

*Morten Tolboll*

## Richard Dawkins (The Matrix Dictionary)

Richard Dawkins is the atheistic answer to Ken Wilber. Both are biologists who want to be philosophers instead of the philosophers. Both are in love with Charles Darwin and his theory of evolution. Both want their own discipline to be the answer to all the riddles of the universe. And both therefore ends in two versions of reductionism (Social Darwinism).

See my article [A Critique of Richard Dawkins and the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry \(CSI\)](#)

My **inquiry** (yes let's use that word with emphasis) in this article is: why is it that Richard Dawkins is so praised in the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry - (Center for Inquiry (CFI) and Richard Dawkins Foundation are now formally merged) - where the main virtues (a defense of science, rationality and reasoning) only can be described as the precise opposite of, what I in this article will show, is Dawkins'? I will show that it is because the underlying goal is ideology and neither science nor philosophy. Religious pseudoscience and atheistic pseudoscience are two sides of the same Matrix coin in The Matrix Conspiracy valuta. My conclusion is that CSI in short is a right-wing conservative, so-called "skeptical" atheist movement. In the following I will illustrate this by investigate both sides of the coin, since New Age is part of the widely spread popular culture, which actually adopts a lot of atheistic pseudoscience.

There is a lot of good rational thinking among skeptics generally, and I think the skeptics community largely is doing a good job (and I certainly have been inspired by it), but if you for example have a look at the Skeptical Inquirer magazine, it can be tiresome to hear the same analyses of the same topics again and again, as for example Creationism. Creationism is after all a belief held only by a very limited group of people. And if those analyses again are being limited to a very few people within creationism, the whole thing is getting a bit foolish. Take for example the 8 pages long article *Fire-breathing Dinosaurs* in the July/August issue 2017 ([read more here](#)).

It is a well researched and all through scientific article, that shows why dinosaurs can't breathe fire, and that the creationist idea of fire-breathing dinosaurs therefore is an example of pseudoscience. But what's the point in using so much energy on such a

limited topic? (it seems like the magazine is desperately in need of material in order to have enough content for the next issue).

If the skeptic community should be taken seriously they should also deal with the pseudoscience within reductionism, and all the problems of man, society and nature. But then again, that's what philosophers are doing.

*Related:*

[The Matrix Dictionary](#)

*All articles and books referred to are available in free PDF Versions. Links can be found on my blog: [www.MortenTolboll.blogspot.com](http://www.MortenTolboll.blogspot.com)*

Copyright © 2017 by Morten Tolboll.

Terms of use:

[http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.en\\_US](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.en_US)