

[return to updates](#)

RUPERT SHELDRAKE

and “the Skeptics”



by Miles Mathis

My readers have begged me to say more about Rupert Sheldrake, and I have to admit he is a colorful character—much more interesting at first glance than the various Hawkings and Dawkinses. I had not heard of him before a few days ago, but I feel I can already say that with some certainty. He has a definite charm, and was well-chosen for his role. I should start by saying that I agree with him completely about the dogma of science and its ever-increasing levels of control. His critiques of modern science—both its methods and its findings—are mostly true. It is only when he begins advancing his own theories that he goes off the rails for me.

Let us take his theory of vision. I don't think modern science has it all right by a long shot, and Sheldrake's point that consciousness is still a mystery is well-taken. But his return to Plato's (or Plotinus' or Wittgenstein's) theory of vision is shot through with holes. The first hole we find is in Sheldrake's claim that current theory has a virtual movie running in the brain at all times, and no one has ever seen this movie. What he means is that we haven't found a playback button in the brain, so that the researcher can see a stored movie or watch the movie playing along with the owner of the brain. Although true, it isn't really to the point. We know the method of playback in the brain must be quite complex, and our inability to recreate an image contained in electrical signals in neurons is not surprising.

However, if we study photography as a simpler analogue to this problem, we find it doesn't confirm Sheldrake at all. Many people find photography inherently mysterious, but the camera certainly doesn't need to re-project the image back out onto reality. Furthermore, the image *is* inside the box. If we peek inside a camera obscura, we can see the image being cast in there. And in more modern cameras, the film captures the images. We can go in and see the image on the film, and the film is inside the box. If we were very tiny, we could climb in the camera with the film, in which case we would both be *inside the box*. This is roughly what is happening with vision: both your consciousness and the

recorded image are inside the box of your head. You then simply need a translator, from real image to the electrical signals that make up consciousness. I can't tell you how this is done, but something like it is done all the time with transmission of images to TV's. The electromagnetic field is used as translator and carrier. I am not saying the mechanics are strictly equivalent, but the process of vision should no longer be the great mystery it was in Plato's time.

More to the point is Sheldrake's contention that the image is created *outside* the mind, in the place it actually seems to be. In other words, he would say that my image of this computer screen is on the computer screen, just as it seems to be. My first thought upon hearing that was of dreams. The moving images in dreams can't be anywhere but in the mind. They certainly can't be in the "real world," since if they were our eyes couldn't see them. Our eyes are closed. Why would we project the images out beyond the skull, and then retrieve them by some mysterious means through closed eyes? The brain *can* manufacture entire movies from piecing together old memories, and if it can do that in dreams, why does Sheldrake have a problem with the brain doing that by using incoming light instead of old memories? He might say that dreams are in the head but waking experience isn't, but that isn't the point. The point is that the very existence of dreams has falsified his previous assertion. He has said that the theory of images inside the skull doesn't work, and I have reminded you it works perfectly well with dreams.

I haven't studied Sheldrake's theory of dreams. He might argue—again with Plato—that dreams are broadcast into our heads by the gods, for their own purposes. And while I have no proof they are not, that doesn't support his visual projecting either. Dreams, whether put there by gods or manufactured by our own brains, are in our heads. Unless, of course, Sheldrake wishes to propose that dreamland really exists somewhere outside our heads. Also possible, but not provable or disprovable, as far as I can see. And not to the point, either, since in all the cases we have looked at here, no projecting onto a pre-existing real world is going on. In other words, I don't see the point of projecting an image back onto something that has just projected an image into us. In vision, we have already received the image once the photons go into our eyes. The communication is achieved. Why reflect or transmit the image back to the real world? We know the brain can see an image without any real world there, as in dreams or hallucinations, so no response to the real world is necessary. No conservation of energy law applies here, requiring an image for an image. I see no need for the image actually being *out there*. When we watch a Hollywood movie on a screen at the theater, we have no emotional need for the image to be where it seems to be. We don't *need* for there to be a person where we see a person. We see a person on the screen now, while the person is really in a Hollywood studio months ago. Normal vision is much better than that, since we see a person now on our personal visual screen, and that person really is there now, he or she just happens to be a few feet away. Why be bothered by that when we aren't bothered by films at a theater?

Sheldrake will say that our screen image matches the size of reality perfectly, since we are able to touch reality. It is right where we think it is. This he takes as confirmation of his theory. But it isn't, because all we have to do is fit the screen size to reality, and there is no reason to think the brain isn't capable of that. Virtual reality goggles can already do something like this, and the mind learns very quickly to match the hands' motions to the given moving image. Again, there is nothing really mysterious about this, and it doesn't require the brain projecting anything upon reality. It doesn't require a recasting of the image, it simply requires a screen fitting.

Sheldrake's theory should also be testable, since if the eyes are projecting images onto the real world, photon traffic would be going in both directions. Visible light should be coming out of the eyes. We know visible light is going into the eyes and we can measure it pretty easily. The light coming out of

the eyes should be detectable with the same ease. The data is negative as far as I know. I leave open the question of whether or not *something* is being emitted by the body or brain, but we know it isn't visible light.

It appears that Sheldrake is not claiming we project visible light, in the naïve way I have it above (and as the old philosophers did), but still, it isn't clear what way we *are* projecting according to him, or why we would need to. In my opinion, Sheldrake is mixing a good but foggy hunch with a private psychological need, and getting them all mishmashed. We therefore have to look at his theory as both physicist and psychologist. The good hunch is that the living body is reading information from the environment, and emitting information into the environment, in ways so far not understood by science. Although the mechanism of that is probably the charge field and its E/M adjuncts, Sheldrake prefers to explain it as something to do with vision. The private psychological need is that things are where they seem to be. Sheldrake has an obvious need to join his image of the world with the world itself, and this need is understandable. We all have it, since our mind naturally pretends at all times that the image and the reality are one. Sheldrake only does most of us one better in pretending that the pretending is not pretending. He needs to use science to bring the image and reality together, *really*. Why is his need so strong that he needs to parade it in lectures? Unknown, but the best hypothesis is separation anxiety: either a too-early separation from a parent, a separation from a lover, or (as he might put it, following Jung) separation at birth from the cosmic womb. In any case, it is a separation anxiety that we all share with Sheldrake to some extent or another, which is likely why Sheldrake's audience is so prone to follow him in this theory of visual projection.

For myself, I think his return to Plato on this is initially intriguing but finally without merit. If you read Sheldrake's sources as I have, including Plato and Plotinus, I think you will find that Sheldrake's theories are far better than theirs, and that is because he is closer to a mechanical theory of charge field interaction than they were. The ancients had an extremely foggy hunch—barely coalescing out of the mist—that unknown fields were at play. To his credit, Sheldrake follows their hunches, refusing to dismiss them simply because they aren't “modern,” as most contemporary scientists do. He then uses his greater knowledge to focus these old hunches, making them somewhat less foggy and somewhat more believable. But without the charge field, he remains in the same basic mist the ancients were. To be fair, mainstream scientists are in the same mist regarding the charge field, and since they are unwilling to follow Sheldrake on his hunch, we may say they are even deeper in the fog than he is.

Sheldrake's use of staring experiments as proof of visual projection is equally foggy. Let us say that the experiments do show some minor cognizance of being stared at. Is this proof of the theory of visual projection? Not at all. It is proof of some sort of communication, but not necessarily of visual projection. A better theory to explain any type of rough communication like this is one that uses the electromagnetic or E/M field. If you are going to explain “extrasensory” perception by a mechanical model, the E/M field model is much preferable to visual projection. We already know that animals can get rough information from the E/M field, including direction, location, and earthquake warnings via magnetoception. Humans have been shown to have much weaker levels of magnetoception. Since the E/M field is known to exist, and since the brain is known to work on electrical impulses, it isn't too great a leap to suggest that those electrical impulses are traveling beyond the body, either as magnetic waves or some other charge waves. The mechanics and fields already exist and all we have to do is use them. Whereas with Sheldrake's theory, we have to propose a photonic projection from the eyeballs, in the visible part of the spectrum.

Sheldrake is always talking about how easy experiments are to run, but he has failed to run clarifying variations on his staring tests. Why not run a variation where the staring is done with eyes closed?

Why not just have the starrer think, “I am staring at you,” or “I am thinking of you”? The starrer could even imagine a picture of the receiver. I suspect the percentages would be just as high or higher in that case. In which case projecting visible images has nothing at all to do with it.

His non-staring numbers are also ambiguous, since it may be that the receiver can't differentiate between “I am being stared at” and “Staring is going on in the immediate vicinity.” Rather than have his starrer stare at receiver or something else, he should have his starrer stare at receiver or *at nothing*. When not staring at the receiver, the starrer should be instructed to let his mind and gaze wander, or to repeat a meaningless ditty inside his head or something. It may be that the receiver is reading “strong intention” in the immediate area, rather than “staring at me.” Currently, Sheldrake's non-staring numbers are at 50%, compared to staring numbers of 60%. I would wager that changing his methods in my way would increase his non-staring numbers to his staring range. And all this would confirm my charge field mechanism rather than his visual projection mechanism.

I am all in favor of experiments linking the charge or E/M field to the so-called paranormal, but Sheldrake's chosen experiments are not what one would call state-of-the-art. We have machines that can detect tiny fluctuations in the E/M field and in the photon field. We saw such a machine being used in recent orbiton experiments [[Schlappa et al 2012](#)], where the RIXS device was monitoring incoming photons meeting a charge field emitted by atoms. If mainstream science had any interest in finding the mechanism of telepathy, it would put its expensive machines to work in rigorous experiments. Scientists would externally monitor the field of the brain—*outside* the skull—to determine if signals were being sent via the photon or ion field. The fact that they don't do this—instead funding self-administered trials at grade schools—indicates they wish to create diversions rather than solve the problem. It all begins to look like another clever cover-up, feeding the public useless information and manufactured controversies (as between Sheldrake and Dawkins or Sheldrake and Marks/Colwell), while keeping the real information for themselves.

Am I saying the government has already run these experiments? I would assume so. If they used tax dollars [to stare at goats](#) back in the 1970's, we may assume they have developed more sophisticated methods since then. We may assume the military is using the new machines to their fullest effect. You just aren't hearing anything about it, since the military does not publish in *Scientific American* or *Physical Review Letters*, much less the *Journal of Psychiatry*. You only get the continuing diversionary farce, spearheaded by places like Cambridge and Harvard and people like Sheldrake.

While I am critiquing Sheldrake, I should pause to critique his critics as well. Marks and Colwell have published famous debunkings of Sheldrake's staring trials, but their debunkings unfortunately reverse upon themselves, as so many of these “skeptical” analyses do. Sheldrake himself has already hit them with [some good reversals](#), but I have a few of my own he missed. In their paper [at *Skeptical Enquirer*](#), they push the data in some very hamhanded ways. The first push can be seen in table 1, where they mysteriously run 1/3rd as many non-feedback trials as feedback. Ask yourself, “Why didn't they run 180 non-feedback and 180 feedback?” Clearly, they were hoping that if they limited their data set enough, no variation would emerge in the non-feedback trials. Since they *wished* for variations to emerge in the feedback trials, they tripled the number of trials. They attributed this to learning something from simple yes/no feedback, but given that there were three times as many feedback trials, it is more likely the better scores were due to acclimatization. In other words, the most logical reading—and therefore the default reading—of this is that the extra trials allowed the participants to home in on the field signals the experimenters were trying to disprove. Sixty trials split up into sets didn't allow them time to do this, but 180 trials did.

After all, this is what the experiment is really about. Is there a field between starrer and staree, or is there not? If you are trying to prove there is not, you should give non-feedback and feedback variations equal time to acclimatize to this field. Marks and Colwell purposely do not give equal time to the two variations, cuing us to their prejudice. They are claiming prejudice by Sheldrake, but their prejudice is much more transparent. There may be remaining imperfections in Sheldrake's methods, but nothing I have seen compares to this awful and obvious push in the first table at *Skeptical Enquirer*. Any scientist who catches so-called skeptics at such things should permanently dismiss them as biased (and probably bought). And not only biased, but contemptuous of their audience. Marks and Colwell have to think very little of their readers' intelligence to try to pass table 1 past them. The same can be said for the editors at *Skeptical Enquirer*, who should be able to spot obvious data pushes like this. Any magazine that would print such garbage should be shunned.

Which brings us to the skeptical societies in general. Have you ever asked yourself why the skeptical societies all seem to be filled with skeptics who are only skeptical about non-mainstream things? Why aren't these skeptics ever skeptical of anything they have been taught in school or told by the mainstream media? We have been encouraged to question authority, but these skeptics never do. They only question people who question authority. They pile on anyone who doesn't bow as low to the assigned gods and demigods of current science as they do. The "skeptics" like Michael Shermer have never met or heard of an authority they didn't love. The skeptical society skeptic always turns out to be a defender of the faith, protecting his beloved teachers from any and all serious analysis, by any means necessary, including sophistry, fudged data, and character assassination.

Due to the historical and current definition of skeptic, we would expect skeptics to be outside the mainstream. The first line at Wikipedia defines a skeptic as someone who questions claims that are taken for granted elsewhere. For instance, Peter Abelard was a skeptic regarding the religious dogma of his time, and it cost him dearly. He was forced to retreat into the wilderness to avoid further persecution, and his students had to live around him in tents. Only much later was he called the greatest thinker of the 12th century. Questioning the *status quo* doesn't normally lead to great popularity in the mainstream, for obvious reasons.

So the skeptical society skeptics don't even fit the definition of skeptic. The skeptical society skeptic doesn't question dogma, he guards it. The skeptical society skeptic is only skeptical of anything that doesn't fit the current standard model of everything.

The modern skeptic isn't a skeptic, he or she is a Mandarin or Pharisee.

Like everything else, the definition of skeptic has been inverted. These people try to capture the title skeptic in order to capture its historical prestige. The greatest thinkers in history have been skeptics, since they had the guts to question received opinion or current wisdom. But the modern skeptic is a protector of all received opinion and current wisdom. In any and all questions, you will see the fake skeptics taking the side of authority. That is the opposite of skepticism. That is obeisance.

I had never thought much about it until about 10 years ago, when I finally saw through these people. It took 9/11 to make me see what was really going on. Possibly the skeptical societies were once composed of real skeptics, but now they are just government fronts. They are paid to "debunk" anything the government (and other institutions) doesn't want you to believe, and prop up everything the government wants you to believe. In other words, all the current debunking is indistinguishable from propaganda. These people aren't skeptics, they are just government operatives in disguise. That is why the debunking is so poorly done. It isn't convincing to anyone but other government operatives.

After all the spinning and misdirection we have been hit with in the past decade, I don't feel the need to couch this in more polite terms. All the “scientific” societies have been unmasked in the past decade, and it should now be clear to anyone paying attention where their loyalties lie. It isn't with the truth or with science, properly defined. As with the mainstream media, there is already a mass exodus of readers from the scientific societies and journals, and I suggest you join that exodus. And if you are still under their influence, I suggest you take a closer look. I share your love of science and your love of unmasking fraud, but the debunking we now see in the mainstream isn't part of either one. It is only institutionalized fraud and the amateurish attempt at mass brainwashing through pseudoscience.

This would seem to put me far closer to Sheldrake than to what now passes for mainstream science. I disagree with Sheldrake on many things, as we saw above, but he seems to be earnest. The same can't be said for the skeptics who are aligned against him. I not only disagree with them about almost everything, I think many of them are paid liars. They don't seem to me to have any interest in the truth. Sheldrake makes mistakes, like all of us, but these skeptics aren't making mistakes. They are purposely fudging tables, data, equations, and arguments. In my experience, I would say about 90% of their arguments consist of highschool debating tricks and other sophomoric sophistry, and the other 10% is fake equations and graphs.

Unfortunately, these fake scientists now run the world. It isn't only the skeptical societies that are stiff with them, the universities are run by the them, the journals are run by them, and all other institutions are controlled by them. The entire field is corrupt from the top down. If you have made it to this point in your life with any residual integrity left, the best thing you can do is flee the whole lot. Don't take their classes, don't subscribe to their journals, and don't fund their projects. They are on the wrong track, and the only way you can find the right track is to get out of their car. Put your boots on the ground and start walking toward another horizon. And if you have to hitch a ride to make better speed, be damn sure the person driving has more sense.

But now back to Sheldrake. I let this paper sit while I researched him further. I recently tripped over him being interviewed by Deepak Chopra, and had to reconsider my first (rather tame) opinion of him. No earnest scholar of anything would be caught in the same sentence with Deepak Chopra—the viceroy of Transcendental Meditation, the man too crooked for the arch-crook Maharishi Mahesh Yogi. Maybe Sheldrake is just trying to sell his book, and Chopra knows how to do that. Possibly we will see Sheldrake on Oprah next. But there may be more going on here than I first thought. It is curious that Sheldrake is trying to lead those disenchanted by current science further into mysticism. As I pointed out in a previous paper, Sheldrake and I tend to be lumped in together as “heretics,” but while I am insisting physics return to mechanics, Sheldrake is pushing the “non-mechanistic” and “non-material.” Sheldrake and I start from the same criticism of the mainstream, that is, but after that he goes south and I go north.

This is curious because—as I have shown—science was (re)infected with mysticism about a century ago, and has been in steep decline ever since. This is especially true in physics and mathematics, which have nearly dissolved in the past five decades. Both have been replaced by a manufactured and finessed heuristics. So when I see a solution to this mess pushed by a prominent biologist from Cambridge and Harvard, and that solution promotes even larger doses of mysticism, I have to ask why. Notice that Sheldrake is mainstream himself. He is not fired for promoting mysticism. Cambridge actually funds him to do these no-tech studies in the paranormal. And he has no trouble finding a publisher. His publisher Crown is a division of Random House, the largest publisher of books in the world. His fellow authors at Crown include George Bush, Barack Obama, and, yes, Deepak Chopra.

In the end, what Shel Drake does is divert dissatisfaction with current science into ineffectual or trivial channels. I am not saying we shouldn't be studying the paranormal, but if you compare the topics I have chosen to be skeptical about and the topics Shel Drake has chosen to be skeptical about, you see a big mismatch. I am questioning the basic equations of Newton, Einstein, Bohr, Schrodinger, and Maxwell. Shel Drake is questioning if dogs know when their master is coming home. I am questioning the value of π in the kinematic circle and elliptical orbit and the Lagrangian and the entire foundation of the calculus, while Shel Drake is questioning telephone telepathy. And yet it is his response to science that gets promoted as a mainstream variant.

Why? Well, it could be because his variant is no real threat to the mainstream. There may be a few manufactured differences with Richard Dawkins, to help sell both their books, but Shel Drake's variation is mainly just trivial. It doesn't address any central issues. He calls science dogmatic, but then doesn't criticize anything specific. His critiques are all *general* critiques of scientific assumptions and methods, but he doesn't ever put his head or anyone else's on the block. The dogma of science is a problem only in the case that science is wrong. If all the theories and equations are right, I am not against scientists thinking they are right. I have no problem with confidence; it is misplaced confidence I abhor. So Shel Drake needs to show us where science is wrong. He never gets around to doing that.

In both his books and lectures, everything remains very foggy. He tells us that if we don't like the current theory of vision, for instance, we can go back to that of Plotinus. Notice two things here: One, Shel Drake almost always stays in the realm of consciousness, which even mainstream science still admits is mysterious. Science is actually *less* dogmatic about consciousness than it is about anything else. This gives Shel Drake room to move without seriously offending anyone. He can appear to be revolutionary while being nothing like. His is just another muddy theory about consciousness among hundreds of others. Two, he is telling you that if you aren't convinced by current explanations of consciousness, you can go back to the Neo-Platonists or anyone else you like. Because modern science hasn't given us a convincing theory of consciousness, you are free to insert all the mysticism you like right there. You are still free to believe whatever you like in this arena, since the data is both incomplete and ambiguous.

But that isn't skepticism (or science) either. Skepticism is questioning authority, but we have no authoritative theory of consciousness. Like mainstream scientists, Shel Drake is just setting up shop in a data hole and blowing a lot of smoke. I have shown how mainstream physicists like Hawking and Penrose do this, seeking out data holes like black holes and the first seconds of the universe and singularities and dark matter and virtual particles, where they are free to theorize without being inconvenienced by evidence or falsifiability. In these places, they only have to worry about other theorists. Well, Shel Drake is doing the same thing, but instead of doing it on the edge of a black hole, he is doing it on the edge of known science. By dabbling in the paranormal, he is automatically beyond the dogma of science and the confines of hard data. Since the "field" of the paranormal is thought to be unknown—we haven't discovered the messenger particle of telepathy, for instance—he is unconstrained by data. All data in the field at this time is circumstantial. "This happened and then this happened," but no mechanism has been found or proposed as the causal link. Shel Drake's morphogenetic field is not a mechanism (or a field), it is just a name. He has no physical theory of cause, one that could be investigated mechanically.

To be specific, the difference between his field and mine is that I have postulated a real field of real particles, and pointed to where they exist in the historical equations and in the known particle

hierarchy. These particles can be investigated physically, since they are already detectable with the machines we have. We may have to tweak our machines to see the particles in new ways, but my theory is fully falsifiable. Sheldrake's morphogenetic field has none of these qualities, since he proposed no physical field of particles, much less tried to explain the mechanics of it. This is precisely why he dodges into the non-material and non-mechanistic, along with Deepak Chopra and all the rest. It is always easier to theorize when you don't have to obey any mechanical or logical rules. We have seen that with mainstream physics in the 20th century, which threw out mechanics for just that reason. It was restricting their ability to theorize. Well, Sheldrake has learned this lesson well. He is less controversial than he would like you to think, since he learned and inherited his distaste for mechanics from the princes of physics, all the way back to Bohr and Heisenberg.

Sheldrake encourages scientists to “come out of the closet” as he has, publicly embracing the non-material and the religious and so on, which he says many of them already do in private. While I don't doubt that many scientists do have another side, and while I don't have anything (in general) against faith, religion, or broad assumptions of meaning, I don't think scientists really need to be encouraged to come out of the closet in this way. Scientists should be free to have whatever religious feelings they have, just like anyone; but what scientists need at this point in history is encouragement to come out of the closet and be real scientists again, instead of equation pushers and magicians and computer modelers. They need to be encouraged (and required) to embrace mechanics again. They need to be required to embrace rigor again. They need to be required to embrace honesty and integrity again. They *don't* need to be encouraged to be even squishier than they already are. The absolute last thing we need right now is a further injection of non-materialism into science, since that will just encourage scientists to cheat even more than they do now. Most of the rules of science have already been jettisoned, and allowing a Deepak Chopra mentality into mainstream science will not help at all. If anything, there is already an excess of creative freedom in science—and especially in physics. We don't need to encourage the continuation and escalation of the free-for-all in theory. We need to encourage a return to soberness, logic, firm definitions, and, most of all, mechanics.

Is this newest promotion of neo-mysticism a function of Sheldrake's personality, or is it something more? Is Sheldrake so popular because he is a charming old Brit with a smooth voice, one who sticks mainly to bestseller topics like dogs and telepathy; or is Sheldrake so popular because he is promoted so heavily by the mainstream? You could (and should) ask the same of Deepak Chopra. We are told he is so popular and so rich because he is a great speaker with a lot of charisma. But is he? If he is, I have missed it. To my ear, he is a droner, and is about as charismatic as Henry Kissinger. So if he is just a modern version of the old snake-oil salesman—without the charming patter—why is he everywhere? Is he everywhere because people love him, or do people *think* other people love him because he is everywhere?

I think the answer is obvious, if you study it at all. These people like Oprah and Chopra and Tolle are popular simply because they are promoted. If you turn on the TV or go to the bookstore, they are what is available. They aren't created by public demand, they are created by the major salesmen—who know what they want you to have. If you turn on the TV, Oprah is on. Truly interesting people aren't on, so you watch Oprah. If you go to the bookstore, they don't have any truly interesting books. Those are all out of print. They were pulped in the last decade. If you want to read a book, you have to buy Tolle or Chopra or someone else handpicked for you by the media.

But why would the mainstream wish to promote Chopra and Sheldrake? Shouldn't the mainstream wish to suppress them? If science is so dogmatic, shouldn't the Inquisitors have silenced them by now? We may assume they were picked to perform a function, that function being the mental and psychic

evisceration of the counter-culture. Those whose brains have not been turned to mush by the inanities of mainstream science might wish to escape and find sanity. To prevent that, Chopra and Sheldrake and others are cleverly positioned at the exit doors, where they deliver a new set of speeches and drop a new shelf of books. The greater part of the escapees are thereby (re)diverted back into the old ass-biting mysticism, where they can twiddle away the rest of their remaining days, chasing their own tails and being a threat to no-one's empire.

So once again we see a discussion being split into two sides, with both sides being promoted by the same controlled media. It is called manipulating the opposition. The analogy is politics, where you are presented with two parties. You are led to think you have only two choices, and then both choices are controlled from above. Since the truth is behind door number three, you never notice it. Your eyes are kept on doors 1 and 2, since that is where all the bright lights and loud music is coming from. There is a permanent debate going on between door 1 and 2, and you are kept up-to-date on this debate with a constant reportage. Those fronting doors 1 and 2 have agreed to split all the catchwords and hot topics and news of the day, to draw you in. Someone representing one of the two doors will be a master of words like love and altruism and harmony (see Deepak Chopra), and this will draw all the sweethearts to that door. Another representative of the two doors will be a master of words like realism and patriotism and protection and defense, and that will draw all the wannabe tough-guys to that door. Any sound from door 3 will be drowned out in the constant din from the other two doors.

This is Sheldrake's (and Chopra's) function: act as door 2 to science's door 1. Science had become a monopoly, but monopolies can't create the noise duopolies can. A manufactured controversy always makes more noise than propaganda from a single source. A promoted duopoly is a better guarantee that the public will never discover any truth, or trip by accident into any area of reality.

My mind was formed back when the media was only 60 or 70% controlled, so I tend to have remaining pockets of naivete—which explains my two days of believing in Sheldrake's earnestness. But since the media is now controlled at near 100%, I should have known Sheldrake was a fraud only because I was looking at him. Real people are no longer promoted: reality is not useful to the current custodians of culture. If you are in search of any reality, you have to take your tent to the edge of the wilderness, camping in the garden of some Abelard's hermitage.