failed. There is also a growing public interest in herbal remedies, whose curative influences may take longer than manufactured pharmaceuticals but which also may not have as many troublesome side effects as the latest drugs. Finally, attitudes they (doctors) may express toward their patients (such as genuine warmth, concern, and confidence) affect healing, this has only recently been incorporated as part of the curriculum in medical schools, and still only to a very limited extent, “ (Wallace 2008). While Wallace goes a bit beyond discussing only the “magic pill “ popping, he does point out the reticence within biomedicine to have any alternatives to their system. The biggest reason is money, of course. But another factor is this resistance to embracing an entirely new scientific paradigm, and the two factors combined would lead to an entirely new metaparadigm. We’ll get there in just a minute.

The statistics on drug use point to the use of prescription drugs as increasing among adults. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention has for their statistics on therapeutic drug use within the U.S. as, “Percent of persons using at least one prescription drug in the past month: 47ff (2003–2006), “ although the CDC’s citation for this statistic cites a 2009 source.

CDC goes on to specify for physicians’ office visits the following statistics: “Number of drugs ordered or provided: 1.9 billion; percent of visits involving drug therapy: 71ff; most frequently prescribed therapeutic classes: analgesics, (used to reduce pain) antihyperlipidemic agents (used to treat hyperlipidemias, or high levels of fat that produce cholesterol problems) and antidepressants,” (italics mine), with their source for these stats being The National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey of 2009.

The CDC next breaks down drug use into the category of hospital outpatient department visits, with the stats: “Number of drugs ordered or provided: 247.7 million; percent of visits involving drug therapy: 75ff; most frequently prescribed therapeutic classes: analgesics, antidepressants, and antidiabetic agents (used to treat high blood sugar condition or diabetes), “ with their source being the same as the one above for the physician’s office visits and percentage of drugs presented there.

Finally, the CDC presents for, “Hospital emergency department visits that the number of drugs ordered or provided: 212.1 million; the percent of visits involving drug therapy: 77ff; and the most frequently prescribed therapeutic classes are analgesics, antiemetic (used to combat nausea or vomiting) or antivertigo agents (used to combat dizziness, often accompanied with nausea and vomiting), and antihistamines (used to treat
symptoms from allergies), “(CDC 2010). It has been suggested from many sources in natural healing and holistic health that the increases in allergies are from an increased burden on our immune system. The increase in toxins in our air, food, and water supply are the main culprits. Also, within this list of drugs, one is able to observe that the majority of these health issues, including depression, can be treated by eating certain foods, while staying away from others. In other words, the majority of these health concerns that people are receiving medications for can be treated preventatively, with relatively simple dietary changes. The bottom line is that the majority of these issues people are getting medication for come from their lifestyle choices.

In a March 2005 article from the New York Times Magazine, author Roger Lowenstein interviews David Cutler, a former junior economics faculty member at Harvard, and now a full faculty member at Harvard, who left Harvard to go to Washington DC as a draftsman of the healthcare bill under Hillary Clinton. Cutler left Washington DC “in 1994 “with the question nagging at him as to why the health care reform had failed back then. It had seemed to Cutler and the Clinton’s team that corporations, consumers, the uninsured, and doctors had all been clamoring for reform. Cutler came up with his answer; curbing the health care growth is the reason any health care reform fails. His epiphany: most health-spending is good, and it is rising because it is delivering products of economic value. Cutler says that, “Spending has been rising because it can do more things that Americans want,” (italics mine) (Lowenstein 2005).

Yes, the U.S. spends more than any other country, while it only has the eighth-lowest life expectancy in the OECD. Japan, though, spends $2,878 per person “about $5,000 less than the U.S. “and has the highest life expectancy among developed nations, reports the Huffington Post on their business page, in March of 2012. So with the statistics hovering around America spending 15 percent of its gross domestic product on health care, what are we spending this much on? Well, aside from medications, another dynamic with our health care system that describes American behavior under our scientific materialist metaparadigm is the option to have surgery. These surgeries, which again are the other most used treatment method next to prescription drugs in our medical system, utilize devices. These devices come from the biotech industry.

So when Cutler then wondered if Americans might be spending more because they were getting more and better treatment, he joined with Dr. Mark McClellan, another economist, to see if this was the case. They chose to look into heart attacks, and to see if they were occurring less frequently. They were. Still, spending on heart attacks has been rising. The cost of the surgery rates have been relatively stable. What they found is, “But as the technology improved, the operation was being performed far more often,” (italics mine) (Lowenstein 2005). It’s ultimately the same with medications. For example as there have been improvements made to the side effects of prozac, more people are taking antidepressants.

Richard Gerber, M.D., helps us here, “As science grew more sophisticated,
so did the nature of the biomachine we were thought to be. That is, as our technologies became more powerful with the discovery of the optical and electron microscopes, the parts and gears of the human machine were studied at smaller and smaller levels," (Gerber 2000). What Gerber is reflecting is the scientific materialist's premise in reducing; and reducing the physical to as small of a level it can, as applied to biomedicine.

Yet mainstream science is what is giving us our biomedicine and technology. Remaining unapplied from theory are the quantum physics' concept of energy being the fundamental building block to the universe and not the physical. This would mean that they would be working with energy as opposed to the physical within biomedicine. The biomedical techniques, of medications and surgeries, do not focus on any of this. Prescription drugs are still working with the physical; they're going through chemistry, which is still a physically based pathway. So it stays with the physical approach of the older Newtonian based, scientific materialist paradigm. Again, notice the focus on the physical only, while the newer quantum physics' discoveries are left to the wayside. Why is that? Who is benefitting from that? The holistic healing modalities, for example energy healing and acupuncture, both address energy, and not just the physical, although they do impact the physical. The focus is different; eradicate the fundamental problem at the energetic level, and the physical will also adjust back into balance, and health. It just happens slower than surgery or chemicals, typically.

Dr. Gerber continues to reflect this focus within the scientific materialist metaparadigm, "While early European physicians could analyze the human body only in terms of dissection of organs at the time of autopsy, today's medical researchers have the tools to study our physical makeup at the cellular and molecular levels. Modern medicine's current Newtonian biomechanistic viewpoint suggests that if we could only understand how all the different tiny parts fit together in the human body, we could develop better ways of fixing and repairing the body in the event of illness. This mechanical approach to fixing the body is nowhere more evident than in the field of surgery. Surgeons are the ultimate biomechanics. Orthopedic surgeons work with unique surgical 'carpentry tools,' which included drills, saws, screwdrivers, and screws that allow them to replace arthritic joints with better, synthetic joints of metal, Teflon, and plastic. Vascular surgeons work to cut out clogged arteries and replace them with newer synthetic Dacron grafts to restore adequate blood flow to the oxygen-starved limbs of individuals with vascular disease. While these surgical approaches do indeed provide a very sophisticated 'fix,' they do not fully explore the reasons behind 'why' diseases occur in the first place," (Gerber 2000).

This area of study is relegated to medical researchers, scientists within the scientific metaparadigm, known as molecular biologists, who are the ones who study the body's most minute parts "the structural molecules, the enzymes, and even the genetic structures that compose and direct the function of the body at the cellular level. Gerber explains that the thinking behind this is that if they could only know which enzyme was defective
or which gene was abnormal, then they could invent a molecular solution that would circumvent the disease process and thus “cure all illness.” There have actually been many medical breakthroughs resulting from this line of scientific inquiry, Gerber claims. Greater knowledge of the structure of human insulin, genetics, and the way insulin is manufactured ultimately led to the development of genetically engineered human insulin, thereby helping countless diabetics.

The cost of having a medical system based on these technologies is staggering. Lowenstein continues, citing that six of the seven G-7 countries, have seen spending growth on health care, regardless of how it’s financed and organized. The rise in the American health care costs is close to the middle of the pack. Yet when attempting to understand what is the driving force behind this growth in costs, Lowenstein reports that Sherry Glied, of Columbia’s School of Public Health, concludes that there is no specific aspect of any of the health-care systems in any of these countries that is “the main determinant of growth in costs.” Lowenstein adds to that, “Technology is, and that, “Better treatments lead to higher use,” (italics mine) (Lowenstein 2005).

Important to remember is that our medical system works, according to Cutler, because it produces more of what Americans want. There is a full equation here; it is not just those in power. It is not just the biotech companies, the pharmaceutical companies, the doctors, the AMA, and the insurance providers who are inducing in us this artificial demand, right, as if they were selling us iPhones? This is different, this is our health, and this involves life and death. We’re demanding these technological devices and these pharmaceutical designer drugs from biotech. It’s not just for entertainment value; it’s for life quality, or life versus death. This is huge. So this is a different story than with technology, and the use for it. It’s helping to save lives, right, so how can it be anything other than virtuous?

“Contrary to the fears of many on the le’, higher prices are not the chief culprit. Thanks to continued pressure from H.M.O.’s, doctors’ rates have been held in check. So have the prices of pharmaceuticals already on the market. But because new drugs are more expensive, and because people take more pills, total spending on drugs since 1990 has quadrupled. As Cutler says, medical spending isn’t increasing because of inflation so much as because of people consuming more ‘good stuff.’ This view is beginning to course through the health-care world. Scanning the literature, you now happen upon sentences like, ‘We believe that some of the concern about the growth in spending may be misplaced’ (Health Affairs) and ‘On average . . . society is better off exchanging more money for better health’ (The Journal of Economic Perspectives). No one disputes that spending will continue to increase; limiting the rate of growth is the most we can hope for, “ (italics mine) (Lowenstein 2005). The key question here, obviously is, are we actually enjoying “better health “ as the Journal of Economic Perspectives suggests?

Every year the Organization for Economic Cooperation and
Development (OECD) publishes data that allows for comparisons of health systems across thirty industrialized countries. Health Affairs has been a publisher of many papers that use this data. The leading journal of health policy thought and research, Health Affairs, is a peer-reviewed journal founded in 1981 under the aegis of Project HOPE, a nonprofit international health education organization. In an article entitled, “It’s the Prices, Stupid: Why the United States is So Different From Other Countries,” by Gerard F. Anderson et al., they say, “In that first report featuring 1984 data, the United States led the way in per capita health care spending at $1,637, nearly double the OECD mean of $871. In the latest offering, featuring data from 2000, the situation is much the same, although the absolute numbers are much higher. The U.S. per capita spending is $4,631, compared with an OECD median of $1,983. The U.S. level was 44ff higher than Switzerland’s, the country with the next–highest expenditure per capita...Over the entire 1990–2000 period the spending gap between the United States and the OECD median actually widened slightly, “ (italics mine) (Anderson et al., 2003). These statistics attest to our role as leading spenders on health care of any industrialized nation, and that figure has been producing a widening gap, increasingly.

“Measured in terms of share of GDP, the United States spent 13.0 percent on health care in 2000, Switzerland 10.7 percent, and Canada 9.1 percent. The OECD median was 8.0ff. Ability to pay–measured here by per capita GDP–has repeatedly been shown to be a powerful predictor of the percentage of GDP allocated to health care...Private spending in the OECD data falls into the broad categories of (1) out of pocket spending for deductibles, coinsurance, and services not covered by health insurance; and (2) premiums paid by families and individuals for private health insurance...This varies considerably across OECD countries. The median country finances 26 percent of its health care from private sources. The range is as high as 56 percent in the United States and Korea to as low as 7 percent in Luxembourg and 9 percent in the Czech Republic. As a percentage of GDP, the OECD countries spent 0.4–7.2 percent of GDP on privately financed health care in 2000, with an OECD median of 2.0 percent. The United States was the highest at 7.2 percent. U.S. private spending per capita on health care was $2,580, more than five times the OECD median of $451, “ (italics mine)(Anderson et al., 2003). Comparatively, we’re spending a lot of money the most per citizen than any other countries. Yet both our health and even our mortality rate have been decreasing.

“Although the percentage of the health care dollars financed from public sources in the United States is low compared with other OECD countries, the absolute amount is relatively similar to other OECD countries. “ Please rered that. “Public sources in the United States accounted for spending of 5.8 percent of GDP in 2000, very close to the OECD median of 5.9 percent. In fact, on this measure of public spending, the United States is virtually identical to that of the United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan (5.9ff each) and not much smaller than neighboring Canada (6.5 percent). “ (Anderson et al., 2003). But the key thing here is only the U.S. and Japan are not socialized
systems, although Japan’s system runs closer to a socialized system than ours. So why are we still spending as much on public health care as these top producing countries who have socialized medical care? We’re a 56ff privatized system with an insurance industry. Yet why, when we’re the highest ff of OECD countries with our health care delivery system privatized for profit? Are we paying equal amounts as smaller nations whose entire health care system is mostly funded by public funds (government/taxation) as it is in a socialized system?

Continuing with “It’s the Prices, Stupid: Why the United States is So Different From Other Countries,” the authors mention that the numbers are actually worse, in that OECD’s stats don’t specify what portion of the public, or where the publicly financed health care is coming from. “These researchers measured the public sector’s share of total health not by who ultimately paid the providers of health care, but by the ‘action of health spending that originated in households in the form of taxes. On that measure, close to 60ff of total U.S. health spending in 1999–7.7 percent of GDP—was financed through taxes,” (italics mine) (Anderson, et al., 2003). I’m sorry, but why is that the case when we have a privatized healthcare program that has insurance providers functioning on a for-profit basis? If we were in a country with socialized medicine, I could understand these tax rates coming out of public money.

Another valuable statistic from this report goes back to the issue of our global competitiveness. The authors say, “In the United States medical school enrollment has been essentially constant since 1980. The observed increase in the number of physicians has mostly come from physicians who immigrated to the United States following medical education in other countries,” (Anderson et al., 2003).

Sue Blevins, a writer for the Cato Institute says, “The American Medical Association (AMA) has lobbied the government to highly limit physician education since 1910, currently at 100,000 doctors per year, which has led to a shortage of doctors and physicians. Wages in the U.S. are double those in Europe, which is a major reason for the more expensive health care,” (www.cato.org/).

Blevins’ article, “The Medical Monopoly: Protecting Consumers or Limiting Competition? “ written in 1995 discusses how nonphysician providers of medical care are in high demand in the United States because of licensure laws and federal regulations that limit their scope of practice and restrict access to their services. So, the result has been less choice and higher prices for consumers. While safety and consumer protection issues are often cited as reasons for restricting nonphysician services, Blevins continues, the restrictions appear not to be based on empirical findings. “Studies have repeatedly shown that qualified nonphysician providers—such as midwives, nurses, and chiropractors—can perform many health and medical services traditionally performed by physicians—with comparable health outcomes, lower costs, and high patient satisfaction. Licensure laws appear to be designed to limit the supply of health care providers and restrict competition to physicians...
from nonphysician practitioners. The primary result is an increase in physician fees and income that drives up health care costs, “(Blevins 1995 www.cato.org). This also provides a limit to their competition because of historically labeling natural healers as quacks. Yet those who benefit from the status quo are the very ones who gave the label of quackery. Thus rendering their competition less competitive by this name calling. And mainstream masses buying this labeling, following their lead, all in the idea that these are the “official” statements from those in positions of “authority” and are thus, the ones in the know. Does it really come down to name-calling and bullying from the dominant system so they can stay in power? “But I thought that science is science. And so if something is proven effective by science, and then science backed medicine, then that is what I believe, right? There’s no way people in power would do anything that blatantly self-interested, when the welfare of so many citizens are at stake, “is frequently the line of thought that comes up in reaction to the beginning stages of becoming aware of this picture as it is getting painted for you. Don’t worry, you’re not alone. Facts are facts, right?

Aside from doctor’s salaries, the cost of prescription drugs, and surgeries, there is the medical device industry as well. According to Anderson, our spending in the U.S. for medical technology is the highest out of any country’s spending on medical technology. “Just as constraining, and possibly more so, can be the availability of medical technology. Canada’s health system also delivers far fewer highly sophisticated procedures than does the U.S. system. For example, the U.S. system delivers four times as many coronary angioplasties per capita and about twice the number of kidney dialyses. These data, of course, do not provide insight on the medical necessity of these procedures. Quite remarkable, and inviting further research, is the extraordinarily high endowment of Japan’s health system with CT and MRI scanners and its relatively high use of dialysis. These numbers are all the more remarkable because Japan’s health system is among the least expensive in the OECD, “(Anderson et al., 2003).

The authors bottom line commentary is: “These simple comparisons suggest that Americans are receiving fewer real resources than are people in the median OECD country...The researchers [of this other study they’re referring to] estimated that Americans paid 40 percent more per capita than Germans did but received 15 percent fewer real health care resources. A similar comparison revealed that the U.S. system used about 30 percent more inputs per capita than was used in the British system and spent about 75 percent more per capita on higher prices...In 2000 the United States spent considerably more on health care than any other country, whether measured per capita or as a percentage of GDP. At the same time, most measures of aggregate utilization such as physician visits per capita and hospital days per capita were below the OECD median. Since spending is a product of both the goods and services used and their prices, this implies much higher prices are paid in the United States than in other countries. But U.S. policy makers need to reflect on what Americans are getting for their greater health spending.
They could conclude: It’s the prices, stupid,” (italics mine) (Anderson, et al., 2003).

Statistics from the 2007 European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations say that according to the data compiled and published by multiple international pharmaceutical trade groups, the U.S. is the world leader in biomedical research and development as well as the introduction of new biomedical products. Providing these statistics: “The research and development of medical devices and pharmaceuticals is supported by both public and private sources of funding. In 2003, research and development expenditures were approximately $95 billion with $40 billion coming from public sources and $55 billion coming from private sources. “ Public sources obviously equates to spending our tax dollars. These investments into medical research have made the United States the leader in medical innovation, measured either in terms of revenue or the number of new drugs and devices introduced. Further describing the presence of the pharmaceutical industry in the United States, EFPIA states that in 2006, the United States accounted for three quarters of the world’s biotechnology revenues and 82% of world R&D spending in biotechnology. They also state that pharmaceutical trade organizations also maintain that the high cost of patented drugs in the U.S. has encouraged substantial reinvestment in such research and development, (italics mine) (2010 www.efpia.com). Meaning, they see where their profit is at, so they continue to reinvest. It is within the American public.

The Congressional Budget Office in a report in January of 2008, entitled “Technological Change and the Growth of Health Care Spending“ has found that “about half of all growth in health care spending in the past several decades was associated with changes in medical care made possible by advances in technology. “ Other factors included higher income levels, changes in insurance coverage, and rising prices, (2012 U.S. Congressional Budget Office). Also, according to a TIME magazine article, “Why We Pay So Much, “ prescription drug prices in the United States are the highest in the world. “The prices Americans pay for prescription drugs, which are far higher than those paid by citizens of any other developed country, help explain why the pharmaceutical industry is—and has been for years—the most profitable of all businesses in the U.S. In the annual Fortune 500 survey, the pharmaceutical industry topped the list of the most profitable industries, with a return of 17% on revenue, “ (Barlett et al., 2004). And if you re-read the previous three paragraphs, look how much of this revenue is gained based on taxpayers’ dollars.

Wendell Potter, in an article entitled, “Special Interests Target the Independent Board that May Be the Last, Best Hope for Medicare Reform“, states that “One of the reasons why Congress has been largely unable to make the American health care system more efficient and equitable is because of the stranglehold lobbyists for special interests have on the institution. Whenever lawmakers consider any kind of meaningful reform, the proposed remedies inevitably create winners and losers. Physicians’
incomes most likely will be affected in some way, as will the profits of all the other major players: the hospitals, the drug companies, the medical device manufacturers, and the insurers, just to name a few. The list is long, and the platoons of highly paid and well-connected lobbyists who represent their interests comprise a large private army that conquered Capitol Hill years ago (2012 www.publicintegrity.org).

The pharmaceutical industry has thousands of lobbyists in Washington D.C. that lobby Congress and protect their interests. The pharmaceutical industry spent $855 million, more than any other industry on lobbying activities from 1998 to 2006, according to the non-partisan Center for Public Integrity. “Pharmaceutical companies argue that the prices they set are necessary in order to continue to fund research. Only 11% of drug candidates that enter clinical trials are successful and receive approval for sale. Critics of pharmaceutical companies point out that only a small portion of the drug companies’ expenditures are used for research and development, with the majority of their money being spent in the areas of marketing and administration,” (2010 www.publicintegrity.org). Have you noticed in the recent years an increase in television and magazine ads for prescription drugs? This would certainly coincide with the increase in sales and revenue of prescription drugs, and to the fact that the pharmaceutical industry has been for years and still is the most profitable of all businesses in the U.S.

Stephanie Rodriguez wrote, “Prescription Drug Advertising: Some Advocate Return to Ban,” in April of 2005. She says, “One of the fastest-growing areas for advertisers is the pharmaceutical industry, which spends billions of dollars each year advertising new drugs to consumers. While these advertisements may help the undiagnosed, it can also create a demand for unneeded treatment. ‘People are attracted to these drugs because they see these positive images on television,’ said Lynda Kaid, Telecommunications Professor at the University of Florida. ‘They see it as a quick fix to all of life’s problems.’ Direct-to-consumer advertising reaches 14 percent of all prime time shows on television, according to studies conducted by Kaid. Advertising for drugs in the U.S. became legal in the 1980’s. The U.S. and New Zealand are the only two countries that legalize advertisements today...Dr. John Colon, physician for the Florida Department of Health, acknowledges that one of the leading prescription drugs in the market is Strattera, an Attention Deficit Disorder medication. ‘I get young kids asking me about certain medications all the time, especially about Herpes or ADD drugs,’ Colon said. In the past prescription drug advertising in the United States was directed primarily to doctors, who were the sole decision-makers when choosing prescription medication. Today, pharmaceutical companies are reaching consumers through mass marketing in television ads. “

Rodriguez goes on to say that the growth of direct-to-consumer advertising throughout the past 11 years has led the Food and Drug Administration to conduct a national telephone survey of adults and their views on drug promotion, in which the results were seventy-two percent of adults surveyed recalled seeing an advertisement for prescription
drugs within the past three months. She then says, “Many doctors said that they are increasingly pressured by patients to prescribe drugs seen on advertisements. ‘I think it puts the doctor in a bad situation because people tend to see symptoms and think they have them when they don’t,’ Colon said. ‘It creates a confrontation between the doctor and the patient.’ Proponents of television ads for prescription drugs say that the commercials serve as a valuable educational function to the public,” (Rodriguez 2005). Stephanie Rodriguez wrote this as a sophomore at the University of Florida’s College of Journalism and Communications.

From the Washington Post, “For decades, the United States has been slipping in international rankings of life expectancy, as other countries improve health care, nutrition and lifestyles,” (Ohlemacher 2007). In this biotech era and its high profile within the scientific materialist metaparadigm, specific to the medical industry, this field has become all–encompassing with its influence. This influence includes the cross–over of many, many different industries of all sizes producing various services and products within the entire medical and biotech fields, along with insurance companies, all of whom have a vested interest in keeping the scientific materialist metaparadigm unchallenged in any substantial way. So it does seem that in the modern age the scientific materialist metaparadigm has been able to remain in place due more to the profit margin and less to philosophical beliefs.

But prior to today, in fact at the dawning of the pharmaceutical industry, we go to John Kellogg–father of Kellogg’s Corn Flakes®. Kellogg graduated from New York University Medical College at Bellevue Hospital in 1875 with a medical degree; he was known to be a gifted surgeon, although he was generally against unnecessary surgery to treat diseases. Kellogg is one of the early American doctors who recognized that the reliance of the doctor on pharmaceuticals was not in the best interest of neither the patient nor the medical profession. In fact, he found the increasing prescription writing and reliance on pharmaceuticals alarming. He said so, “This undue credit to the effect of the drugs prescribed, when it occurs among medical men, probably arises mostly from the habit and routine of always prescribing in certain approved manners in certain kinds of cases, and when improvement takes place, forgetting to allow sufficiently for the healing power of time and nature herself...As nothing but hard–earned experience and frequently disappointed hopes in his scientific prescriptions, will ever thoroughly convince the young practitioner of their frequent inutility, so nothing but the proper kind of education on these matters will ever convince the people of their frequent too great confidence in the efficacy of drugs alone,” (italics mine) (Kellogg 1905).

Implied within Kellogg’s comments is the placebo effect; the belief the medication will work, so it does. Remember though, he said this just as this system was beginning. So he had a unique vantage point–regardless of how many studies today show yes, there’s a placebo effect and no there’s no placebo effect, depending upon who is paying for the study or how it’s intended to be used. When, in fact, placebo use and studies started within
the pharmaceutical industry. Keep reading below.

There is a rich history of the investigation into the power of the placebo effect, stemming from the pharmaceutical industry and not the natural healing, or homeopathic world. Ironically, this is where the research first began on placebos; when pharmaceuticals first began to be prescribed on a more regular basis. The American Library of Medicine holds an online historical documentation of this. In this document, one can see early pharmaceutical, biomedical medications that were prescribed to and used by the public, but were actually placebos, and known by the doctors to be so. The antique bottles themselves with the word “placebo” on it can be seen on their website. The caption of these photos reads, “Placebos were produced for clinical use in a range of different shapes and colors, and physicians even discussed which colors and shapes worked best. Bottles were labeled with simple code names (Cebocap, Obecalp) so patients would not catch on to the fact that they were being given a placebo rather than a real drug,“

In fact this document contains much information on the historical discussions by leading American doctors, members of the AMA, as they began to more actively use prescription drugs for treatment. Eugene F. Dubois, Professor of Medicine at Cornell University, speaking at the Cornell Conference on Therapy in 1946 from his paper “The Use of Placebos in Therapy” said, “You cannot write a prescription without the element of the placebo. A prayer to Jupiter starts the prescription. It comes with weight, the weight of two or three thousand years of medicine. “ The Library of Medicine then goes on to say, “Thus the groundwork was laid for the serious investigation of the role of hope, imagination, and expectations in the operation of medications and procedures in scientific medicine.”

W.R. Houston defined the issue clearly, when he said, “The Great Lesson of medical history is that the placebo has always been the norm of medical practice. “ The American Library of Medicine’s digital publication, “Emotions and Disease: Self–Healing, Patients, and Placebos “ furthers the discussion by saying, “The issue was quite complicated and compromised for physicians. Many of them were aware that they too prescribed medications whose principle basis of action was the patient’s credulous belief...the most experienced and sophisticated physicians knew that many medicines thought to be effective were really not, at least not on the basis of pharmacological principles. The regular profession was itself often guilty of over–drugging. Thus William Osler, the beloved and influential turn–of–the–century Professor of Medicine at Johns Hopkins University could slap down quacks and jab at his colleagues at the same time by saying ‘In the fight which we have to wage incessantly against ignorance and quackery...diagnosis, not drugging, is our chief weapon of offence,‘ “ (ibid).

Finally, “Some went even further, Lewellyn F. Barker, Osler’s successor as professor of medicine at Hopkins, suggested that whatever success modern physicians had with their prescribed medications depended largely
on their ability to awaken confidence and inspire the idea of authority by their scientific training and by their mode of inquiry and of examining the patient. Even more provocatively, Harvard Professor of Psychiatry, C. Macfie Campbell, declared in a much noted 1924 lecture that physicians sometimes brought about the improvement of their patient unwittingly, when the patient is already prepared for the display of power, “ (Ibid).

Now back to Kellogg, this is the same John Kellogg who is the founder of the Kellogg breakfast cereal; he and his brother Will Kellogg started the Sanitas Food Company at a time when the standard breakfast was meat and eggs for the wealthy, while the poor ate porridge, farina, gruel, and other boiled grains. John and Will argued later over the ingredients for the Kellogg breakfast cereal. Will wanted sugar to be in it, and John was staunchly opposed. So they split ways, with Will starting the Battle Creek Toasted Corn Flake Company, and this eventually became the Kellogg’s cereal we know of today. John went and formed the Battle Creek Food Company so he could develop and market soy products. John Kellogg, as a trained medical doctor, held strong beliefs in the benefits of eating healthy to maintain an optimally functioning digestive tract, which he recognized—amongst many others prior to the modern biomedical model, including both the Chinese and the Indian culture’s medicinal practices, as well as many “folk healers” and natural healers throughout history—to be central to maintaining health—a healthy gastrointestinal tract.

Kellogg believed that most disease is alleviated by a change in intestinal flora; that bacteria in the intestines can either help or hinder the body. These pathogenic bacteria produce toxins during the digestion of protein that poison the blood. A poor diet favors harmful bacteria that can then infect other tissues in the body. Kellogg also operated on the understanding that the intestinal flora is then changed by diet and is generally changed for the better by a well–balanced vegetarian diet favoring low–protein, laxative and high–fiber foods. This natural change in flora could be sped by enemas seeded with favorable bacteria, or by various regimens of specific foods designed to heal specific ailments.

Kellogg taught these various regimens at the Battle Creek Sanitarium, where he held classes on food preparation for homemakers, and taught classes on breathing exercises and mealtime marches (calisthenics) to sanitarium visitors in order to promote proper digestion of food throughout the day. He also made use of artificial sunbaths and phototherapy (light therapy), while also patenting the process for making peanut butter due, to his belief that nuts were a healthy, strong food choice.

I have been known to often comment in my “Food as Medicine “ workshops and food demos at health food stores, in my “Eating for Empowerment “ Nutrition classes, on my radio show, and with clients how much I’ve seen nuts used in other countries. Whereas here in the U.S.A. nuts are frequently just in bulk bins at health food stores, or as salted party snacks in the chips aisle at mainstream grocery stores. An example of this is on the streets of Istanbul, Turkey, particularly in Beyazit Square leading into
the Grand Bazaar, where there are individuals with carts that serve roasted chestnuts or walnuts then packed into heated and dried apricots and a host of other nut treats typical of Turkish culture. A warmed walnut inserted into a so’ dried fig or apricot is like eating a slice of pie. It’s amazing!

Kellogg also invented granola—the American version of the European (German) muesli—and a healthful “granose biscuit.” He had many notable patients, such as former president William Howard Ta’, aviator Amelia Earhart, Arctic explorers Vilhjalmur Stefansson and Roald Amundsen, economist Irving Fisher, Nobel Prize winning playwright George Bernard Shaw, founder of the Ford Motor Company Henry Ford, inventor Thomas Edison and actor/athlete Johnny Weissmuller.

Kellogg was also a proponent of what he termed “Biologic Living,” also known as “The Simple Life in a Nutshell.” Biologic Living means health, comfort, efficiency, long life, good digestion, sound sleep, a clear head, a placid mind, and an attitude that is content and happy to be alive (Lifestylelaboratory.com 2010). Interestingly, as a side note, at the top of Kellogg’s article, Lifestyle Laboratory wrote as an introduction, “In Dr. Kellogg’s time, Biologic Living promoted a vegetarian diet with a limited use of dairy products including eggs. Today, however, animal diseases are increasing rapidly, and chemical usage has multiplied exponentially. Biologic Living has—of necessity—evolved to include a total vegan diet and a lifestyle that deals with the reality of our modern toxic world.”

Kellogg, at the time as his fellow doctors were increasing their writing of prescriptions, prescribed what the training and education for medical doctors should be, “To this end the study of anatomy, physiology, hygiene, and particularly the laws of life, with the influence thereon of habits, conditions, and surroundings, should enter largely into, and be assiduously carried all the way through, the education of the young, even if this be to the exclusion of almost no matter what other branch besides. And if the use of drugs be referred to at all in their education, it should be with a special care that they be taught the facts as they are,—that the essential and useful drugs are really few and their administration rarely necessary; that in the aggregate in the world it is probable enough that more harm is being yearly done by their indiscriminate and unskilled use than there is good by their timely and judicious employment,” (Kellogg 1905). Note the date he said this. One could think upon reading this, “Yes, but we’ve advanced so much since then.” Have we?

Kellogg also went on to say where and how he saw doctors able to be most effective, “Physicians can do much more than is usually done in the direction by their individual influence in practice. Each physician should constantly endeavor to establish in the minds of his patrons the fact that they should seek intelligent opinions and skilled advice more than prescriptions. And even at an occasional risk of losing patronage, when medicine is not required at all, he should dare to say so, and give the right advice instead. Doctors should be educators more than physic-mongers [not solely and incessantly focused on the physical only]. Whatever time the occasion demands should be taken to fully explain the trouble for which persons present themselves, and the best
regulation of living to be adopted under the circumstances; and for this opinion and advice alone, when kindly given, they should, and generally will, expect to pay, [as in even if no action is taken other than advice], “(italics mine) (Kellogg 1905). This sounds quite similar to what an Ayurvedic doctor in India does.

Chapter 5—The Breakdown of Newtonian Physics and Scientific Materialism: Quantum Physics Emerges and Scientific Certainty Begins to Falter: Where Are We Headed?

“I now believe that rather than trying to explain consciousness in terms of the material world, we should be developing a new worldview in which consciousness is a fundamental component of reality,” Peter Russell (Russell 2000).

Science and Common Sense

Indian born and trained physicist and University of Oregon Institute for Theoretic Physics retired professor of 32 years, Amit Goswami is perfect to turn to at this point: “To grasp the meaning of someone else’s system it is essential to understand the metaphysical basis behind that system. And there is the rub. The metaphysics of science, as developed mainly in the West in the last three hundred years, seems diametrically opposed to the metaphysics behind the dominant religion of the West, Christianity. “ Goswami continues, by introducing us to this new time and quantum physics’ discoveries, explaining that by the twentieth century, science’s success had led to a series of metaphysical notions of reality based on science. Each one of these was antithetical to notions of popular Christianity. One of these ideas is strong objectivity, which was already mentioned–reality is independent of us, “so our free will, our decisions to love God or to follow ethics, does not make any difference in the affairs of the world. Other ideas are material monism and its corollary, reductionism—all things are reducible to matter and to its elementary particles and their interactions. The dualism of God and
the world was openly questioned: if the God–substance is different from the world–substance, how does God interact with the world? Therefore, it makes sense (to the scientists) to postulate that there is only substance, matter, “(Goswami 2000). There is irony intended behind Goswami’s words. Since retirement, he’s been applying quantum physics’ mechanics to the “mind body problem,” including serving as a member of the Advisory Board on the Institute of Noetic Sciences, stated by former astronaut Edgar Mitchell, the sixth man to walk on the moon.

Goswami’s understanding come by him naturally, as a physicist. What would cause Goswami’s perspective that would make him retire from physics, and choose to apply quantum physics to the mind body connection “and to work with the sixth man to walk on the moon? What could these three seemingly divergent fields have in common? Let’s check out what went on in physics. By the 1920’s, the classical Newtonian outlook began to break down. The relativity theory from Einstein—stating that time and space are no longer absolute, but relative—and the development of quantum mechanics with its new understanding that it is not particles but actually waves at the subatomic level chipped away at the Newtonian outlook. That energy is the basic building block of the universe and not matter, and that these waves of energy are within a bigger sea of energy and are without predictable behavior also hammered away at the solidity of the foundations of Newtonian physics. Combined, all of this unraveled the scientific community. And it hasn’t been the same since. Even more baffling, within this unpredictability, these waves of energy are affected by subjective influences from the human mind, and its thoughts and expectations of what it is observing. It is interesting to note that those of us outside of science have no clue of this.

These discoveries undermined Newtonian physics most fundamental principles. As a result of the nature of these discoveries, the question then followed if the possibility of pure objective perception in and of itself is even possible. So then doubt arose that eroded scientific materialism’s model of the physical as the basis of our universe. But what also arose as well is doubt about the effectiveness of the methodology science uses—the scientific method itself—which assumes objectivity as its basic functioning premise. *How could the scientific method in fact produce certainty about an objective world, when it seems like we can’t even observe the objective without causing it to change, according to the Observer effect as seen in the wave/particle duality of quantum physics?* Which actually brings into question the definition of “the objective world” and doubt of its actual existence. These questions result from a long, complex line of questioning that has resulted from the bewilderment that physicists have faced because of these discoveries. We will explore and clarify the most important ones.

However, as apparently set up by Descartes’ successors in the Western tradition of science and ultimately the West’s metaparadigm, when you doubt the existence of a real objective world, the only alternative you have is subjectivity. So everything is thrown back on the individual subject and his or her own mind. In our materialist metaparadigm, this subjectivity
then automatically leads to the leap all the way to the conclusion that the subjective is messy, unreliable, bad. Objective is rational, reliable, and good. Further implied conclusions about the subjective are that if le’ to “just the subjective” (as if that were possible) we would simply perceive whatever we invent or wishful thinking, with nothing in–between. Simply, the world becomes whatever we make up in our minds and we can’t be trusted with our minds’ regions that are “not–objective.” Compare this view to the Buddhist and Yogic understanding of the mind and this view itself seems unreasonable. Ironic, isn’t it?

**Meditation, Mindfulness and Common Sense**

Our society hasn’t endorsed actively going within and working with our minds, so subjectivity is a dangerous unknown. The power in the mind is its ability to objectively reason. In fact, objectivity and reason go hand in hand is the unconscious assumption in our culture, yes? Why are we stuck with only these two alternative extremes of subjectivity and objectivity? Because deeply rooted in Western thinking is a belief in the duality of mind and matter, subject and object and that it is the objective only that is reliable. Our entire functioning of our metaparadigm, our society has developed around this central tenet.

Robert M. Young, in his chapter “The Mind Body Problem” from his book *Mind, Brain and Adaptation in the Nineteenth Century: Cerebral Localization and its Biological Context from Gall To Ferrier*, provides a quote from E.A. Burfi, author of *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Sciences*, that helps to illustrate what has happened, “…it does seem like strange perversity in these Newtonian scientists to further their own conquests of external nature by loading on mind everything refractory to exact mathematical handling and thus rendering the latter still more di9cult to study scientificaly than it had been before. Did it never cross their minds that sooner or later people would appear who craved verifiable knowledge about the mind in the same way they craved it about physical events and who might reasonably curse their elder scientific brethren for buying easier success in their own enterprise by throwing extra handicaps in the way of their successors in social science? Apparently not; mind was to them a convenient receptacle for the refuse, the chips and whittlings of science, rather than a possible object of scientific knowledge,” (Young 2010).

We inherited this split, and from this split have le’ the mind basically unexamined. Instead, we have ignorantly labeled it as unmanageable; again save for the cognitive functions, such as memory recall, processing sensory information, fact and data retrieval, perceptual processing, and analysis. Which are–these cognitive functions–ensuingly, a rather large percentage of what is studied in psychology. Psychology has chosen to focus mostly on the physical because it struggles to be considered worthy amongst its big brothers of hard science.

It is this very factor that is part of the great resistance to the implications
of what the quantum theory unveiled. Namely, the discovery that our world is quite a bit more dependent on the subjective than what Newtonian physics had determined—and wanted. The discovery of the “Observer effect” in quantum physics has led quantum physicists coming up against this long held, strong belief that had so many invested historical reactive emotions contained within it—that the subjective is messy, so go to the objective. It goes directly back to the creation of science in the beginning of the Enlightenment, emerging from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, where these beginning scientists were all men making these choices of what to focus on. There is no ground for consideration in this model we’ve inherited that there could be healthy, Our entire functioning of our metaparadigm, our society has developed around this central tenet.

Robert M. Young, in his chapter “The Mind Body Problem” from his book Mind, Brain and Adaptation in the Nineteenth Century: Cerebral Localization and its Biological Context from Gall To Ferrier, provides a quote from E.A. Burfi, author of The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Sciences, that helps to illustrate what has happened, “...it does seem like strange perversity in these Newtonian scientists to further their own conquests of external nature by loading on mind everything refractory to exact mathematical handling and thus rendering the latter still more difficult to study scientifically than it had been before. Did it never cross their minds that sooner or later people would appear who craved verifiable knowledge about the mind in the same way they craved it about physical events and who might reasonably curse their elder scientific brethren for buying easier success in their own enterprise by throwing extra handicaps in the way of their successors in social science? Apparently not; mind was to them a convenient receptacle for the refuse, the chips and whittlings of science, rather than a possible object of scientific knowledge, “ (Young 2010).

We inherited this split, and from this split have le’ the mind basically unexamined. Instead, we have ignorantly labeled it as unmanageable; again save for the cognitive functions, such as memory recall, processing sensory information, fact and data retrieval, perceptual processing, and analysis. Which are—these cognitive functions—ensuingly, a rather large percentage of what is studied in psychology. Psychology has chosen to focus mostly on the physical because it struggles to be considered worthy amongst its big brothers of hard science.

It is this very factor that is part of the great resistance to the implications of what the quantum theory unveiled. Namely, the discovery that our world is quite a bit more dependent on the subjective than what Newtonian physics had determined—and wanted. The discovery of the “Observer effect” in quantum physics has led quantum physicists coming up against this long held, strong belief that had so many invested historical reactive emotions contained within it—that the subjective is messy, so go to the objective. It goes directly back to the creation of science in the beginning of the Enlightenment, emerging from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, where these beginning scientists were all men making these choices of what to focus on. There is no
ground for consideration in this model we’ve inherited that there could be healthy, successful management of our mental landscapes and emotional worlds; not from what they’d seen. By the time we’d gotten into modernity, science had proven a perfect partner for industrialization, leaving us where we are today in the post–modern world.

Mindfulness arises from an introspective observation of our mind. Typically this is coupled with guidance from an experienced teacher providing explanations of what we’re discovering in this murkiness of the human mind. Or as the Buddhists put it “in the neurotic human mind each human has. So as more aware humans of our minds’ nature, we then go out in the world more mindful of our own mind’s tricks as we interact with others. Ultimately, we become therefore less reactive and more successful with our social and interpersonal interactions. This simply has not been looked at until only recently by the mainstream masses of our materialist metaparadigm. And as this entire discussion is pointing towards, neither has it been looked at, nor genuinely considered within Western science and biomedicine. This again reflects the strong resistance to giving credence to the studying of the mind, as well as the effects of the mind on the body. And thus we have the resulting strong resistance to acknowledging a connection between the mind and the body. You probably now see the need for the preamble at the start of the book.

Acknowledging the mind body connection is only the first step, really. Because then, the mainstream institutions and the field of biomedicine would then have to shift their focus from the physical, and yield to an emphasis on the non–physical. This is the land of the not–so–easily–measured. And it sounds like a metaparadigm shift. Which, once it fully happens, would then result in it not just being at the grassroots level that there is an appreciation and demand for the healing techniques based on a different paradigm. The holistic paradigm that includes the mind body connection is where we’re headed, it seems, yes? Financial support would change, for one, along with many, many other changes throughout most levels of society. So again, we are in the embryonic stage of a metaparadigm shift.

It has been only the last fifteen years that the mind and mindfulness has begun to be seriously explored within the West. This has ultimately lead to using rigorous scientific methods to compete with the dominant metaparadigm, which the Mind Life Institute with the Dalai Lama’s efforts has led to. Non–mainstream scientists have tracked the results of the changes in the specific lobes or regions of the brain and the behavioral changes as a result of long term meditation with Buddhist monks. They’ve used EEG’s to do this. The behavioral and brain lobes they targeted for measure were in long-term meditators, to measure the impacts of meditation and mindfulness. The MLI’s biennial summits were directly responsible for much of this activity. This is the crux of an authentic meeting of the East by the West in our now globalized world.

Additionally, this historical refusal to truly examine the mind has caused us to avoid systematically exploring the use of much of the inherent mental
and metaphysical potential of humans, which is available to achieve even greater things than typically previously considered. Yogic science and chi gong both acknowledge this particularly once we learn about our minds and how to manage them. Tapping into this power source is not something that the West has embraced, because it involves subtle energy, consciousness, and the mind.
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