Perspective

Science, Subjectivity & Reality

Contzen Pereira* & J. S. K. Reddy

Abstract

In this paper, we argue on the ability of science to capture the true subjective experience of life, blinded within the limits of its reductionist approaches. With this approach, even though science can explain well the physics behind the objective phenomenon, it fails fundamentally in understanding the various aspects associated with the biological entities. In this sense, we are skeptical to the present approach of science and calls out for a more fundamental theory of life that considers not only the objectivity aspect of a biological entity but also the subjective experience as well. It raises questions as to what does it takes to develop a new science from a subjective standpoint.

Key Words: Science, subjectivity, reality, cosmos, peripersonal space.

> *Modern science is based on the principle "Give us one free miracle and we'll explain the rest." The one free miracle is the appearance of all the matter and energy in the universe and all the laws that govern it from nothing, in a single instant* - Terrence McKenna

The Cosmos showers the experience of life graced by an enigmatic subject grounded in an objective fabric (or biological structure). The extent of the subjective experience is in a way bounded by the limitations of an objective fabric. In this sense each biological form in the universe including humans are gifted with only limited versions of the Cosmos or reality. Whatever we experience of life is not a true experience or holistic experience in its entirety. It is only resulting from the limited glimpses or from the limited sensory faculties we are fabricated with. Each biological entity in the universe, say, insects, birds, animals, including humans experience reality in a totally different version (Peter et al 2004; Chen et al 2016). No two entities can have the same subjective experience. Each experience is limited by their own adaptations specific to the fabric's evolution. For example, a human's perception of reality is limited by his visionary (ranging from 400-700nm), auditory (20 to 20,000 Hz) and other abilities (Peter et al 2004). Is there any way to prove if reality perceived by two humans is one and the same? Are there any scientific investigations into how these capabilities of various sensory agents evolved with human fabric? Do ancient human ancestors or cave men and present humans have access to the same versions of the Cosmos? Why is it that the Cosmos gives us access to the limited perception of reality as well as its different versions (Pereira and Reddy 2016)? What is the science behind each biological entity that has access to various versions of the Cosmos specific to its fabric?

* Correspondence: J. Shashi Kiran Reddy, JNCASR, Bangalore-560064, India. Email: jumpal_shashi@yahoo.com

In the present school of thought, modern science tries to understand life and its works from its limited perception of the Cosmos, there by developing scientific techniques or methods that fit well with the objective reality (Lanza and Berman 2010). But how far can this help in understanding life at a holistic level? Can present science ever be able to experience life in its true sense? Is it possible for present science to explain and capture life from a subjective standpoint?

In a true sense, subjective experiences like taste, touch, and various other emotions can't be explained from an objective standpoint (of present science). Even with a thousand scientific articles that quote the various properties of a sugar molecule, trying to explain its taste, these articles can never provide details about the feel of its taste. How can one quantify this? Same thing is with touch, one can explain the mechanism of what is happening and how tactile sensations are monitored, but cannot explain the experience. Each life experience is unique and science is a generalized attitude. Science is just external never intrinsic. It is a language/attitude towards understanding things around us. Everything should be studied from a first person (subjective) and a third-person (objective) perspective. Only then it can be claimed as a complete or true understanding. That's why we are unique in experience and that's our signature. No one can experience us and no one can be like us. Science can explain objectively the nature of consciousness and other constituents but what about the subjective experience? The science of experience or quality is needed, but can such attitude with science be possible? How can one include this aspect into the modern school of thought?

When we generate a hypothesis for a study, we base our hypothesis on the other person perspective embracing the reductionist approach of a different kind. The very nature of questioning is an outward projection and another person's perspective. We tend to reduce an experience to be more objective. Life and consciousness can only be complete in the other sense (Sheldrake 1995; Lanza and Berman 2010). We may claim to come up with the general theory of consciousness associated with its nature and working, but do we really mean it unless we add a subjective aspect? When we intend to study a bird's flight mechanism, we tend to reduce it to a mere object and try to look for the fundamental laws governing its motion and dynamics. Accordingly, science is successful in extracting the objective/physical laws governing such motion that applies to our everyday life. But, should we celebrate the success of science in reducing the biological or living entity to a mere object leaving its subjective aspect or life ignored? Is it not the bird that is regulating its motion or dynamics according to its needs and necessities? Is the bird a mere aerodynamic toy responding to the ambient objectively? The attitude of science is good in understanding various objective phenomena but not biological subjects? We need a different approaches in science to understand and study biological entities (Sheldrake 1995; Bruce Lipton 2005; Niskama Shanta and Vijnana Muni 2016).

Apart from being alienated from the subjective aspect, the science of objectivity (or reduced science) in itself suffers from the tunneling vision resulting from various disciplines of science that are closed to their own versions governed by respective laws and theories. It fits well with the story of four blind men trying to explain how an elephant looks like with their limited experience, where in which one argues elephant be a pillar, the other snake and so on, depending on which part of the experience they have access to. Modern science in this sense falls short in explaining life at a holistic level just because it embraces reductionist approach at various levels (Sheldrake 1995; Bruce Lipton 2005).

Science always seeks to understand the origin and evolution of life (Sheldrake 1995; Reddy and Pereira 2016). How many theories do we have that explain the origin of life and its evolution considering the properties of the geomagnetic fields that could have played a curial role in its evolution? Do we have an absolute definition of life; of what it means, and about its nature? From a science perspective if life appeared from an evolutionary standpoint, then how does matter come into the first place? Does science have theories explaining the evolution of matter? Did life evolve independently with respect to the evolution of matter? To what extent does science accept the Gaia theory of life, which supports the co-evolution of matter and life? Doesn't it seem obvious, that such an evolutionary connection could have taken place?

Science has always had a problem dealing with anything non-material or non-physical, this is because of its narrow-mindedness towards a few dogmatic principles i.e. all scientific quantity should be measurable and one must be able to reproduce similar results at any given point of time etc. It's like experiencing a particular season and thereby estimating how it could possibly impact all year round. How can we call psychology a science? Is a person's psychology directly measurable? And can it be reproduced? Connecting life at a fundamental level with any of these phenomena can shake the very foundations of science. The inclusion of the non-local and non-material concepts associated with various aspects of life could probably reveal life's hidden secrets. What does science know about the physical/material brain and its connection to non-physical/non-material mind? How does it construct? If science cannot accept field theories of life, then how can it embrace the concept of non-local Peripersonal Space (PPS)? Peripersonal space (PPS) is the immediate space that surrounds the body, which apparently acts as an interface between the body and the environment (Rizzolatti et al 1997). The concept of PPS from experimental neuropsychology is associated with the non-local field constructed by one's brain to navigate and to interact with the surrounding environment. It has been shown that such a field is sensitive to the presence of other biological entities and even physical tools (Teneggi et al., 2013; Maister et al., 2015). Even though it is not a physical field, can't it give us a glimpse into thoughts and emotions? Can't it help us understand how matter could be connected to the mind? How does the material brain create or construct non-material PPS? What does present science know about the nature and various functional aspects of PPS?

Even when we consider the non-physical aspects associated with life, science fails to explain the underlying connection or communication at a fundamental level (Sheldrake 1995; Rubik 2015; Niskama Shanta and Vijnana Muni 2016). What theories do we have to explain various patterns appearing in the biological and physical worlds (Thompson (1917) 1992; Christine Sterne 2008)? Is there any science underlying each biological pattern? How are these patterns connected to the various functionalities of a biological system (Pereira and Reddy 2016)?

Conclusion

The celebrated success of science in explaining the governing physical laws and in understanding the objective aspects of the universe comes to an end with the question of the subjectivity of a biological entity. The present school of thought fails to explain the fundamental mechanisms involved in life's functioning and evolution. By considering the non-local and non-material aspects associated with life's constituents, it could help in revealing the hidden secrets

of life at a more fundamental level. In this context, this paper is skeptical to the objective/reductionist approach in studying biological entities that quote our limitations with the available sensory faculties that perceive reality, thereby seeking a new holistic and synergetic approach.

References

Bhakti Niskama Shanta, Bhakti Vijnana Muni, Why Biology is Beyond Physical Sciences?, Advances in Life Sciences, 2016; Vol. 6 No. 1, 13-30.

Bruce Lipton. The biology of belief: Unleashing the power of consciousness, matter and miracles. Mountain of Love/Elite Books, Santa Rosa, CA, 2005.

Chen PJ, Awata H, Matsushita A, Yang EC, Arikawa K. Extreme spectral richness in the eye of the Common Bluebottle butterfly, Graphium Sarpedon. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 2016; 4.

Christine Sterne. Blueprints of the Cosmos, Unpublished, 2008.

Lanza R, Bob Berman. Biocentrism: How Life and Consciousness are the Keys to Understanding the True Nature of the Universe. BenBella Books, 2010.

Maister L, Cardini F, Zamariola G, Serino A, Tsakirisa M. Your place or mine: Shared sensory experiences elicit a remapping of peripersonal space. Neuropsychologia, 2015; 70, 455-461.

Pereira C and Reddy JSK. Cosmic Origami: Finger prints of Life. Scientific God Journal, 2016 (In Review)

Peter A, Eileen K, Peter H. Biology in Context: The Spectrum of Life. Second Edition, Victoria: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Reddy JSK, Pereira C. Origin of life: A consequence of cosmic energy, redox homeostasis and the quantum phenomenon. NeuroQuantology, 2016 (In Press).

Rizzolatti G, Fadiga L, Fogassi L, Gallese V. The space around us. Science 277(5323), 1997 :190–191.

Rubik B. The Biofield: Bridge between mind and body. Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, 2015; vol. 11, no. 2.

Sheldrake R. A New Science of Life. Park Street Press, 1995.

Teneggi C, Canzoneri E, di Pellegrino G, Serino A. Social modulation of peripersonal space boundaries. Current Biology: CB, 2013; 23(5), 406–411.

Thompson DW, Thompson K. On Growth and Form. Revised edition (Jun 1992), Dover publications, 1992.