

UNITED WISDOM

The Great Moment: Science and Mystical Comparisons

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W47 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Great Moment: Science and Mystical Comparisons

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

Inner transformation · An archival comparative essay

Something unexpected has happened in recent decades, the authors suggest. Physicists, neuroscientists, and cosmologists have begun to discuss questions that a century earlier were more closely associated with mystics, Indian philosophers, and Sufi poets. Two maps of the world can sometimes be placed beside one another so that their outlines appear to overlap. This essay surveys those proposed intersections. Resemblance, however, is not proof that the maps describe the same thing.

The Great Moment

For centuries, science and mysticism seemed to occupy different rooms of one house, avoiding each other in the corridor. Science concerned what could be measured, repeated, and published; mysticism, what could be experienced but was difficult to articulate. Facts belonged on one side, meanings and states on the other.

The article sees that line becoming less clear in the twentieth century. Reality as described by precise methods departed from the image of Newtonian billiard balls. The authors find it closer in some respects to images in the Upanishads, Ibn ʿArabī, Nicholas of Cusa, the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*, and Christian mysticism.

Consider the old image: separate parts interacting under strict laws, space as an empty container, time as an evenly flowing river. Newtonian mechanics was extraordinarily productive, enabling orbital calculation and classical engineering. The archive says it “collapsed” under experimental evidence in the early twentieth century. More precisely, its domain was limited by later theories; it remains useful within those limits.

The “great moment” is the essay's name for two maps appearing to show some of the same rivers and mountains in different symbols. What follows preserves the proposed comparisons while distinguishing experiments, theoretical models, philosophical positions, and metaphor.

I. Quantum Nonlocality: What the Experiments Establish

The authors consider quantum entanglement their strongest comparison.

They first recall religious images of connectedness: Indra's net, each jewel reflecting all others (Wikipedia, “Indra's Net”); Ibn ʿArabī's unity of being (Ibn Arabi Society, “Oneness of Being”); and Advaita's account of Brahman and apparent separation (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, “Śaṅkara”).

The source argues that these no longer seem merely poetic once physics calls certain assumptions of separability into question. That inference is the essay's interpretation; the experiments do not validate those religious systems.

John Bell formulated an inequality in 1964 that made certain local hidden-variable accounts experimentally testable. The archive simplifies this into a choice between independently existing particles and particles “instantaneously reacting” across distance (Mapping Ignorance, “Bell's Theorem”). That wording must not be mistaken for an ability to send information faster than light.

The essay follows experiments from Clauser in 1972 through Aspect and Zeilinger and the loophole-free tests of 2015, then the 2022 Nobel Prize in Physics. It cites a 2023 superconducting-circuit experiment in *Nature* reporting a Bell-inequality violation with a probability bound of p < 10^-108 under the tested null assumptions. The numerical claim is inherited and not newly checked here. It is not the probability that all possible alternative accounts of reality are false.

The authors read these results as a challenge to a world made entirely of independently specified local things. They cite a PNAS profile of Aspect, Clauser, and Zeilinger for a more careful formulation concerning locality in Bell's sense, then contrast it with the looser assertion that the universe is one indivisible whole.

The section ends by suggesting that Indra's net has become more than metaphor. That is the article's rhetorical conclusion. Bell tests establish constraints on physical models; they do not establish universal spiritual interconnection.

II. The Holographic Principle: Source and Projection

Mystical traditions often speak of manifestation, emanation, or projection from a deeper reality. The essay names Plotinus's One, Cusa's coincidence of opposites, Shankara's māyā, and Kabbalistic tzimtzum and the sefirot as distinct versions of this motif.

It then turns to Juan Maldacena's 1997 AdS/CFT correspondence, a major mathematical realization of holographic ideas (Wikipedia, “Holographic Principle”). The archive describes a gravitational interior and a lower-dimensional boundary theory as equivalent, using a three-dimensional interior and two-dimensional boundary for illustration. This is not a universal

dimensional statement about every AdS/CFT model, nor a demonstrated description of our observable universe.

The source attributes to Leonard Susskind the image of ordinary three-dimensional reality as a hologram encoded on a distant surface. It elaborates with a bubble: events inside a volume might be represented on its boundary. Planets, galaxies, and human history are used as imaginative examples, not experimentally established holographic encodings.

The essay invokes emergent spacetime and a “universe in a bottle” model, citing Quanta's “How Our Universe Could Emerge as a Hologram.” Its philosophical parallel is visible reality arising from a more fundamental description: one source, multiple projections. The fact that mathematical dualities and religious emanation both admit such language does not make their claims identical.

III. Consciousness as a Fundamental Feature

The article expressly calls this its most controversial and exciting comparison.

In Advaita, Brahman is described as *sat-cit-ānanda*, being, consciousness, and bliss, rather than consciousness being merely a property of neurons. The source also gives a broad account of Mahayana as linking reality and awareness. That generalization does not cover all Buddhist philosophical positions.

Against familiar brain-produces-mind accounts, the essay introduces panpsychism and Integrated Information Theory, IIT, as contemporary discussions that resemble older questions.

Panpsychism treats mentality as fundamental and widespread in nature. The archive cites the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy and describes it as an active position in analytic philosophy, situated between forms of physicalism and dualism. Its academic discussion does not establish it as true.

Giulio Tononi's IIT is introduced as relating consciousness to a system's integrated causal structure, represented through Φ. The source simplifies this as any system with sufficiently integrated information having subjective experience (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy; Wikipedia). It links Tononi and Christof Koch with panpsychist implications and the possibility of consciousness beyond brains (MIT Press Reader, “Is Consciousness Everywhere?”). The theory, its mathematical formulation, and those implications are contested; ordinary complexity is not automatically evidence of experience.

The archive cites a 2013 *WIRED* discussion with Koch and a 2026 EurekAlert item, presenting him as arguing that existing physicalist descriptions leave questions about subjective experience and that idealist or panpsychist frameworks deserve reconsideration. His

professional role and the exact 2026 statement are inherited details, not freshly verified current facts.

The authors find significance in serious discussion of consciousness as fundamental rather than exclusively derivative. The discussion itself is real as a philosophical topic; it does not settle the metaphysical question.

IV. Psychedelics and Neurotheology: Studying Mystical-Type Experience

The essay declares that mystical experience has become measurable, and means that literally: aspects of reports and their correlates can be studied.

It cites Roland Griffiths and colleagues' controlled psilocybin work at Johns Hopkins beginning in 2006. The archive describes the foundational paper as finding experiences strongly resembling spontaneous mystical reports, with participants later ranking some among their life's most meaningful events, alongside major family experiences (Griffiths et al., 2006).

The authors interpret this as making experiences of unity, sacredness, and self-transcendence reproducible subjects of research rather than merely private claims. The existence of reports and measurable correlates does not establish their metaphysical interpretation, and a controlled study does not guarantee an outcome for every participant.

The source then cites a 2022 Johns Hopkins Medicine report associating stronger psychedelic mystical-type experiences with increased attribution of consciousness to animals, plants, and inanimate things. It calls this a controlled study and interprets the change as movement toward panpsychism. The design has not been newly verified here, and the archive's “controlled” label must not be assumed accurate. A change in participants' beliefs is not evidence that those beliefs are true.

In parallel, the essay introduces neurotheology and Andrew Newberg's SPECT studies of Buddhist meditation and Franciscan prayer. It reports decreased parietal activity in one setting and increased frontal and language-related activity in another, relating these to altered boundaries and inward dialogue with God (Newberg, “Research”). These regional summaries are inherited and should not be treated as simple one-region explanations of complex experience.

The source cites Newberg as saying that a biological correlate need not negate a spiritual component (Frontiers in Psychology). Equally, a correlate does not prove such a component. The useful boundary is that experiences can be studied as human phenomena without deciding their ultimate religious meaning. This section is historical research discussion, not advice to use psychedelics.

V. The Noosphere and the Internet

In the mid-twentieth century, the Jesuit paleontologist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin described successive spheres of Earth: geosphere, biosphere, and noosphere, a sphere of collective thought. Radio, television, and computing machines could help connect minds into what he imagined as a "brain of brains," moving toward the Omega Point of his theology (Teilhard.com, "The Noosphere").

The internet did not yet exist in its later form. The archive quotes *The Formation of the Noösphere*:

> *"No one can deny that a network (a world network) of economic and psychic affiliations is being woven at an ever accelerating speed which envelops and constantly penetrates more deeply within each of us."*

The essay cites Human Energy for the view that Teilhard broadly anticipated the internet. It celebrates a spiritual image of collective thought appearing to acquire an engineered counterpart. That is a retrospective comparison, not proof of the Omega Point or of the network possessing a single consciousness.

VI. Cosmic Web and Neural Network: A Striking Resemblance

The theme of correspondence across scale is old: "as above, so below" in Hermetic tradition, patterns within Kabbalistic symbolism, and the human being as microcosm in Renaissance thought.

The essay connects this with a 2020 quantitative comparison by astrophysicist Franco Vazza and neurosurgeon Alberto Feletti. Their study examined aspects of the cosmic web and neural tissue across an enormous difference in scale, described in the archive as twenty-seven orders of magnitude. It reports similarities in statistical measures such as density patterns, connectivity, power spectra, and an estimate interpreted as storage capacity (Frontiers in Physics; University of Bologna).

The authors are presented as cautiously discussing common principles by which complex networks can organize despite different underlying processes. The essay also cites *Nautilus* for the striking formulation that the cosmic web resembles a brain more than the inside of a single galaxy.

The archive broadens this into a claim that the same patterns repeat throughout reality and that an old mystical intuition has become testable. The narrower lesson is a comparison of selected structural measures. Similar network statistics do not demonstrate that the universe is a brain, stores humanlike memories, or is conscious.

VII. Biocentrism and the World in the Observer

The article links Shankara, Berkeley, Schopenhauer, and Heidegger through the question of how the world we know relates to the knowing subject. Their positions differ substantially; this is the essay's chosen common theme.

In 2007, Robert Lanza proposed biocentrism, described here as a prominent but controversial thesis making life and consciousness fundamental to the universe rather than merely its products. The archive gives its slogan as “Life creates the universe, not the universe life” (Robert Lanza, “Biocentrism”).

It acknowledges criticism of imprecise formulations and unsupported leaps from quantum physics to idealism (Sam Woolfe's critique). The authors nevertheless find its public discussion by a medical scientist significant as a sign that an old philosophical question has entered popular science. Professional standing and circulation do not establish the hypothesis.

The essay invokes a statement attributed to Werner Heisenberg: the smallest constituents cannot be understood as independently existing objects in precisely the ordinary sense of rocks or trees. It connects that claim with continuing debates about quantum interpretation (Science and Nonduality, “Do Quantum Phenomena Require Conscious Observers?”).

Crucially, the source itself adds a limit: the observer effect in a double-slit experiment is not proof that consciousness literally creates reality. Physical interaction and acquisition of which-path information can account for lost interference; a conscious spectator is not required for that point. The archive cites Larry Gottlieb on the observer effect. Philosophical questions about observation remain open, but the experiment does not settle them in favor of idealism.

VIII. Simulation: A Secular Comparison with Māyā

The essay places Advaita's māyā, Plato's cave, and Zhuangzi's butterfly dream beside modern simulation arguments. In each, what appears need not be the final account of what exists. Their specific claims remain different.

Nick Bostrom's 2003 argument in *The Philosophical Quarterly* is presented as a disjunction: humanity may not reach a posthuman stage, posthuman civilizations may not run many ancestor simulations, or simulated observers may vastly outnumber original ones. The archive paraphrases the last branch as making our own simulated status overwhelmingly likely. The argument depends on its assumptions and does not show that we actually inhabit a simulation.

David Chalmers's *Reality+* (2022) adds another distinction: virtual reality can be real in its own right. A simulated basis need not make experiences and relationships unreal.

The authors read these as secular, technological forms of an older question about a deeper layer beneath appearances. “Source code,” “source,” or “more fundamental reality” provide new vocabulary. This is an analogy among questions, not a finding that māyā and computer simulation are the same or that hidden code has been discovered.

IX. Quantum Vacuum and Images of Emptiness

The source compares Buddhist emptiness, Daoist language, and Kabbalistic *ayin* with an image of fullness within apparent emptiness. These traditions do not all mean a generative physical substance by “emptiness.”

It then describes the quantum vacuum as a lowest-energy state of fields and uses the familiar language of virtual particles appearing and disappearing. The Casimir effect and Lamb shift are cited as examples of nontrivial quantum-field behavior, through an inherited Frontiers in Human Neuroscience reference concerning zero-point fields.

The archive presents vacuum energy and field structure as though they vindicate mystical emptiness: not mere absence, but a ground of manifestation. That conclusion goes beyond the comparison. Virtual particles are not a simple literal account of tiny objects constantly materializing, and Buddhist śūnyatā, Dao, and a quantum vacuum belong to distinct conceptual frameworks. The source's metaphor is preserved; scientific identity is not established.

What to Do with These Comparisons

The authors believe these intersections restore intellectual dignity to mystical language. After an era in which rational and spiritual thought often seemed incompatible, structural parallels can invite a more serious conversation.

The archive explicitly adds an essential qualification: these parallels do not verify spiritual traditions. Science has not thereby confirmed a soul, certified God, or removed the need for disciplined experience, meditation, prayer, or textual study. That qualification remains central to the adaptation.

The essay nevertheless offers a sweeping composite portrait: one interconnected world, emerging from deeper structures, permeated by information, related to consciousness, displaying repeated patterns, and sometimes experienced as unity. It says this could sound either like the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* or like a summary of recent scientific journals. The composite mixes established findings, disputed theories, speculative extensions, and religious imagery. It must not be treated as a single scientific conclusion.

That perceived convergence is the authors' “great moment.” Maps drawn from different directions seem to share stretches of coastline. Keeping them side by side becomes an invitation to think, rather than an instruction to collapse their differences.

The manifesto's underlying conviction is that if the maps truly coincide, one territory lies beneath them: one source, many languages; one crystal, scientific, mystical, poetic, and personal facets. Whether particular maps coincide is precisely what careful comparison must still establish. The essay closes with hope that people might argue less about words and look more attentively toward what the words indicate.

Key Quotation

> *“The idea of an objective real world whose smallest parts exist objectively in the same sense as stones or trees, independently of whether or not we observe them, is impossible.”*
>
> *— Attributed in the archive to Werner Heisenberg (1958); translated from the supplied Russian wording and not newly authenticated.*

Connections with Other Traditions

Advaita Vedanta: Brahman and māyā. Mahayana Buddhism: Indra's net, emptiness, and dependent arising. Ibn ʿArabī's Sufism: unity of being. Nicholas of Cusa and Christian mysticism: coincidence of opposites; Plotinus and the One, placed alongside them in the archive. Kabbalah: Ein Sof, tzimtzum, and the sefirot. Daoism: Dao, wuwei, and emptiness. Hermetic correspondence, perennialism in Huxley and Schuon, and Teilhard's noosphere and Omega Point. These are selected comparisons, not a consensus among traditions.

Sources Listed in the Archive

• Nobel Prize in Physics 2022: Aspect, Clauser, Zeilinger, entangled photons and Bell inequalities.

• *Nature* (2023), “Loophole-free Bell inequality violation with superconducting circuits.”

• “Loophole-free Bell tests and the philosophy of physics,” arXiv.

• Wikipedia, “Holographic Principle,” AdS/CFT and Maldacena.

• Quanta Magazine, “How Our Universe Could Emerge as a Hologram.”

• Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, “Panpsychism.”

• Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, “Integrated Information Theory of Consciousness.”

• MIT Press Reader, “Is Consciousness Everywhere?” concerning Christof Koch.

• *WIRED*, Christof Koch on panpsychism (2013).

• EurekAlert, Koch on the limits of materialism (2026), as dated in the archive.

• Griffiths and colleagues (2006), “Psilocybin can occasion mystical-type experiences,” PubMed.

• Johns Hopkins Medicine, psychedelics and consciousness attribution (2022).

• Andrew Newberg, neurotheology research.

• Frontiers in Psychology, neuroscientific study of spiritual practices.

• Teilhard de Chardin, “The Noosphere,” Part I.

• Teilhard de Chardin, *The Formation of the Noösphere*.

• Human Energy, “What Is the Noosphere?” and whether Teilhard anticipated the internet.

• Frontiers in Physics, Vazza and Feletti, neuronal networks and the cosmic web.

• *Nautilus*, “The Strange Similarity of Neuron and Galaxy Networks.”

• Robert Lanza, biocentrism.

• Nick Bostrom, “Are You Living in a Computer Simulation?” *The Philosophical Quarterly* (2003).

• Wikipedia, “Simulation Hypothesis.”

• Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, zero-point field and an electromagnetic theory of consciousness.

• Wikipedia, “Indra's Net.”

• Ibn Arabi Society, “Oneness of Being.”

• Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, “Śaṅkara.”

• Wikipedia, “Unity of Opposites.”

Tags

Science and mysticism, quantum nonlocality, holographic principle, panpsychism, IIT, neurotheology, psychedelics, noosphere, simulation, biocentrism, perennialism, United Wisdom, unity manifesto.

Cover Concept Preserved from the Archive

A dark background with a crystal or sphere refracting light into many rays. A mathematical formula on one side, Arabic calligraphy or a Sanskrit sign on the other. Below, two almost-touching fingers recall Michelangelo's Adam and God, one organic and the other a neural-network lattice. Caption: “Beyond the bridge between maps lies one territory.” This is an editorial design concept, not evidence of scientific equivalence.

About the Authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, comparisons among traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding operate between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.

Archival editorial note. This adaptation retains every comparison in the original while explicitly separating evidence from interpretation. Bell tests do not permit faster-than-light messaging or verify spiritual unity. AdS/CFT is not an experimentally established holographic account of our cosmos. IIT, panpsychism, biocentrism, and simulation arguments have different and contested statuses. Neural and experiential correlations do not prove metaphysical beliefs. Network resemblance is not evidence that the universe thinks; quantum vacuum is not Buddhist emptiness. The source's 2022 study-design description, 2023 significance figure, 2026 Koch attribution, and quotation wording remain unverified. No fresh scientific or clinical review was performed.

References Inherited from the Archive

These links preserve the archive’s reference record; their contents were not newly checked for this translation.

- PDF-L001 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L002 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L003 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L004 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L005 — original PDF page 3

- PDF-L006 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L007 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L008 — original PDF page 4
- PDF-L009 — original PDF page 4
- PDF-L010 — original PDF page 4
- PDF-L011 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L012 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L013 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L014 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L015 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L016 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L017 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L018 — original PDF page 6
- PDF-L019 — original PDF page 6
- PDF-L020 — original PDF page 6
- PDF-L021 — original PDF page 6
- PDF-L022 — original PDF page 7
- PDF-L023 — original PDF page 7
- PDF-L024 — original PDF page 7
- PDF-L025 — original PDF page 7
- PDF-L026 — original PDF page 7
- PDF-L027 — original PDF page 8
- PDF-L028 — original PDF page 8
- PDF-L029 — original PDF page 8
- PDF-L030 — original PDF page 8
- PDF-L031 — original PDF page 9
- PDF-L032 — original PDF page 9

- PDF-L033 — original PDF page 9
- PDF-L034 — original PDF page 11
- PDF-L035 — original PDF page 12
- PDF-L036 — original PDF page 12