Ontologically distinct in our ontology

Bhakti Vijnana Muni, PhD

googlegroups.com, bvm@scsiscs.org
online_sadhu_sanga@googlegroups.com

Abstract: An apple and an orange are ontologically distinct in our ontology because they are different entities. The thinking about an apple and the thinking about an orange are also distinct. But nobody is suggesting that there are difference of ontological category within these pairs. Whatever category apples go in, oranges go in too.
[Bhakti Vijnana Muni. **Ontologically distinct in our ontology.** *Rep Opinion* 2016;8(1):54-62]. ISSN 1553-9873 (print); ISSN 2375-7205 (online). http://www.sciencepub.net/report. 8. doi:10.7537/marsroj08011608.

Keywords: ontologically; distinct; ontology; entity

J: Forget card tricks like Frege. An apple and an orange are ontologically distinct in our ontology because they are different entities. The thinking about an apple and the thinking about an orange are also distinct. But nobody is suggesting that there are differences of ontological category within these pairs. Whatever category apples go in, oranges go in too.

A: It is not a difference in category or in aspect. It is a difference of qualia.

J: An ontological category, of 'substance type' or 'aspect' is, as far as I can see, by convention, a category that does not change with point of view. Tokens may be different but types like 'mental', 'physical', 'supernatural', 'dynamic' or 'causal' are by nature third person 'it' categories. This is where I think Ram (and almost everyone else) is coming unstuck.

A: The concept of Nature that I am using encompasses the totality of existence, including first-person experiences. I am not reducing Nature to the "it" aspect (like Materialists do).

J: Does a snail have a 'mental' aspect?

A: Yes she has because it processes information and uses it for adaptive actions.

J: What is an 'aspect'? In my view, IF the snail subject were me, here, now, then I would have a 'mental' relation to the world.

A: If she were you, and had the capacity to feel the here and now, she would be conscious.

J: Although, as some on this list have pointed out, we can never test for that, the conception has some heuristic value. 'I' certainly seem to have a mental relation to the world. But where I think Ram (and perhaps yourself) goes wrong is in trying to equate this mental 'aspect' to the third person account of physics - to allocate it to this part of a process and to allocate 'physical' to some other part of a process. This must be a category mistake.

A: I am not making this category mistake, since I distinguish three ontological categories (aspects) in Nature (physical = matter/energy, mental unconscious = form/information and mental conscious = feeling the cognitive content)

J: What I am trying to say is that the duality in the world is very simple, as Whitehead realized. It is the duality between the present, here, now, and the past, there then.

A: This is another issue, the issue of becoming.

J: It is incredibly difficult to find ways of expressing this that do not get swallowed up by tour operators organising language holidays. But in a sense what I am saying is obvious to a child. 'Mental' is the events inside me, here, now, that I cannot describe in shape or form because I have no sense organs to inspect them. 'Physical' is the events outside me, there, then, that I can describe in space as well as time because I have mobile sense organs that can triangulate around shapes and a differentiating machine called a brain to compute shapes. This is really what the distinction between 'private' and 'public' amounts to, plus the fact that a here, now is always a subject, so you can never get in on another here, now.

A: Your holiday trip lead to a dead end. To define "physical" this way is a return to the Modern philosophy of Locke and co. To deny mentality to other people and animals is a return to Descartes. Maybe a remedy to this nostalgia would be to read Husserl's "Cartesian Meditations"... it worked well for several philosophers formerly hypnotized by Modern issues, helping them to move to Contemporary approaches. Best Regards, Alfredo.

Comments: Our philosophy is not solipcism. The particular is not just identical with the universal but is a unity in difference. In the process of nonduality, the difference is preserved. The living entity is an individual. Other living entities cannot directly possess the immediacy of the content of conscious experience of a particular individual. But the living entity has the capacity to know itself and let itself be known by other individuals. Therefore, the self is not formless but has an inherent form.

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] submission

I rather suspect that the whole idea of something being alive or dead is now seen to be arbitrary. Now that we can remove nuclei from cells and put them into other cells, maybe freezing the components for months in between, the concept of a life unit becomes arbitrary. I personally think it has nothing to do with consciousness or subjectivity anyway. Life is divisible. Subjectivity is indivisible. They are incommensurable. BW.

Jo E.

Comments: You have completely missed the concept of biology. Being alive is a precise process. We can't neglect the process and focus only on the content. Put that nuclei in a dead cell, will it become alive?

Re: Triple Aspect Monism

Dear All:

I would like to introduce the main ideas of my philosophical framework, called "Triple-Aspect Monism" (Pereira Jr, 2013; 2014). It is compatible with a forthcoming chapter with Ram Vimal and Massimo Pregnolato (Pereira Jr., Vimal and Pregnolato 2016).

The proposal is intended to overcome the dichotomy of Materialism X Idealism, as well as the conflict between Theism and Atheism. Nature is conceived as the totality of existence; a mind-independent eternal reality, composed of interacting, self-organizing elementary energy waveforms (like the "strings" of M-Theory). These elementary waveforms can be compared to the "alphabet" of reality. They exist eternally in potential states; their different combinations define different kinds of evolutionary processes that occur in different regions (for instance, in the planets of the solar system). The possible interactions of elementary waveforms define the state space of Nature.

The potential states are actualized in three aspects (ontological categories), according to an order (each aspect being a condition of possibility for each other). The first or immediate actualization of the big system is the physical aspect, characterized by the presence of matter. All systems composed of matter/energy are physical. In the universe or multiverse, there are regions where only the first aspect is actual.

The second actualization is form/information. This aspect contains all laws and principles of Nature, mathematical relations, logical inferential rules, information patterns, etc. The rules do not exist in the void, they are the results of the systematic self-organization of the elements of Nature. This aspect was largely developed with the emergence of biological systems that exchange all kinds of signals internally, with other similar systems and with the physical environment.

The third actualization we know about is feeling/consciousness. It occurs when a system feels the information it processes. Feeling is an affective state characterized by the capacity of the information to affect (or to cause, in the sense of Aristotle's Formal Cause) the physical structure of the system in a non-linear fashion (like Bernard Baars' Global Workspace, which defines a threshold for conscious activity in information processing systems - the difference is that his theory is cognitive, while mine identifies feeling as the mark of consciousness).

As far as science goes, there is no other ontological aspect to be assumed as a necessary concept for the scientific explanation of reality. God and spirituality are contained in the third aspect. God is real as an intentional object of desire of human consciousness (Man creates God for Man's own purposes, and then the created entity becomes real in human culture).

Spirituality is the art of feeling. All arts are based on elaborations on feelings, and all them can contribute to spirituality. Meditation is a set of techniques to improve the art of feeling. Religion is a social phenomenon that provides opportunities of sharing feelings (faith) and improving them (praying). Best Regards and a Happy 2016!

Alfredo Pereira Jr., PhD, L.D., Institute of Biosciences, São Paulo State University - BRAZIL

Pereira Jr., A. (2013). Triple-Aspect Monism: A Conceptual Framework for the Science of Human Consciousness. In A. Pereira Jr. & D. Lehmann (Eds.), The Unity of Mind, Brain and World: Current Perspectives on a Science of Consciousness (pp. 299-337). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pereira Jr., A. (2014). Triple-aspect monism: Physiological, mental unconscious and conscious aspects of brain activity. Journal of Integrative Neuroscience, 13(2), 201-227.

Pereira Jr., A; Vimal, R.L.P and Pregnolato, M. (2016) Can Qualitative Physics Solve the Hard Problem? In: Poznanski, R., Tuszynski, J. and Feinberg, T. (Eds.) Biophysics of Consciousness: A Foundational Approach. Singapore: World Scientific.

Comments: You think that first is the physical aspect, then the information aspect and then the feeling aspect. But why don't you consider that life/feeling/consciousness is first and matter is the last. That is the Vedantic contribution to the whole world --- In the beginning is Life or Life comes from Life and Matter comes from Life. If you say that first matter existed then you have to explain how the border between matter and life appeared. But it is much easier to think that the border between life and matter appeared from the life principle. A richer principle can yield a simpler principle but it is very difficult to

conceive of a complex principle from a simple principle.

In this regard Srila Bhakti Rakshaka Sridhara Deva Goswami Maharaja explained the Vedantic views [1]:

"Yes, consciousness comes first and then matter. The basis of all things material is consciousness, which is spiritual. Consciousness can contact consciousness directly. When consciousness comes into the stage of matter, material conception, we experience a kind of vague consciousness; first there is hazy consciousness and then material consciousness. But everything has its spiritual side. And as eternal souls, our direct connection is really only with the conscious aspect of existence.

The soul, coming into material consciousness, must come through some hazy reflection of consciousness, *cidåbhåsa*. Only then can the soul experience material consciousness. Before pure consciousness evolves to material consciousness, it will pass through a hazy stage of consciousness or *cidåbhåsa*. So in the background of every material thing, there is a spiritual conception. This cannot but be true."

[1] Sridhar, BR, *Subjective Evolution of Consciousness*, Sri Chaitanya Saraswat Math, pp. 15-16, 1989.

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] is thought computable?

Dear Stuart,

Penrose gave an example of a chess position which a computer would inevitably loose by the move P x Rook a move which no human would make, because the loss of the game was immediately 'obvious'. The computer could not be programmed to understand the kind of meta-reasoning concerned in all such situations. Human minds on the other hand perform this function of decision based on understanding the whole time. I think that Roger wanted to establish that this kind of process is not available to purely computational devices. Maybe you could check with him!

Alex

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] submission

Thanks for the comment Lee,

One of the problems of joining a new list is that one has no idea whether one is conversing with a panpsychist or a functionalist or an Australian physicalist or what. And sometimes it is hard o tell from the posts!! I was thinking of Patricia Churchland or Dan Dennett or even my old neuroscience supervisor, Ian Glynn. Deflation is often very much on show - rucksack and wheelie-trunk in tow. And you will appreciate that I raised this not so much in the context of deflating phenomenality as in deflating the implication of internal comparison. Where is the internal comparison in a Churchlandic 'brain state'? Not that one could not propose one, but that it tends to get forgotten. The analysis needs to be more in terms of patterns of internal dynamic relation rather than 'state' in my view.

I have no problem with there being phenomenality in silicon chips. Searle has no case there. But I don't see any reason to think the phenomenality would bear any relation to what we would consider interesting aspects of the computation. In contrast our phenomenality does seem to relate to interesting aspects of computation. That is actually the hardish problem. Where I think Searle may have a point is in that local dynamic relations within condensed matter may matter.

Jo

Comments: Our idea is close to Panentheism of Hegel. The Vedantic idea is that we cannot measure consciousness in terms of numbers. It cannot be established that consciousness is a result of computation. Hao Wang the biographer of Gödel wrote about him, "Either the human mind surpasses all machines (to be more precise: it can decide more number-theoretical questions than any machine), or else there exist number-theoretical questions undecidable for the human mind.[2]"

Wang further writes, "In brief, Gödel's theorem reveals the algorithmic inexhaustibility (or incompletability) of mathematics (and even of arithmetic). This fact of algorithmic inexhaustibility shows, according to Gödel, that either the human mind surpasses all computers or that mathematics is not created by the human mind, or both. It is therefore clear that the theorem is relevant to both the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of mathematics. In terms of philosophical discourse, the theorem helps to clarify the dialectic of logic and intuition, of formalism and content, of the mechanical and the mental, of language and thought, of truth and provability, and of the real and the knowable."

From the Eastern view of Vedanta, we can say that this would mean that mind nor a mechanical machine or a result of mechanical computation involving merely some number crunching. Even the so called numerical infinity is a spurious infinity. Number is only an abstraction. This topic is discussed by Hegel and an article to explain it was written by Sripad Bhakti Madhava Puri Maharaja, PhD: http://www.gwfhegel.org/trueinfinite.html.

[2] Wang, H., *A logical journey*, pp. 3, 185, 77.

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] submission

Modern man is formed by words. The biology of Humans is rooted in experiencing the world and not in thinking about the world. The cognitive system and the

physiological systems is made in order to make sense of the world, the world which is dynamic, live yet with an inherent order and purpose. But constant engagement with word during the formative stage configures both the systems to engage with the word. Human child is impressionable and the word's impression totally changes the tools and processes needed for cognition. Fundamental changes happen to the functioning of the eye, memory, ear and also to the cognitive process. The development of a sense of self is the key to our spiritual, psychological and physical well being and is directly connected with the authenticity of knowing and being in the world.

FORMATION OF BEINGNESS IN HUMANS Deterministic nature of the brain comes from deterministic nature of our cognitive source. We are shaped by our cognitive source- direct engagement with the world does as per the way world exists, engagement with the word creates the linearity, rigidity and thus the deterministic nature and so does the digital format. Last week I saw a mother trying to 'teach' a child. She showed the drawing of a maze in which there is a rabbit on one corner and on other corners are a fox, a snake and a carrot. The rabbit has to go through the maze and get to the carrot. So the child starts drawing and then at one point he sees a stone and he asked the mother whether he can jump over the stone to which the mother says no. The child is situated in the three dimensional world and what we are busy trying through education is to bring them to our two dimensional world. We have reversed our natural situation. The real world has become the means to be in the two dimensional world which is where the modern man seems to be located. That is why thinking has become more important than seeing or sensing. The child is situated in SEEING. seeing seeing seeing..... Thought happens once in a while!

Our being in the world is established by being in experience. We are rooted by the senses, experience and awareness. Senses are two way tools that connect us to the outer world and awaken our inner world simultaneously. Senses are the primary tools and language was used in support of the sense only to achieve this rootedness. This had been the natural process till literacy was introduced on a large scale to human culture. Instead of being in the world we became ‘knowings’ of the word. We live in the realm of language and mind. Modernity represents this fall of the senses

There is a saying by Milerappa ' spirituality is the last ploy of the mind'. I put this in a more drastic manner- 'reasoning is the ploy of the mind'. It makes you think you have understood. I am talking about fragmented reasoning. The kind that is 'taught' to us in lieu of memorization and not the one that is inherent aspect of life. This kind of reasoning short circuits comprehension! Let me put it more bluntly. Modern education is the biggest crime on Humanity. I wish i am wrong. But last 30 years I have researched on this issue. I have several such lessons from the non literate communities. From 1989 I have lived and studied the cognitive system of non literate communities and also of the literate culture. Put in another way I have been studying the Formation of the being-ness in humans. This is the basic operating principle with which we function. Literacy transforms humans in a fundamental way. More education, more damage. From biological and holistic beingness to psychological and fragmented. From awakening to conditioning. Autonomy is the most important aspect of all living beings. If this is denied then there will be distortions. Bonsai plants are good examples. What modernity does is to turn us in to bonsais. (Bosai trees also are seen in 'civilized' households) But the fragmented mind plays the trick and makes you feel there is nothing wrong with you. Not just that, it makes you feel superior- developed, civilized, educated! Even when some evidences show up, mind makes you think otherwise. Mind controls what it wants to see and hear. So there are stories about preliterate societies cruelty etc being spread. These stories were made by the western travelers and later by the early anthropologists. (even now some of them continue this story) Human brain is very plastic (much more than all other life forms) and it is formed by the external conditions. Literacy creates conditions that are anti life. When you learn from life you acquire qualities of life but when you learn from non life you acquire those qualities. The whole cognitive system gets rewired impacting the brain. This started on a large scale in Europe after printing press was established in Germany- Guttenberg. The much celebrated age of reason is an outcome of this shift in cognitive conditions. Presence of multimedia- television, computer, mobile etc is impacting humans in a fundamental way again. This cognitive condition is very different to the text. The history of west needs to be studied as history of text. (Type of alphabet is also an important factor. Pictographic alphabet impacts the brain very differently from the phonetic or syllabic).

This will be difficult to understand as most people in this list would not have studied the cognitive system of non literate people. Children give us a glimpse but we quickly turn them in to our ways. We immediately start teaching them language. The pre linguistic phase is shortened as much as possible. This is the most important phase of humans. We don't let the child be. Take its own time to get rooted in the world- directly without the mediation of language. Learning from children was the idea of the Sadhana school initiative. The sahaj qualities can only be awakened ‘where there is conditions that allow autonomy to function.

Jinan, ('DIGITAL MEDIUM IS A TOOL.DIGITALLY MEDIATED KNOWLEDGE DESTROYS THE BEING')

Comments: We appreciate your concerns. But Reason is the activity of thinking. Thinking proper can unify. Mind is an impulse which flows through the senses and hence an untrained or unrestrained mind can be bad. Therefore, education proper must be reasoned to approach towards the Truth. Socrates said, "An unexamined life is not worth living." Kindness, affection, proper guidance are all necessary. First we have to be good ourselves and then only we can try to do some good to others.

Re: [Sadhu Sanga]: Leibnitz, Whitehead, relational ontology, two sources of information, and the extended dual-aspect monism (Dvi-Pakṣa Advaita Vedānta).

Dear Jo,

Thanks for your comments. I agree with Alfredo. In the defense of the extended dual-aspect monism (eDAM) framework, I would like to add the followings:

1. The eDAM is also not making category mistake because the self 'I' is the subjective experience of subject and is 1pp-mental aspect of a state of self-related neural-network (NN). The self 'I' has its NCC (neural correlates of consciousness), which is the self-related NN (midline structures: (Northoff, 2014b; Northoff & Bermpohl, 2004)) that is 3pp-physical aspect and is inseparable from the 1pp-mental aspect. Information is the same, only perspectives are different.

2. As per (Vimal, 2010c), "The two modes are: (1) the non-tilde mode that is the material [physical] and mental aspect of cognition (memory and attention) related feedback [FB] signals in a neural-network of the brain, which is the cognitive nearest past approaching towards present; and (2) the tilde mode that is the material [physical] and mental aspect of the feed forward [FF] signals due to external environmental input and internal endogenous input, which is the nearest future approaching towards present and is a entropy-reversed representation of non-tilde mode." In other words, In the eDAM, the FF-signal is the nearest-future becoming to present and FB-signal is the nearest-past becoming to present when the match between them is perfect. If stimulus is novel, then there is no past.

3. Jo: I am afraid I am not persuaded. You still have not said what you mean by physical, other than over there. There is no struggle to incorporate experience into physics because physics has always been the exercise of finding law-like patterns of disposition that can predict the content of experience. Without experience there simply is no physics. For sure physics seems to describe events over there for which we can only guess at any phenomenality but whatever 'physical' means it has to include 'that which determines the content of experience, so experience is what the theory is built from.

Ram: The term 'physical aspect' in the eDAM and TAM is detailed in previous emails; briefly, in the eDAM, it has mind-dependent NCC and mind-independent NCC-in-itself components.

I agree that physics and all sciences and other areas are products of our minds that include experiences. However, if you say it is all experiences then it is panexperientialism, a sort of panpsychism that has 7 problems elaborated in (Vimal, 2010d).

Furthermore, physics and all other sciences are from 3pp and are for public; nothing private. Yes, we use 1pp, but we get consensus on whatever we observe and then physicists erroneously claim that it is mind-independent (such as Newton's law in classical physics). In some cases, we simply cannot have consensus; then 1pp remains as 1pp, i.e., observations remain observer-dependent. For example, achromats, protanopes, and trichromats will never have consensus over the color-experience of ripe-tomato (dark greyness vs. beigeness vs. redness, respectively) as elaborated in one of my emails.

However, this is not what I am talking about. What I am trying to say is that any good framework must explain the solid empirical data with the same information but from two different sources. At present time, as you seem to argue that modern physics (QFT) is unable to explain 1pp and 3pp sources of information because for QFT it is the same sort of information so unable to distinguish as if QFT is 'blind' to the two sources of information. It is because of this inability of QFT, a monad or an occasion of experience needs to be a dual-aspect entity. I do not see any way out if you like your relational ontology to explain the gap between the two sources of information, which is authentic and has lots of solid empirical evidences, which you cannot deny.

Your explanation based on present/now/here as 1pp and past/then/there as 3pp is untenable because (i) they appear separable, and (ii) as Alfredo mentioned it is related to the issue of becoming, which I tried to elaborate above in [2]. It seems that quantum field theory (QFT) renamed matter in the sense that particles are excited modes, but modes are still 3pp-material/physical aspect. QFT still lacks mental aspect. Therefore, modes/monads need to be dual-aspect entities to explain the two sources of information.

In addition, the debate on same-from-same (life from life, matter from matter) and cross-causality (life form matter or matter from life) needs to be addressed. The eDAM does a good job on this debate. QFT is 'blind' on this because mind and matter look the same for QFT; so, there is nothing to debate. Being 'blind' does not mean that the explanatory gap problem

disappeared. This problem still remains in current relational ontology because the unexplained gap is now between 3 pp-modes and 1pp experiences. To address this problem, monads and occasions of experiences need to be dual-aspect entities. Regards,

Rām Lakhan Pāndey Vimal, M.S., Ph.D.

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Re: is thought computable?

Dear Jean-Yves,

Good luck on your forthcoming talk on "Is Thought Computable". You suggested comparing it to other things like:

- Is mathematics computable?
- Is fear computable?
- Is a stone computable?
- Is Varanasi computable?
- Is the universe computable?

I just posted something about: Is color computable? That is a LOT simpler than your other examples since color starts with just 3 dimensional, because of the 3 cones. And even with just 3 dimensions there are some subtle aspects of the neural correlates of color qualia (NCCQ) for which we don't yet know the full computation. It is too bad that your talk is on the same day as the Berwick & Chomsky new book on language mechanisms comes out. Does thought in humans have a language aspect? If so their book may be relevant since it provides a new understanding of linguistics based on a very simple computation they call "merge". I look forward to hearing your and other thoughts on that computation after the book is out.

Stan

Comments: The hard problem of consciousness which includes perception cannot be solved by only studying the NCCQ. These are just elaboration of the objective spectrum of color and nothing else. How it gives rise to perceptions of color in the subject is related to living concept which has three aspects, (i) Thought, (ii) Will, and (iii) Feeling. Perception is a process that requires the perceiver, the process of perception and the object of perception. Therefore the percept requires the precept for perception to occur. The thought is contributing to everything and all our perceptions and concepts. Yet this thought we can't explain. Therefore the reasonable solution to the problem is that perception of color comes when the subject's mind comes in contact with the objects of sensory perception through the senses. It is a very intricate phenomenon, which has to be traced to the higher categories in terms of knowers of the field of activity, i.e the soul and the supersoul.

Subject: [Sadhu Sanga] Color Qualia,. the big breakthrough

Dear Bhakivijnana Muni

You mentioned Goethe's update on Newton's views of color. Thanks. It thought it would be useful for me to fill in some of those details. In my previous posting I stated that we know so little about human neural correlates of qualia. That isn't really true for the neural correlates of color qualia (NCCQ.

The big breakthrough in human color perception was the realization that Step 1 was to pass the input photons (or waves) through 3 wavelength sensitive cones. By converting the input to just 3 dimensions (rather than a different dimension for each different wavelength it became almost trivial to understand most color human color perception.

Ram: The two attributes of light (wavelength and intensity) are transduced by photoreceptors (rods and cones) into single attribute of electrical signal; this is called univariance principle. This is the reason why we need at least two cones/receptors to experience color.

Step 2 was to realize that after the cones come neurons with centers and surrounds, like input from red cones surrounded by input from green cones, and vice versa, and blue surrounded by red plus green cones. That was able to start the explanation for the unique hues. (It would be good to google unique hues if that isn't a familiar concept). Unique yellow is the qualia of the color looking yellow without any greenness and redness. . It has recently been found that the precise location of the unique hues is slightly dependent on seasons of the year in regions of the world that have different colors (like green). This sort of slow adaptation is understandable by something neurons are well know to do: adaptation. That is the weighting of center and surround of most all neurons as seen in experiments with probes in neurons.

Step 3 is to look for individual differences in color qualia. That would be things like looking for how small differences in things like unique yellow depend on the precise spectrum of the color pigments. There are subtle difference that are linked to the small difference in cone photopigments that can be determined by recent progress in measuring the genetics between different people. This can be done because the specific location of the color genes in our 46 chromosomes are well understood.

So to first order the neural correlates of color qualia (NCCQ) are quite well understood. When I say that there are still important mysteries that is because of things like Benham's top and Land's colors that I mentioned in my previous posting. Those subtle phenomena are important items presently being researched.

Ram: In addition, stimulus dependent signals travel in feed forward (FF) pathways from retina to LGN to V1/V2 to V8 for color, where cognitive feedback (FB) signals meet in reentrant fashion. When FF and FB signals are matched, a specific color

subjective experience (SE) is selected from the embedded long-term memory traces and experienced by the self (SE of subject, 1pp-mental aspect of a state of self-related cortical and subcortical midline structures); 1pp: 1st person perspective. This is further elaborated in (Vimal, 2010c).

Stan

Rlpvimal

Comments: Memory is already a perception. The models of memory based upon the bits/qubits are not complete as these do not deduce perception. Sripad Madhvacharya has explained that memory is not just the past impressions. Memories are also experiences but are not purely and simply the reflections of the *Samskaras*, impressions, feelings or beliefs. They are direct apprehensions of the mind penetrating into the past. Memory resembles perception when we consider the point of immediacy and differs from perception as it refers to past. In this way memory is connected with one's past experiences. Thus Sripad Madhavacharya's position is "Memory is an immediate perception of the past by the mind. [1]"

[1] SHARMA, BNK, Philosophy of Sri Madhvacharya, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1962.

Ram: Thanks for the information related to debate; I was not aware of it. But yes, Achintya Bheda Abheda vada is the latest sub-school of Vedanta that I mentioned before. I have been trying to understand this philosophy that it should have already implemented dual-aspect view. I have been trying to understand if it really did. Are you claiming that it is a version of dual-aspect monism?

We need to define our terms clearly to avoid confusion. How do you define life, consciousness, matter, energy in your framework?

In my view, the well-known equation energy E=mc2=hν (ν is frequency) implies that mass, energy, wavelength and frequency can be expressed one from other and are physical entities. Assuming life or living entities as dual-aspect entities, your argument is consistent more with matter from matter or physical aspect of life from physical aspect of life. These experiments do not prove that matter-in-itself came from consciousness. It is unclear how we can congeal experiences/thoughts into matter-in-itself (not its appearances).

In the extended dual-aspect monism (eDAM, Dvi-Pakṣa Advaita Vedānta) (Vimal, 2008b, 2010c, 2013, 2015f, 2015g), consciousness is defined as: consciousness is the mental aspect of a state of a brain-system or a brain-process from the first person perspective; consciousness has two sub-aspects: conscious function and conscious experience (Vimal, 2010d). Comments are most welcome!

Rām Lakhan Pāndey Vimal, M.S., Ph.D.

Comments: The body is the illusion of self. But the self or the atman is not equal to the Brahman in all respects. Atman is a dependent category and Brahman is the original whole. Consciousness is the very quality of the self. It means the capacity to know. Consciousness takes many shapes like immediacy of perception, understanding, reason, self consciousness, otherness etc. Thinking is found to be contributing to everything. Achintya Bheda Abheda harmonizes the four vaisnava schools viz., *Suddha dvaita samanvaya* (Sripad Madhvacharya - Pure Dualism), *Visista advaita samanvaya* (Sripad Ramanuja Acharya – Qualified Monism), *Suddha* Advaita *samanvaya* (Sripad Vishnuswami – Pure Nondualism), *Dvaita Advaita samanvaya* (Sripad Nimbarka Acharya – Dualism and Nondualism). So it has 10 main points which has been explained by Srila Bhaktivinoda Thakura.

(i) The truth is revealed in the unbroken chain of disciplic succession from the Lord. This relates to epistemology of *Veda shastra*. This reveals: (ii) Sri Hari is the Supreme Absolute Truth. (iii) Sri Hari is the shelter of All Energies, (iv) Sri Hari is the Original Person and He is an ocean of transcendental *Rasa* or Mellows, (v) The living entities are the separated (unity in difference, which is ubiquitous) part and parcel of Sri Hari. The living entities constitutes the marginal energy that lies in the border between Matter and Spirit, (vi) The living entities who are in material plane are under the influence of the external energy which deludes the living entities to think they are made up of matter which they try to measure. But they cannot measure in truth anything. How can we put a number to consciousness for example, (vii) When unalloyed service mood arises and which further develops into transcendental attachment in love of Godhead, then the living entity is completely freed from the delusion arising due to the influence of the external energy, (viii) All substances are simultaneously one and different manifestation of Lord Hari, and Hari is the Substantial Truth of all truths, (ix) Pure and unalloyed dedication called *suddha bhakti* is the process of self realization, (x) Pure Love of Sri Krishna called Krishna-Prema is the object of Service. Service is exclusive. Devotee does not want anything from the Lord but only wants to engage in exclusive service.

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Re: is thought computable? Jan 3

Thought is computable. Where thinking people get hung up is on the whole body responses that are inextricably linked to thought process, such as emotions and the biochemistry of the entire physical self. For example, after frustratingly trying to remember a name that then suddenly appears in your mind following various consciou and unconscious

processes you get a pleasant 'Aha!' feeling. The 'feelings' associated with the mind experienced by our mind-body biocomputer are the infinitely complex elements that are, at present, 'un-computable.'

Have a great talk, Jean-Yves. With feeling.

-- MT

Comments: How can you put a number on thought?

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Re: Idols of the Mind vs. True Reality & Transcendent Consciousness

With salutations and respect to BMP,

In my abstract to Consciousness: Transcendent or Emergent (prepared for the 2016 Science of Consciousness conference), I propose that to argue the transcendent nature of consciousness, one must boldly assume that it transcends everything material - that there is a higher aspect of human consciousness which transcends the material world. My approach is that of engineering physics which seeks underlying mechanisms. Although it may be assumed that human consciousness is physically biologically implemented, a rational foundation for its transcendent nature is advanced. The foundation assumes that our material reality is a part of a pervasive transcendent reality, enabled and augmented by an energetic substratum, in which we humans are immersed through our consciousness. I imagine the substratum - the Mesostratum - as an osmotic energetic interface between the Physiostratum and Superstratum - as explained later.

First, it is postulated that consciousness wave functions and signal modes underlie consciousness. These signals are ostensibly far stranger and more subtle than the electromagnetic waves that dominate the physical world, terrestrial technologies, and cosmic phenomena. Arguably, the best instrument for exploring these signal modes is the human brain/mind, specifically of individuals who possess a singular ability to access and explore the Mesostratum - and their own transcendent consciousness. Although transcendent human consciousness implies a form of immortality, I conclude that this form of immortality is not an implicit in individual consciousness but is shared in a transcendent consciousness Superstratum . . . . just as a drop of water, when returned to the ocean, loses its identity - loses its BMP I-ness.

Departing the Physiostratum, the I-ness of a conscious entity transpirates as a complex attractor wavefunction in the Mesostratum continuum. Ultimately, each I-ness entity dissipates in the Superstratum. By visiting and exploring the Mesostratum, some singular Physiostratum conscious entities may attune to dialogues among I-ness entities - before the I-ness entities are absorbed in the Superstratum and become elements of the One-ness. The dialogues are non-verbal, transcendent, informative, and illuminating: Entity Alef recalls awakening in human form in a habitable portion of the Physiostratum, “I casually strolled along pleasant verdant countrysides teeming with flowers, luxuriating in the fragrance carried by sweet fresh air. I experienced physicality, sentience, and self-awareness. I acutely felt joy and sorrow, which are foreign to the supernal realms of the Superstratum.”

Entity Betu awoke as a bacterium in the intestines of Ted Williams (one of the greatest hitters in baseball history), “All went well until Ted died and was cryogenically preserved. I chose not to await his revival. I feared awakening in a Petri dish amidst agar plates and being subjected to microbiology studies.”

Entity Gaia awoke as a planet, “I enthusiastically engaged in maintaining my biosphere and its inorganic envelope as a self-regulating system maintaining conditions for life and evolution of life forms. I ensured the stability of global temperature, ocean salinity, atmospheric oxygen, and other environmental variables as needed for habitability and comfort. All went well till I was demolished by an asteroid. The Ultimate Entity, the One-ness, awoke and realized the Universe, “I am approachable, infinite, eternal.”

Are the emergence of life, a thoughtful brain, and consciousness perhaps potentiated by phenomena inherent to the cosmic milieu? This life and consciousness-generating activity may involve the emergence of signals devoid of and not requiring a physical network – not any ‘hard wiring’ at all. It can be argued that the life-generating process began spontaneously as random statistical fluctuations of the energetic substratum – which may be taken as identical to the zero-point field (ZPF) – the theoretical substrate which produces an omnipresent quantum foam. Consciousness from Nothingness, Journal of Consciousness Exploration & Research, September 2014.

Joachim Keppler suggests “that the universe is imbued with an all-pervasive substrate of consciousness and explains how the brain shapes this substrate in a causally closed functional chain, thus opening up entirely new perspectives for consciousness research.” (Frontiers in Psychology 4:242, published online Apr 30, 2013) Keppler suggests that fluctuations in the ZPF may provide the fundamental mechanism for consciousness. The essential function of this mechanism is the formation of stable attractors; cohesive dynamic systems with a set of physical properties toward which the systems tend to evolve. When realized physically, the attractor may be a fractal structure known as a strange attractor. According to Keppler, suitable quantum waveform-signal inputs induce a transition to an ordered phase that prompts a

neural network assembly to become an attractor; a pattern of conscious activity.

I posit the mesostratum [essentially the ZPF substrate] in place of ether, which early in the last century was considered a substance that carries light waves (this was disproved and abandoned). It can be demonstrated that light waves, indeed all electromagnetic waves and fields, transpirate in the mesostratum (a hyperspace, not a substance, transcending gravitational physicality by definition). This reality has been staring the physics community in the face since Thomas Young's double slit experiment and the Michelson–Morley interferometer experiment. . . . . One need simply observe that just as Platonic perfect forms and mathematical objects exist, Schrödinger wavefunctions, electron orbitals, probability functions, magnetic fields, electromagnetic waves, light waves, and other such continuumthings exist; and the mesostratum exists and is necessary to subsume them. It is apparent that mesostratum continuumthings like informational signals and mathematical objects transpirate outside and independently of the particulate physiostratum and its discontinuous granular spacetime. . . . The wavefunction evolution [and collapse] scenario [leads to the wave-particle duality idea] . . . The collapse alone is manifest, when a quantumthing suddenly lands in a physiostratum gravitational agglomeration of quantumthings and is observed - is detected/measured [as a quantumthing in an agglomeration of quantumthings, i.e., matter]. Mesostratum: A Signal Transmission Modality, Prespacetime Journal, June 2014.

Best regards to all, Alex Vary

Comments: There are two problems with this idea. Firstly, although quantum physics infers consciousness to collapse the wave function, quantum mechanics is not really a theory about consciousness. It does not even clarify or deduce what consciousness is and how it arises. A theory of consciousness must be able to cover perceptions, understanding and reason. What can be said is that it is thought which contributes to all of these, yet that thought is never explained as a wave or a particle phenomenon. What is the origin of thought, as it is our thoughts that we are closest to, and the world which is so far away from us and which we try to model in terms of waves and particles also requires our thinking and perceiving being for even to come to our knowledge. Thus it seems unreasonable that QM can explain thinking. Secondly the individuality of living entities cannot be denied. It is not merely an illusion. The impersonal philosophy however construes that all particulars are identical to the Universal and the difference is a result of ignorance. But that may be the interpretation of Sankaracharya in his Sariraka Bhasya of Vedanta Sutra. Sripad Madhva Charya countered that philosophy and explained that the particular is not identical to the Universal but is a difference in unity with the Universal. This function of difference in unity, he termed as *visesa* and explained that this *visesa* is ubiquitous. If we deny the unity in difference we deny any knowledge in reality. To know something we require these *visesas*. Therefore the *atman* is not something which is a colorless, attributeless Oneness. Rather the atman is a finite center of consciousness and the individuality of the atman is an eternal truth of the atman. The individuality of atman, which is a finite center of consciousness, is that it cannot possess the contents of the immediacy of perceptions and the thoughts of another individual conscious being. Atman means the self and this implies an otherness also.

References

1. National Center for Biotechnology Information, U.S. National Library of Medicine**.** http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed. 2015.
2. Wikipedia. The free encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org. 2015.
3. Ma H, Yang Y. Turritopsis nutricula. Nature and Science 2010;8(2):15-20. http://www.sciencepub.net/nature/ns0802/03_1279_hongbao_turritopsis_ns0802_15_20.pdf.
4. Ma H, Cherng S. Nature of Life. Life Science Journal 2005;2(1):7 - 15.
5. Ma H. The Nature of Time and Space. Nature and science 2003;1(1):1-11.Nature and science 2007;5(1):81-96.
6. Ma H, Cherng S. *Eternal Life and Stem Cell.* Nature and Science. 2007;5(1):81-96.
7. Ma H, *Chen G.* Stem cell. The Journal of American Science 2005;1(2):90-92.

1/24/2016