

There are some big empty spaces all along the 13 pages of this document. Be careful not to miss some comments.

## Customer Review

20 of 24 people found the following review helpful:

★★★★★ **Fascinating and Hard Hitting**, May 7, 2009

By **Robert B. Zannelli**

It is well known that Quantum Mechanics presents us with a picture of the world that is at odds with our everyday common sense. This fact has been seized on by new age gurus and some religionists to enlist Quantum theory as "proof" for their assertions. DR Stenger, who has a talent for making modern physics accessible to lay readers, takes on the new age Gurus and Quantum religionists, debunking their absurd and unsupported assertions. Along the way the reader is introduced to the real wonders of Quantum theory making this book fascinating as well as a useful source for debunking new age nonsense.



★★★★★ ([7 customer reviews](#))

## Comments

**Initial post:** May 13, 2009 7:14 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 19, 2009 10:17 AM PDT

Wojciech Langer says:

From Editorial Review (quote): "...the belief that 'you create your own reality' by controlling the laws of physics with your mind. "

Stenger is a good writer, I read couple of V.Stenger's books ("Timeless Reality" being the best, where he sticks mostly to science he has practiced). Unfortunately his latest books are getting frankly speaking, sort of misleading and... boring. He creates perception that essentially we know everything about the Universe and physical laws in "The Comprehensible Cosmos", which is obvious nonsense. He embarks in endless discussions "science vs. faith" where there is no winner in that argument ("Has Science Found God", "God: The Failed Hypothesis", "The New Atheism"). Now he takes on quantum physics vs. consciousness - gray area, where science is still at the crossroads. Not every prominent scientist shares Victor Stenger's opinion (and he is far from being prominent, no disrespect meant). Just search for what Roger Penrose and John Wheeler think about it. We simply do not know, but Stenger plays "guru" who knows all and his attitude has become gradually irritating. He should take Valium and relax. For objective look at quantum vs. consciousness I suggest reading "Quantum Enigma - Physics Encounters Consciousness" by Bruce Rosenblum and Fred Kuttner.

Even Carlos Calle in his new "stenger-like" book "The Universe - Order Without Design"

provides look at Stephen Hawking's fascinating proposal that present-day observers may influence the very nature of reality. So, what really do we know about consciousness? Obviously Stenger is far away of being Hawking.

"Useful as it is under everyday circumstances to say that the world exists "out there" independent of us, that view can no longer be upheld. There is a strange sense in which this is a "participatory universe" (John Wheeler).

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 4, 2009 4:49 PM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 4, 2009 5:02 PM PDT

[Steve Thomas](#) says:

Has anyone ever noticed that Langer's type of critique always seems to take the same basic shape? They begin with a general assertion that the writer is by and large good but going stale, and then this opens the door for the reviewer to get a little more directed with criticisms. Then the subtle shift: "He embarks in endless discussions "science vs. faith" where there is no winner in that argument." And in his latest book the author has just simply gone too far, and then we're reminded that the author should stick to his or her subject of study. And then the coup de grace, "...Stenger plays `guru' who knows all and his attitude has become gradually irritating." Very last, the switch, "For [sic] objective look at quantum vs. consciousness I suggest reading "Quantum Enigma - Physics Encounters Consciousness."

Indulge me an interpretation. "Truly everyone, I am open-minded because I have read many books, including Stenger's, but he is just too closed-minded to be useful about the subject. In fact, he's part of that `new atheism' thingy, and everyone knows they're all just a bunch of activists. If you want something that's a little more balanced, then read this guy, he's much smarter... and I happen to agree with him too." The simple fact of the matter is that it seems Langer happens to like to idea of consciousness being tied to quantum mechanics, so anyone who disagrees with him is called irritating or, in this case, told to take a controlled substance. Here's an idea Langer, rather than giving us the usual spiel, please tell us exactly how Stenger got his physics wrong. We're all waiting for your brilliant insights.

---

**Your post, in reply to** [an earlier post](#) on Jun 5, 2009 4:03 AM PDT

[Julio C. S. Barros](#) says:

-

Hi Steve... a little souvenir for you here:

[http://www.amazon.com/review/R3D7BCZOO8KS8D/ref=cm\\_aya\\_cmt?ie=UTF8&ASIN=0345409469#wasThisHelpful](http://www.amazon.com/review/R3D7BCZOO8KS8D/ref=cm_aya_cmt?ie=UTF8&ASIN=0345409469#wasThisHelpful)

And don't miss this one too:

<http://www.criticandokardec.com.br/criticizing skepticism.htm>

Best Wishes

: -)

Julio

-

---

**Your post:** Jun 5, 2009 6:35 AM PDT

[Julio C. S. Barros](#) says:

-

Ok, while we wait for Steve Thomas to do his homework (we'd better be vvvveerrryyy patient), let me say a few words about this coming of this new book by Stenger.

First of all, Hi Bob. Good to read from you. You might want to make a wish as you watch the falling stars, that is, as you watch the stars falling (i.e. the now five stars dropping after

my forthcoming review of this book by Stenger. My copy is soon to arrive...).

I must say that I couldn't help smiling at this expression from reviewer Geoff Gilpin (editorial reviews): "Victor Stenger knows quantum theory as well as anybody." Oh, please, help me out on this one :-). How are we to interpret this?! Sure, he meant "as well any good physicist," and that is precisely my point ;-). Stenger, like "anybody," is good at "shutting up and calculating"; but he is (arguably) poor at interpreting the meaning of quantum mechanics. And it seems that this book is about this, that is, interpreting the meaning of QM and questioning some interpretations of it.

Therefore we must conclude that: this book is about something Stenger is not good at...

During my long stay at Vic Stenger's internet forum (avoid-L - administered by you; by the way, superbly so), I presented to him and to his fellow physicists at the forum (you and I are laymen on this land) my questionings and my critique to many of Vic's assertions, including both some of his own interpretations of QM and some of his refutations to interpretations by others of QM. Naturally, bizarre moments ensued... :

I showed that his graph (from God, the Failed Hypothesis) indicated that entropy was decreasing in the universe (!), and physicist Lawrence Crowell first said my interpretation of the graph was correct and then stepped back saying that I was wrong (to be sure: I never claimed Stenger was wrong in this respect; I only showed an interpretation of the graph itself).

Once, in a most rare moment of "replying" to me (\*mentioning\* me, actually), Stenger complained that he did not disagree with Carl Sagan (as I was "accusing" him of) in the interpretation of QM.

Weirdly, on another occasion, it became obvious that Stenger did not know the meaning of the word "epiphenomenon" (as currently used in cognitive sciences and philosophies), even though he had used (misused) it in God the Failed Hypothesis, even though he had been using it in crafting his own ideas of the relationship between QM and consciousness, and even though (!!!) he had cited a book that fully discusses the meaning of this term (Dennett's Consciousness Explained), and, topmost, even though he is now (and was then already...) adjunct professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado (and one might as well say, "what a sham").

He labelled Ross Rhodes' (Bottom Layer site, where one interpretation of QM is presented) decision not to enter avoid-L as cowardice, and yet not only did Rhodes go on with his debate with Brent Meeker (who was challenging the contents of Rhodes's site), but Rhodes also managed to have Meeker step back in some of his initial charges too. And all the while Stenger himself kept hiding from me in his own forum...

Stenger interpreted Steven Weinberg's article in a quite twisted manner into supporting his untenable notion that "the fundamental notion of matter and material processes has not been changed since the time of Newton - only embellished" (God, the Failed Hypothesis), even though "since the time of Newton" (and up to pre Relativity times) superluminal information transfer was allowed, fixed universal point of reference existed (ether), matter was truly ontologically solid, and time was neither relative nor intertwined with matter...

All this extensive list above not to mention Stenger's being fooled by Larson et al article (he actually further twisted this one too), and not to mention the instances where he seemed to cite things without having read them (and citing them wrongly!).

And I ask you now, Bob: what are we to make of all of this? Are we to side with the fancy interpretations of the New Age Gurus, or are we to nestle with the twisted interpretations of the New Atheism Gorillas? (and I don't mean Guerrillas). Your book review seems to suggest the latter. My repeated advices to you indicate "Neither!". Insistently I have stressed that this religious war of yours in the USA (and Britain), atheists vs other religions (yes, atheism is a religion too), is pointless, at least the way you are fighting it. Self criticism is important. You all in the avoid L forum refrained from acknowledging that Richard Dawkins' remarks (defending James Watson) ended up being racist and racism endorsing. And I asked you all then, "You cannot acknowledge it simply because Dawkins is going to be together with you guys soon in a meeting supporting the organized-activist atheism-materialism movement in America?" Aren't you following the same rotten roads of the millenia "gurus" and politicians of all persuasions? (which dictate that private and communal interests come first, and that mankind's interests and truth come second).

We all have our agendas and "private" wars to tend to. I have been hurt in the past by the excesses of this war of yours, by the writings of Stenger, and by the further twistings of it by unscrupulous internet debaters who dishonestly fought my ideas and cherished beliefs. I fought back, as honestly and thoughtfully as I could. This is not my war, though (I wish it was, but it is not; mine is, imho, far worse). That is why I left your battlefield. My war is together with a huge growing percentage of my homeland's population that is being forced to become a "subrace" (low grade race) when actually they are far more than this. And as, just yesterday, I saw them (students) at the elementary public school where I teach at, leaving their classes like a stampede, some of them very dangerous drug dealers we know or suspect so, some of them prostitutes we know or suspect so, but all of them, believe it or not, with at least a minimum level of healthy affective bonds with the school and with us teachers, then I thought, well, maybe I am fighting my war in a right manner after all... All I can hope for you is that you will manage to do the same.

Best Wishes,  
Julio Siqueira

---

[In reply to your post](#) on Jun 5, 2009 9:46 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 5, 2009 11:45 AM PDT

[Steve Thomas](#) says:

Julio,

I will give you one thing, you're certainly much better than me at navigating the Amazon website, for I always seem to forget where I've been and who I've been speaking with. Nonetheless, I perhaps deserve your snipe as, quite admittedly, I can be a bit abrupt every now and again. As a veteran of this debate, however, I can tell you that the same elements are forever present, whether the discussion is about: God, psychics, UFO's, monsters, angels, demons, the paranormal, ghosts, quantum consciousness, Atlantis, ad nauseum. People just simply want to believe this stuff, and I am left guessing as to why. Perhaps it's for the simple fact that reality can sometimes be a bit harsh or even mundane, but this alone doesn't provide any of us with sufficient reason to believe this stuff. I will keep saying it over and over and over, there as of yet isn't any evidence to support these claims. If so, where is it?

So, Julio, like so many others, you play yourself off as being open-minded and rational, but in reality you're not at all. Take for example your statement, "You might want to make a wish as you watch the falling stars, that is, as you watch the stars falling (i.e. the now five stars dropping after my forthcoming review of this book by Stenger." In and of itself, this statement might have been fine, but then you added: "My copy is soon to arrive..." Wow, you haven't even read the book and you're forewarning us that you're going to give it a bad review. Julio, like all of the so-called phenomena I mentioned above, you simply like to believe, and you don't like Stenger because he pokes holes in your favorite belief. I have read the book, and although I'm not a physicist, I can confirm that it is well-written, easy to read and well-argued.

Yes, I read all of your stuff on your links and it's nothing new. In reality, it's laughable because I wonder if you realize that you're actually proving my point. You don't even really understand the point of Project Alpha, do you? Randi's position was simple: he was exposing the shoddy research methods being employed by these so-called paranormal investigators; they were not employing the scientific method and lacked strict controls. Based upon what you've written, you really do not seem to understand the point of science or the scientific method. Do you really think that discoveries can be covered up? It's always the same, anytime evidence is rejected based upon sound scientific principle, people always claim some sort of scientific conspiracy. Humbug... No longer do we live in the dark ages, so if enough researchers are able to confirm the validity of any claim then it's likely it will become main stream science. The difference between you and me is really quite simple: I withhold judgment; yes, I remain skeptical until there's sufficient evidence to believe any proposition's validity. On the other hand, you seem to state - like so many other believers - that if it hasn't been proven wrong (or at least completely ruled out) then it must be right. In simpler terms, you place the conclusion before the premises, and then change the premises to fit your conclusion. This is hardly the stuff of science and reason.

Furthermore, go back and reread everything that you've written above. I feel obliged to be completely honest with you Julio, it is complete gibberish my good man, for it's like reading the paranoid ramblings of a mad man. I don't even really know what you were trying to accomplish by posting all that. Indeed, the mad scientists are out to get you. Here's an idea, maybe you should attempt to read Jamie Whyte's, "Crimes against Logic," or Karl Poppers, "Conjectures and Refutations" or Sagan's "Demon-Haunted World." They're a good start for people who need to understand how to compose thoughts and how to think properly. Julio, I'm sorry for having to play the role of big bad skeptic, but the elements of your argumentation aren't any different than what I've encountered with most religious people or believers in the paranormal. It's full of a lot of belief and fanciful desire but not any substance. It seems that you have trouble distinguishing between what's actually true and what you want to be true. Indeed, I am a skeptic (perhaps as hard-lined as Harris) but, like any scientifically-minded person, I can be swayed by evidence. Can you produce any?

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 6, 2009 12:38 AM PDT

[Nontheistdavid](#) says:

Julio's claim that atheism is a religion speaks volumes. If atheism is a religion then non stamp collecting is a hobby.

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 6, 2009 6:20 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 6, 2009 6:20 AM PDT

[Steve Thomas](#) says:

D,

Agreed, I do not understand why this is so hard to see. As I noted, he - like so many others - is a "feeler" not a "thinker." His kind tend to confuse the two; here's an example, "I have been hurt in the past by the excesses of this war of yours, by the writings of Stenger, and by the further twistings of it by unscrupulous internet debaters who dishonestly fought my ideas and cherished beliefs." Julio, this is the point of science, we post our findings and other smart people shoot holes in them.

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 8, 2009 2:11 PM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 8, 2009 2:20 PM PDT

[Wojciech Langer](#) says:

Steve Thomas: I am not saying Stenger gets his physics wrong. Just because part of what we know seems to be correct, does not mean that we should extrapolate it to all unknown. I will simply state, that IMO, Victor Stenger seems to be capitalizing on "god-science" books. Easy \$\$ for sure, but my respect for him is dwindling fast (I reviewed three of his books). He expressed his view quite good and clear in "Have Science Found God". But this should be enough. Now I am about to categorize him within the ranks of like Dawkins - writing and repeating endlessly the same message: we know ALL.

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 8, 2009 3:19 PM PDT

[Steve Thomas](#) says:

Langer, although it might seem, I really wasn't attacking you personally, but rather voicing my general frustration with the way these conversations tend to go. All this aside, allow me to ask you a question. Assuming your hypothesis is correct - that Stenger is cashing in on the "God-Science" wave - what bearing would this fact have on the accuracy of his claims? The way I see it, it simply would not. However, I think this particular book takes the entire argument to the next level, so to speak. More specifically, one of the last refuges for God appears to be in quantum mechanics, but Stenger showed us why this really can't be the case.

As far as repeating one's self, well, I too am guilty of that charge, for it seems that most believers readily expose their dearth of scientific and historical knowledge when they enter into the "great debate." I have listened to a lot of believers' counterarguments and I am thus compelled to ask myself, "Self, can this person really be this ignorant?" What seem to develop from these debates are the predictable and usual refutations for the age-old arguments pertaining to God....over and over and over again. This conversation never moves forward because most believers fail to understand the science, appeal to mystery (God works in mysterious ways), or claim that gaps in scientific knowledge prove God's existence. If believers were better educated (yes, a blanket statement and I know that every Christian isn't ignorant) then we wouldn't have to repeat ourselves.

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 10, 2009 7:02 AM PDT

Wojciech Langer says:

Steven: I do not have any issue with your comments and I agree with you as to "what bearing..?".

However I am losing my respect to even a good scientists/writers almost like being obsessed (Dawkins being so far the best example) who keep writing because "what men really want is NOT KNOWLEDGE, but certainty" (quote by Bertrand Russell). I do not like such writers on both sides. You want to write about religion and faith/spirituality? - do it, but not mix with science and vice versa.

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 11, 2009 9:43 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 11, 2009 11:38 AM PDT

**Steve Thomas** says:

Langer,

Yes, I am very familiar with the quote from Russell, but I do contend that you've taken it out of its original context. Nevertheless, I perhaps see where you're attempting to go with it. But, even though science - in its very distinctive way - is seeking certainty, it is a vastly different variety than what the religious mind seeks. Quite arguably, you're guilty of equivocation here. Through rigorous research and experimentation methods, science has delivered a very accurate - albeit imperfect - understanding of our world; an understanding which improves continuously. Can religion make such a claim? Conversely, religion is static and therefore mired in age-old superstitions, bigotry and palpable ignorance, and, as a corollary, neither has it delivered much useful information nor has it aided in the effort to reduce human suffering. And even when religion can claim that it does aid in reducing human suffering, it usually comes with a price (conversion).

This simple fact is what the so-called "New Atheists" (count me among them) point to; through its small-minded approach to medicine, human relations and politics (to name but a few), religion has actually increased human suffering and conflict, and this is why it's so important that we speak of it. So I do not see it as obsession, I see it as vital to our long-term survival. As Sam Harris pointed out in, "The End of Faith," it is likely that most

religious people would see a mushroom cloud over New York as positive; that Jesus is on his way. As he notes, this is hardly the stuff of sustainable public policy. On the other side, however, science can offer little solace for those seeking shelter from the machinations of existence, but it has improved vastly most aspects of life, medicine and, as I noted, it has greatly improved human understanding. Some might claim I'm being cliché, but, nevertheless, it is the light of science and reason that has illuminated the murky corners of superstition and human ignorance, yet so many people cling to religious belief and I'm perplexed as to why. Perhaps I, too, am guilty of the enlightenment fallacy.

---

In reply to an [earlier post](#) on Jun 11, 2009 10:44 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 11, 2009 11:14 AM PDT

Wojciech Langer says:

Thomas: here we go again into "what is religion and what is science and how bad is religion and how science can prove it" etc. Such discussions leads to nowhere. I am not going to be dragged into it. Enjoy your believes and enjoy Stenger's books (yawn). JFYI - there is another boring repetitious book by Dawkins to be soon on the market "The Greatest Show on Earth - The Evidence of Evolution" ("yawn" again).

I will rather stick to true popular science books. I do not need preaching and fundamentalism on both sides. Stenger and others like him are out of my list permanently. I have stopped enjoying his books after presumptuous and full of math off-falls that he himself probably does not understand: "The Comprehensive Cosmos". But, again if you want to explore more on Dawkins, read excellent "Darwinian Fairytales" (you may check my review) by Australian philosopher David Stove (he does not state that evolution is untrue, but adequately categorizes and worries about sanity of writers like Dawkins...and in my opinion Stenger). Frankly, I am tired of this discussion, so excuse me.

---

In reply to an [earlier post](#) on Jun 11, 2009 11:59 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 12, 2009 3:59 PM PDT

Steve Thomas says:

Langer,

I am not trying to drag you into anything, but, even if I was, the very fact that you're posting on Amazon would seem to imply that you've opened yourself up to discussing the matter. Quite frankly, I see a lot of reviewers on Amazon making grandiose claims regarding the accuracy of eminent scientists - that they do not understand math or their reasoning is flawed. But here's the catch, no one ever seems to support these assertions with evidence other than philosophical disagreements, and this simply is not evidence. Your defensiveness belies your reasoning.

If Stenger is wrong regarding his assertions, math or reasoning, then it seems fairly straightforward that other physicists or mathematicians would have picked up on his errors, but we do not see this, do we? Many of the theories he discusses have been confirmed by scientists the world over, but I suppose they're wrong too... What we have here are a plethora of a priori attacks by non-scientists claiming he's wrong. So we'll keep it specific then: please show me one error that Stenger has made. Show me why the math doesn't work - I bet you can't. Lastly, my definition of "religion" is simple and broad-based: it's any unfounded belief in any supernatural higher-power. As I keep saying to people, simply because something presently cannot be explained, doesn't give us the right to explain it with "god." As far as the definition of science, I shouldn't have to explain that one to you.

---

In reply to an [earlier post](#) on Jun 11, 2009 6:07 PM PDT

Steve Thomas says:

Also, I replied to your "Darwinian Fairytales" review, as well. Langer, how can one read so much science and yet not understand science?

[http://www.amazon.com/review/RO1MIG4WD0UXU/ref=cm\\_cd\\_NOREF?encoding=UTF8&cdPage=&newContentNum=2&cdMSG=addedToThread&newCo](http://www.amazon.com/review/RO1MIG4WD0UXU/ref=cm_cd_NOREF?encoding=UTF8&cdPage=&newContentNum=2&cdMSG=addedToThread&newCo)

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 12, 2009 6:27 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 12, 2009 9:00 AM PDT

[Wojciech Langer](#) says:

Thomas: I made the first comment, but starting endless discussion was not my intention. Now I actually regret having it done and now I waste my time trying to explain my position, but you do not simply get it. Check my review for "Has Science Found God?". I liked this book - maybe this will help you to understand what I want to convey. As for a number of books and understanding of science - how many books have you read? Not that many looking at your reviews. You did not read anything by Dawkins, not to mention Stenger, and another hint... Hitchens ("God is not Great"). You have the whole list of similar books. I strongly recommend them for you. These are books supposedly about science, but titles contain word "god". Catchy, is not it? For those who want to be certain, just IN CASE. Anyway, I may be wrong off course (as to your readings), however what I understand about science or not is not for you to judge.

---

In reply to [an earlier post](#) on Jun 12, 2009 9:26 AM PDT  
Last edited by the author on Jun 12, 2009 4:03 PM PDT

[Steve Thomas](#) says:

Langer,

What was your intention then? Was it merely to reinforce your world view? How cowardly that you merely want to post an opinion but when someone calls you on it, you simply flee or claim that you don't want protracted debate. Here's an idea, then don't respond. How easy you and other "believers" make it for yourselves. Again, when the hokum you post is challenged, we "evil atheists" are told we don't get it, are called angry or told that we're not open-minded, pure humbug. You and your ilk merely moan and complain about the findings of science, but it is clear to me by reading the majority of these reviews and rebuttals - including yours - that few people actually appear to understand the fundamentals of science; especially as it pertains to evolution. Take for example, your raving review of "Darwinian Fairytales," plain and simple, the book and its author are a joke! He claims to have an inescapable dilemma but the dilemma is built upon his misunderstanding and ignorance; as I pointed out in my rebuttal to you, it's not a dilemma at all, it's merely his folly.

You then asked me the loaded question inquiring as to how many books I've read. To tell you the truth, I don't know. I can guess, I am 43 and have been reading very heavily since I was approximately 11, so I would estimate about a gazillion books. Somehow you seem to equate the number of reviews with the number of books one reads, but, quite obviously, I do not review much and quite obviously your assertion is a rather dubious one, yes? Indeed, I have read all of Dawkins, Hitchens, Dennett, Harris, Diamond, Hawking, etc. etc., the list goes on. I have even read some of the books you reviewed: "Collapse" and "The Shock Doctrine" both come to mind, and it is pleasing to see that we do have some commonalities. I thoroughly enjoyed both books I have even read the Bible, Book of Mormon, and was schooled at a Catholic University, go "figger" (always been atheist).

So, is my "pedigree" improved by this list? Of course not, they're mere words and unproven claims posted on the internet and therefore aren't proof of anything. And sorry, you're wrong; your understanding of science is for me (and others) to judge. Like I've told other reviewers, this is the stuff of science (and also of posting on the internet); when we post or publish our ideas, other smart people get to shoot holes in them. We're successful when our ideas are bullet proof, so to speak. I have yet to read one review that actually refutes the Theory of Evolution, but I have read a lot of whining and moaning and poor understanding of science. If it wasn't tragic, it'd almost be humorous, but so many "believers" reject evolution because they simply don't like the science, yet they will believe wholeheartedly all unfounded notions such as God, cosmic consciousness or other such gobbledygook. They embrace science when it suits them. Cowards they are!

Steve Thomas says:

Langer,

I post this portion of your review of "The God Theory" only to show that you're a "believer," and not really open to science and the scientific method:

"I just love this book, every sentence from it. It directly opposes widely hold views that "science cannot find God, therefore God does not exists". We are God's experience, we are created to search and learn, therefore above mentioned dogma is rather invalid (according to the author). And it is hard to disagree after reading "God Theory". Despite of many claims that quantum physics is unconscious, Dr. Haisch states otherwise."

([http://www.amazon.com/review/R12BSYK5Z8R2O0/ref=cm\\_aya\\_cmt?ie=UTF8&ASIN=1578633745#wasThisHelpful](http://www.amazon.com/review/R12BSYK5Z8R2O0/ref=cm_aya_cmt?ie=UTF8&ASIN=1578633745#wasThisHelpful))

Your very first sentence is why I claim that you do not understand science, and your reasoning and prose are erroneous, as well. In effect, what your sentence implies is the theologian's idiom, "Absence of evidence, isn't evidence of absence." If so, you cannot be serious, can you? Herein lays the difference between science and theology. A scientist will simply claim, "There isn't any evidence to support the claim that God exists, or, perhaps, the bulk of evidence suggests that there probably isn't a God." However, a theologian will state, "You haven't proven that God doesn't exist, therefore, until you do, God exists." As such, the conclusion is embedded into the hypothesis, and this is called self-referring logic (a well-known fallacy).

As I keep saying, science isn't a religion, a dogma, a cult or a following; it's merely our best and most accurate method for understanding our world. This isn't science, it is anti-science. You're willing to believe such drivel as, "We are God's experience, we are created to search and learn, therefore above mentioned dogma is rather invalid (according to the author). And it is hard to disagree after reading "God Theory". Talking about building upon a false foundation, there isn't any evidence (aside from anecdotal) that God exists, and now you're telling us that, "We are God's experience...?" Seriously, Langer, I am forced to tell you what I've said to so many others, you're not a thinker, you're a "feeler." And now I understand why you have posted here on Stenger's, "Quantum Gods." You're a believer in the new-age concept of cosmic consciousness, aren't you?

Wojciech Langer says:

It is true that my views about faith have been altered since some time. You can categorize me any way you want. But ..let me tell you this: only cows do not change opinions.

Steve Thomas says:

Langer,

You are absolutely correct in your assertion. I, among countless others, have always contended that this is science's greatest strength; that it is peer-reviewed and self-correcting. In light of new information and evidence, old theories are updated or even discarded. If your opinions have changed (hopefully for the better) then wonderful. I, too, have held many opinions regarding various things that have turned out to be simply incorrect, and it would have been completely ridiculous and illogical for me to have not altered my opinion. This is why I continuously speak of evidence. Indeed, this isn't Fox News where the opinion that changing one's mind is a weakness. Indeed, it's entirely the other way around...

Julio C. S. Barros says:

Disgracefully enough (to Stenger's fans :-) ), my copy has arrived...  
So far, I am on page 54 and I already have a list of more than 10 problems to comment  
on... I am beginning to think that I will have to give Stenger less than zero stars.

Best Wishes,  
Julio

[In reply to your post](#) on Jun 23, 2009 7:11 AM PDT

Wojciech Langer says:

Just wonder Julio, why did you wish to waste your hard earned \$\$ for this book.

---

[Your post, in reply to an earlier post](#) on Jun 24, 2009 2:59 PM PDT  
Last edited by you on Jun 24, 2009 3:01 PM PDT

Julio C. S. Barros says:

Hi Langer,

You said: "Just wonder Julio, why did you wish to waste your hard earned \$\$ for this book."

Now that I have finally read the book I can reply to these comments, including those from Steve. There is always the possibility that I am wrong and Stenger (and others) right. In this book he allegedly went after the quantum gurus. This is different from the Judeo-Christian-Islamic guys (which was the subject of his previous book). I really think quantum mechanics DOES NOT back up the position of these gurus. But I wanted to see what Stenger

had to say, and to my utter surprise I found in what Stenger said a place where God might act using quantum mechanics. That was simply unthinkable for me before... And I did point out that it, in a way, is a sign of honesty from Stenger. So the money was well spent. We can only criticize (and see the vices AND the virtues!) the things we know (contrary to what Stenger himself sometimes does...). I have painstakingly come to know Stenger (as a science writer) pretty well.

Best Wishes,  
Julio

-

---

Your post: Jun 24, 2009 3:02 PM PDT

Julio C. S. Barros says:

Hi steve, I will make brief comments about your loooonnnng comments in the comments section of my review.

Best,  
Julio