



## ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 04 No. 02. Oct-Dec 2025. Page#.2319-2328

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17833508>

## Neuro-Spirituality and the Universal Consciousness Field: Reframing the Brain as Receiver, Transmitter, and Filter

Umar Wyne

M.Phil. in Philosophy with Gold Medal/Independent Researcher, Lahore

[Wyneumar@gmail.com](mailto:Wyneumar@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*Most arguments about spirituality still transport between two opposites: either purely religious language that depends on faith and doctrine, or purely materialistic language that tries to reduce everything to brain chemistry. This paper proposes a third way, which I call Neuro-Spirituality. It treats spirituality as a real dimension of human consciousness that can be studied through neuroscience, psychology, quantum biology, and philosophy of mind without getting trapped in dogma. The premise is that the human brain does not simply “produce” consciousness like a machine that outputs a signal, instead, the brain functions as a receiver, transmitter, and filter of a broader Universal Consciousness Field—a non-local field of information and awareness. This idea has old philosophical echoes in concepts like Purusha in Samkhya, Noor-e-Muhammad in some Islamic metaphysics, and more recent scientific speculation in the work of James, Jung, Bohm, Penrose, Newberg, and others.[1–7] But here I try to pull it together in a more systematic and testable way. Methodologically, the paper is a conceptual and integrative study that reviews key literature from neuroscience, quantum physics, genetics, epigenetics, anthropology of religion, and consciousness research which then builds a structured model of Neuro-Spirituality. The results are presented as a theoretical framework and a practical methodology that can later be tested empirically in mental health, creativity, and personal transformation work. The aim is not to substantiate any religious claim or deny spiritual experience but to reframe spirituality as a natural—though still mysterious—expression of human participation in a Universal Consciousness Field.*

**Keywords:** *Neuro-Spirituality; Universal Consciousness Field; brain as receiver; consciousness; quantum biology; non-religious spirituality.*

### Introduction

For an elongated time, whenever people used the word “spiritual,” it was automatically assumed that the whole discussion is related to God, religion, rituals, sacred books, and moral guidance. Spirituality became so tightly tied with religious institutions that many people simply cannot imagine it outside of that frame. On the opposite side, modern scientific culture reacted in its own way and tried to explain every spiritual feeling through neurons, neurotransmitters, hormonal changes, childhood conditioning, or psychological illusion. Both sides—religious and scientific—got stuck in their own extremes. And in this fight, an important middle ground more or less disappeared from serious discussion.

This paper tries to work exactly in that neglected space.

I use the term Neuro-Spirituality as an innovative framework that attempts to bring together a wider group of science and philosophy without forcing them into a restricted definition. My aim is not to “prove” religion or science wrong instead, I want to show that spirituality can be seen as a function of consciousness that goes beyond the usual boundaries we have been

using. It does not belong 100% to religion, and it is not only the side-effect of some brain chemicals either. It can be both biological and non-biological at the same time, because consciousness itself may not be fully limited to individual brains.

To explore this, Neuro-Spirituality brings together four major knowledge streams:

1. **Neuroscience and neurobiology** – explains how the brain, neural pathways, and information-processing systems work inside the human body.
2. **Quantum physics and quantum biology** – shows how information and probability may behave at micro-levels, raising the possibility of non-local effects in living organisms.[5–8]
3. **Genetics and epigenetics** – explains how information is stored, transferred, edited, and activated across generations.
4. **Phenomenology and philosophy of mind** – studies how experience appears, how consciousness feels from inside, and how meaning is formed.[3,4,9]

Rather than limiting spirituality to a religious identity or brain state, I treat it as a mode of consciousness—something that happens when the mind becomes aware of a wider field of intelligence, connection, or insight. This can be personal or non-personal. It can appear in meditation, silence, creativity, intuition, or even during sudden moments of clarity where the mind feels “connected” to something more than itself.

The central hypothesis of this whole paper is to express difficult in terms of implications: the brain is not just producing consciousness; the brain is receiving, transmitting, filtering, and shaping a wider Universal Consciousness Field.[1,2]

This field is non-local. It can be imagined like a “consciousness cloud” or a universal informational layer where minds tune in just the way our digital devices connect to remote servers. The brain is being the interface; the translator is a significant fragment—but it is not the source of consciousness itself. William James suggested long ago that the brain might not be a factory of consciousness but a filter that allows only a small part of a bigger reality to pass through. Carl Jung’s idea of the collective unconscious also points toward a shared field of meaning that is not restricted to one’s mind. David Bohm’s implicate order describes a universe where information is already enfolded in deeper layers of reality. Penrose and Hameroff’s Orch-OR theory further opened the possibility that quantum processes in microtubules may relate to consciousness in a non-classical way.[5,7]

provocatively, if we go far back into human thought, we find similar intuitions—not in scientific language, but in metaphysical or symbolic language.

In ancient Samkhya philosophy, Purusha is described as pure, unchanging consciousness, while Prakriti is the changing material universe. Purusha was not the property of any god—it was a universal field in which all individuals participate.[10] In some Islamic metaphysical traditions, the idea of Noor-e-Muhammad appears as a kind of first light or primordial consciousness, again pointing to something universal and pre-material. These ideas are not taken here as evidence; they are simply reminders that humans have, across different cultures, felt that consciousness is not a closed box but something more expanded.

Just because religions stirred such ideas, it does not necessarily mean that spirituality must remain religious. This paper tries to solve this very issue because religious spirituality often confuses genuine inner experience with dogma, mythology, and inherited symbols, which results in the concepts becoming blurry. Many spiritual traditions attempted to explain consciousness through angels, spirits, or supernatural forces because they didn’t have the scientific vocabulary accessible today. Spiritual experience itself—intuition, clarity, sudden

insight, compassion, or deep presence—does not need any supernatural explanation. It can be understood as the brain opening, even briefly, to a non-local consciousness field.

Another limitation in mainstream scientific thinking is that it frequently assumes that consciousness must come out of the brain the way light comes out of a bulb though this “production theory” has never been fully proven. Even today, nobody can explain how neurons firing in the brain suddenly produce subjective experience—the so-called “hard problem of consciousness.”[9] If we accept that the brain may be a receiver and transmitter, and not the original source, then both spiritual experience and scientific mystery become easier to align.

This paper is therefore built on three major questions:

Can spirituality be understood as conscious participation in a Universal Consciousness Field rather than only a religious tradition?

Can the brain’s intuitive and mystical experiences be explained as information-interaction with that field instead of hallucination or cultural conditioning?

And can we build a Neuro-Spiritual Methodology that can help in mental health, psychological growth, performance improvement, and spiritual development in a practical, disciplined way?

To answer these, the paper moves in four directions.

First, it clarifies the difference between religious spirituality and non-religious spirituality, and why the second one is necessary for a scientific future. Second, it brings neuroscience, quantum physics, genetics, and philosophy of mind together to explore how consciousness works. Third, it proposes a full model of Neuro-Spirituality, explaining how the brain interacts with the Universal Consciousness Field. And finally, it suggests a practical methodology for application in therapy, personal development, intuitive training, and long-term human growth. This approach is not presented here as a final truth. It is presented as a needed step toward a more open, flexible, and future-oriented understanding of human consciousness—one that does not get trapped either in rigid religion or rigid materialism.

### **1.1 Problem Statement**

There is an aberration in the modern era. On one side, religious spirituality is still mostly explained with stories, miracles, and authority of tradition.[1] On the other side, modern neuroscience often explains everything as neurons firing and chemicals moving.[11] For a person like me, working with real people, mental health, and inner transformation, both extremes feel incomplete. Many people have deep inner experiences, intuition, dreams, sudden clarity, or even what they call “spiritual openings,” but they don’t fit neatly into religious boxes, and they also don’t disappear just because we say “it is only the brain.”

Therefore, the main problem is: we do not have a clear, scientifically grounded framework that takes spiritual-type experiences seriously, without turning them into theology, and without killing them inside reductionist language. Neuro-Spirituality and the Universal Consciousness Field are my attempt to fill that gap.

### **1.2 Objectives of the Study**

This study has three main objectives:

1. To reframe spirituality as a scientific and experiential engagement with a Universal Consciousness Field, not only a religious category.[2–4]
2. To argue that the human brain works as a receiver, transmitter, and filter of that field.[2,5]
3. To propose a Neuro-Spiritual methodology that can later be tested in mental health, creativity, and personal transformation contexts.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Religious spirituality and its limits**

Erstwhile, spirituality has been securely bound to religion. In the Abrahamic traditions, it is usually defined around relationship with God, obedience, prayer, and moral transformation.[1] Karen Armstrong traces how the idea of God evolved from tribal deities into more abstract monotheistic conceptions, and how spiritual experience became interpreted through these changing images.[1] In Islamic mysticism, figures like Ibn Arabi developed sophisticated metaphysics where the whole universe is seen as a manifestation of divine reality, and the human heart becomes a mirror for that reality.

While these systems are rich, they depend heavily on belief, authority, and tradition that are mix genuine conscious experiences with doctrine, miracle stories, and institutional control. For someone trying to build a cross-cultural, testable model, this religious packaging becomes a barrier. It also leads to what I call over-religionization of spirituality: every unusual experience is quickly labelled “from God” or “from jinn,” instead of being studied as part of consciousness itself.

## **2.2 Non-religious spirituality and consciousness**

In the 20th century, psychologists and philosophers began to separate spirituality from strict religion. William James treated religious and mystical experiences as data about human consciousness rather than proof of specific doctrines.[2] Jung’s idea of the collective unconscious suggested a deeper layer of mind shared by all humans, populated by archetypal patterns.[3] Later transpersonal psychology and humanistic movements also tried to explore peak experiences, self-transcendence, and meaning-making without forcing them into narrow religious frames.

In recent times, there is a renewed interest in secular or non-religious spirituality, especially in therapy, mindfulness training, and existential psychology. These approaches talk about presence, connectedness, depth, and inner clarity, but do not necessarily rely on any specific God-image. However, many of them still lack a strong neurobiological and field-based explanation of why such experiences happen and how they relate to the structure of the brain and the universe.

## **2.3 Neuroscience of spiritual experience**

Neuroscience has made important contributions by showing that spiritual experiences correlate with specific brain processes. Newberg and d’Aquili, for example, used brain imaging to study practices like meditation and prayer, and found characteristic patterns in frontal and parietal regions linked to attention, self-boundaries, and emotional regulation.[13] Other researchers have studied default mode network activity, gamma synchrony, and changes in neurochemistry (serotonin, dopamine, GABA) during contemplative states.

Most neuroscientific models still treat consciousness as emergent from or produced by the brain, it is seen as the final origin, and the problem is how complexity gives rise to subjective experience. This is the “hard problem” described by David Chalmers: why should neural activity be accompanied by any experience at all?[10] Integrated Information Theory (IIT) tries to describe how information structure and integration shape conscious content,[11] and predictive processing models describe how the brain constantly generates predictions and corrects them via incoming sensory data.[12] But they do not really solve the question of where consciousness itself comes from.

## **2.4 Quantum and field-based models**

Alongside mainstream neuroscience, several physicists and philosophers have proposed field-based or quantum-based theories of consciousness. David Bohm’s idea of an implicate order suggests that the universe is fundamentally holistic, and what we see as separate objects are projections from a deeper informational whole.[4] Penrose and Hameroff argue that quantum

coherence and objective reduction in neuronal microtubules could give rise to moments of conscious awareness.[5]

Quantum biology has also discovered that living systems use quantum effects in photosynthesis, navigation, and enzyme activity.[6] This opens the door to think that the brain, as a highly complex biological structure, may also exploit quantum processes in ways we do not yet fully understand.

An analogous role is played by some thinkers in spirituality and science dialogue, i.e Joseph Selbie in *The Physics of God*, try to connect ancient mystical descriptions with modern field-based physics.[7] Epigenetics and gene expression research, through people like Bruce Lipton and Moshe Szyf, shows that information and environment can reshape biological expression across time,[8,9] which fits well with a model in which consciousness and information are deeply interwoven.

This paper expands the scope of these literatures but does not fully certify any single theory. It proposes a synthesised model: a Universal Consciousness Field in which the brain participates, using quantum-level processes, genetic information, and neural networks as its interface. [4–6,8,9]

### 3. Methodology / Methods

This study is conceptual and integrative. The methodology is closer to what is recurrently called theoretical synthesis or interdisciplinary review. I do three main things:

1. **Narrative literature review** across neuroscience, quantum physics, quantum biology, epigenetics, anthropology of religion, and philosophy of mind. The focus is not to cover every paper, but to select key works that directly touch questions of consciousness, spirituality, and non-local information. [1–13]
2. **Comparative conceptual analysis**, where I place religious, philosophical, and scientific ideas next to each other—not to prove any tradition right or wrong, but to see where there is structural similarity and where science can translate older intuitions into modern language. [1–3,4,7]
3. **Model construction**, where I propose a specific framework: the Universal Consciousness Field and the brain as receiver–transmitter–filter, and then outline what a Neuro-Spiritual methodology could look like in practice.

Future work can turn this into empirical research by using brain imaging, clinical interventions, and psychometric tools to test parts of the model.

#### 3.1 Sources of Evidence

The main sources of evidence used in this paper are:

- **Classical psychology and philosophy of religion**, especially William James' work on religious experience.[2]
- **Depth psychology**, particularly Jung's collective unconscious.[3]
- **Modern neuroscience of spirituality**, including Newberg and D'Aquila's brain imaging studies.[13]
- **Quantum and field-based theories**, such as Bohm's implicate order [4] and Penrose–Hameroff's Orch-OR.[5]
- **Quantum biology**, through Al-Khalili and McFadden's work.[6]
- **Epigenetics and gene expression**, especially Lipton [8] and Szyf.[9]
- **Historical and comparative religion**, including Armstrong's *A History of God* [1] and selected scholarship on early Hindu and Islamic metaphysical ideas.

These sources do not “prove” the model in a strict experimental sense, but provide a strong **scaffolding** of arguments, findings, and analogies on which the Neuro-Spirituality framework can be constructed.

#### 4. Results / Findings

##### 4.1 Spirituality as participation in a Universal Consciousness Field

The first result is reframing that spirituality can be defined as the human mode of participation in a Universal Consciousness Field (UCF). Instead of starting from God, sin, salvation, or any specific doctrine, we start from experience and structure. When people report:

- a sense of unity with everything,
- the feeling that reality is “alive” or intelligent,
- strong intuition or “downloads” of insight,
- deep peace beyond ordinary emotions,
- or symbolic dreams that feel more real than waking life,

These can be interpreted only as psychological anomalies or religious miracles, but as types of interaction between the individual brain-mind system and a wider field of consciousness.[2,3]

Religious traditions have often intuited this field but personalised it into deities or theological forms. In Samkhya, Purusha functions as a kind of pure universal awareness, distinct from material nature (Prakriti). In some Sufi and Islamic metaphysical frameworks, Noor-e-Muhammad is described as a primordial consciousness or light from which creation unfolds. These parallels suggest that the idea of a universal field of consciousness is not a new invention of modern physics; it is a very old intuition, now looking for better language.[1]

Within the UCF model, spirituality becomes:

- **Non-religious by default** (it can co-exist with religion but does not depend on it),
- **Field-based**, meaning it assumes that consciousness is not only “in the head,”[4–6] and
- **Open to investigation**, because experiences can be correlated with brain states and behavioural changes. [11–13]

##### 4.2 The brain as receiver, transmitter, and filter

The second result is a shift in how we understand the function of the brain. Instead of seeing the brain as a closed system that generates consciousness from physical complexity, we treat it as a receiver–transmitter–filter. [2,4,5]

1. **Receiver:** At micro and macro levels, the brain may be sensitive to patterns in the Universal Consciousness Field. Quantum biology has already shown that living systems can maintain coherence and use quantum effects for efficient information processing.[6] If neural microstructures are capable of similar coherence (as Penrose and Hameroff argue), then the brain is not just reacting to sensory input but may be “listening” to a wider field.[5]
2. **Transmitter:** Thoughts, emotions, intentions, and focused attention may not be purely private. If consciousness is field-like, our inner states may contribute back into the field. This could give a non-mystical explanation for phenomena such as emotional contagion, “group fields” in rituals, or strong intuitive bonds between people.[2,3]
3. **Filter:** William James’ filter theory suggested that the brain actually limits the full range of consciousness to make life manageable.[2] Ordinary waking consciousness might be a narrow band within a much bigger spectrum. Practices like meditation, breathwork, focused contemplation, or even crisis states may temporarily loosen the filter and allow more of the field to be sensed.[7,13]

In this view, spiritual practices are not “irrational rituals,” but technologies of tuning. They change brain states so that the receiver–transmitter–filter function is altered and interaction with the field is experienced differently.

### 4.3 The Neuro-Spirituality model

The third result is the proposal of a Neuro-Spirituality model with four main pillars:

1. **Universal Consciousness Field (UCF):** A non-local field of awareness and information, conceptually similar to a “consciousness cloud.” [4–6,11] All individual minds exist within, and interact with this field.
2. **Neuro-biological interface:** This pillar suggests that human nervous system—especially the brain—is the main interface. Quantum-level processes, neural networks, and genetic/epigenetic structures act like hardware and firmware that allow tuning to the field. [5,6,8,9]
3. **Psycho-symbolic processing:** The mind translates raw field interaction into images, concepts, narratives, and symbols. This explains why people experience dreams, visions, archetypes, or religious imagery when interacting with deeper layers of consciousness. [2,3,7]
4. **Practical methodology (Neuro-Spiritual practice):** Specific methods—breathwork, meditation, focused reflection, ethical alignment, journaling, body regulation, and even carefully designed food, sleep, and environment routines—are used to optimise the receiver–transmitter–filter function. The aim is not to escape life, but to increase clarity, stability, creativity, and compassion in real-world functioning. [2,11–13]

These “results” are theoretical, but they are clear enough that future research can design experiments and interventions to test parts of the model.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Comparison with existing models

Compared with classic religious models, Neuro-Spirituality is less interested in metaphysical claims (who God is, what happens after death) and more interested in how consciousness functions here and now. [1–3] It does not deny religious experience, but it refuses to bring it down to one tradition. Instead, it says different religions may have touched the same field but interpreted it through their own stories, symbols, and power structures.

Compared with materialist neuroscience, this model refuses the assumption that consciousness is only a product of brain complexity. [10–12] It agrees that brain states matter a lot, and uses all the data from neuroimaging and neurochemistry, but extends the picture by adding a field dimension. In other words, it says: brain activity is necessary for our kind of consciousness, but not sufficient to explain consciousness as such.

Compared with other field-based or quantum models, the contribution here is mainly the integration with practical methodology and non-religious spirituality. [4–7] Many quantum consciousness theories stay at the level of physics or mathematics and does not pronounce much about daily practice. On the other hand, many spiritual self-help systems talk about “energy” and “vibration” but do not connect to solid scientific work. Neuro-Spirituality tries to sit in the middle: grounded enough to be taken seriously, open enough to be genuinely transformative.

### 5.2 Implications for mental health and transformation

If the brain is a receiver–transmitter–filter for a Universal Consciousness Field, then spiritual crises, depression, anxiety, or even some forms of existential breakdown can be partially understood as disturbances in tuning. This does not replace biological or social explanations, but adds a new layer. [2,11]

For example:

- A person with chronic anxiety may be stuck in a predictive loop where the nervous system keeps expecting threat. Neuro-Spiritual methods can combine breathwork, somatic regulation, and carefully guided contemplation to retune the system away from fear-based patterns and into a more stable, connected state. [11–13]
- A person with deep existential emptiness may be suffering not only from psychological wounds but also from a lost sense of connection to any larger field of meaning. Introducing the idea of a Universal Consciousness Field—not as dogma, but as a working hypothesis—can give a new frame in which their experiences begin to make sense. [2–4]
- Creative block may also be interpreted as a narrowing of the filter. Many creative people report that ideas “come to them” rather than being forced. Practices that widen the filter in a disciplined way can help restore that flow. [2,3,7]

In my own consultancy work, the Neuro-Spiritual frame allows clients to see their mind not just as a private defect machine but as part of a larger informational universe. This often reduces shame and increases responsibility at the same time: “I am not crazy, but I am also not a victim; I am part of a field and I can learn to tune better.”

### 5.3 Limits and speculative elements

Of course, there are serious limitations. The Universal Consciousness Field is, at this stage, a theoretical construct, not a directly measured physical field like electromagnetism. Quantum theories of consciousness remain controversial. [5,10] Some neuroscientists argue that classical neural networks are enough to explain consciousness, at least in principle. [11,12] Epigenetic and quantum biology findings show that life uses subtle informational processes, but they do not automatically prove a non-local consciousness field. [6,8,9]

Therefore, this model should be treated as hypothesis-generating and not as a closed doctrine. It is designed to:

- organise existing data in a fresh way,
- suggest new experiments,
- and offer a conceptual bridge between science and spirituality.

If future research shows that the field metaphor is wrong, the practical techniques of Neuro-Spirituality—breath, meditation, attention, ethical alignment, lifestyle regulation—may still work as psychological and physiological tools.[11–13] But if some version of the field hypothesis turns out to be correct, then this framework may help us stand at the beginning of a new understanding of what it means to be human.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper has tried to do something that is simple to say but quite difficult to implement: to rescue spirituality from both rigid religion and flat materialism, and place it inside a serious conversation about consciousness, the brain, and the universe.

I proposed the term Neuro-Spirituality for a framework where spirituality is no longer defined only by beliefs, rituals, or institutional labels but by the way human consciousness participates in a Universal Consciousness Field. [2–4] In this view, the brain is not only a generator of experience but also a receiver, transmitter, and filter of a wider field of awareness and information. [2,5]

Drawing on William James, Jung, Bohm, Penrose, Newberg, quantum biology, epigenetics, and comparative religion, [1–9,13] I built a model where:

- Spiritual experiences are understood as specific modes of interaction with the field,
- Cultural and religious stories are seen as symbolic translations of these interactions, and



- Practical methods—breathing, meditation, attention training, ethical alignment, lifestyle adjustments—are treated as tuning technologies of the receiver–transmitter–filter system. [2,11–13]

The model remains speculative in some parts, especially where quantum theory and field concepts are involved. [4–6,10] but it is not random imagination. It grows from serious questions in neuroscience (how does the brain relate to consciousness?), from the long history of spiritual experience, and from modern discoveries about information, coherence, and non-local effects in biology.

For future work, this framework can be tested in three main directions:

1. Empirical research using neuroimaging, psychometrics, and clinical trials of Neuro-Spiritual interventions.
2. Philosophical refinement, especially in relation to panpsychism, neutral monism, and process philosophy. [10–12]
3. Practical application in psychotherapy, coaching, education, and leadership, where many people already feel spiritual hunger but do not trust traditional religious forms.

In short, Neuro-Spirituality does not ask us to choose between God and the brain, in fact it invites us to consider the possibility that we are living nodes in a Universal Consciousness Field, and that our brains are beautifully designed—not just to survive—but to receive, transmit, and refine the ongoing story of the universe.

## 7. Future Research Suggestions

Future research can move from theory to testing in several ways:

1. Neuroscientific studies comparing brain activity in carefully designed Neuro-Spiritual practices versus standard mindfulness or relaxation, to see if there are distinctive signatures. [11–13]
2. Clinical trials where Neuro-Spiritual frameworks are used with anxiety, depression, and meaning crises, measuring outcomes over time.
3. Experimental designs exploring intuition, insight, or “field effects” in group settings, with strong controls to avoid pseudoscience. [4–6,10]
4. Interdisciplinary dialogues between physicists, neuroscientists, philosophers, and experienced contemplatives to refine (or falsify) the Universal Consciousness Field model. [1–13]

## References

- [1] Armstrong, Karen. 1993. *A History of God: The 4,000-Year Quest of Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- [2] James, William. 1902. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- [3] Jung, C. G. 1968. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [4] Bohm, David. 1980. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. London: Routledge.
- [5] Hameroff, Stuart, and Roger Penrose. 2014. “Consciousness in the Universe: A Review of the ‘Orch OR’ Theory.” *Physics of Life Reviews* 11 (1): 39–78.
- [6] Al-Khalili, Jim, and Johnjoe McFadden. 2014. *Life on the Edge: The Coming of Age of Quantum Biology*. New York: Crown.
- [7] Selbie, Joseph P. 2018. *The Physics of God: Unifying Quantum Physics, Consciousness, M-Theory, Heaven, Neuroscience and Transcendence*. New York: Inner Traditions.
- [8] Lipton, Bruce H. 2005. *The Biology of Belief: Unleashing the Power of Consciousness, Matter, and Miracles*. Carlsbad, CA: Hay House.

- [9] Szyf, Moshe. 2009. "The Early Life Environment and the Epigenome." *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) – General Subjects* 1790 (9): 878–885.
- [10] Chalmers, David J. 1996. *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [11] Tononi, Giulio. 2004. "An Information Integration Theory of Consciousness." *BMC Neuroscience* 5 (42): 1–22.
- [12] Friston, Karl. 2010. "The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory?" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 11 (2): 127–138.
- [13] Newberg, Andrew, and Eugene d'Aquili. 2001. *Why God Won't Go Away: Brain Science and the Biology of Belief*. New York: Ballantine Books.