

**A similar unifying analysis and modeling of the various schools of the Vedic philosophy and Tony Nader the present leader of Transcendental meditation**

Bhaktivijnana Muni, PhD

[bvm@scsiscs.org](mailto:bvm@scsiscs.org)

[Online\\_Sadhu\\_Sanga@googlegroups.com](http://Online_Sadhu_Sanga@googlegroups.com)

**Abstract:** I am very impressed by the work you have done and I think it is a step in the right direction. But it will take me some time to read it properly. Maharishis Mahesh Yogi has attempted a similar unifying analysis and modeling of the various schools of the Vedic philosophy and Tony Nader the present leader of Transcendental meditation. How do we exchange about these kinds of knowledge in a way that will improve the quality of these works. Nobody can be precise and consistent all the way through such huge amounts of very different kinds of knowledge. We need conferences and journals to discuss and improve on these huge transdisciplinary knowledge systems and finds way to make East and West meet.

[Bhaktivijnana Muni. **A similar unifying analysis and modeling of the various schools of the Vedic philosophy and Tony Nader the present leader of Transcendental meditation.** *Rep Opinion* 2016;8(2):88-95]. ISSN 1553-9873 (print); ISSN 2375-7205 (online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/report>. 8. doi:[10.7537/marsroj08021608](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsroj08021608).

**Keywords:** Maharishis Mahesh Yogi; modeling; Vedic philosophy; transdisciplinary; knowledge; system

I am very impressed by the work you have done and I think it is a step in the right direction. But it will take me some time to read it properly. Maharishis Mahesh Yogi has attempted a similar unifying analysis and modeling of the various schools of the Vedic philosophy and Tony Nader the present leader of Transcendental meditation [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tony\\_Nader#cite\\_note-32](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tony_Nader#cite_note-32) has written a book relating it to scientific neurophysiology, Human Physiology: Expression of Veda and the Vedic Literature (ISBN 9788175230170)[4], which is extremely interesting but also very difficult to evaluate. How do we exchange about these kinds of knowledge in a way that will improve the quality of these works. Nobody can be precise and consistent all the way through such huge amounts of very different kinds of knowledge. We need conferences and journals to discuss and improve on these huge transdisciplinary knowledge systems and finds way to make East and West meet. The Consciousness conference in Tucson in April is one of those institutions created to make it possible. But we might need others. Dr. Allan Leslie Combs is developing a Consciousness Studies PhD program at the California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS) <http://www.theepochtimes.com/n3/1265972-a-place-for-consciousness-studies-in-academia-professor-helps-pave-the-way/> and Dr. Combs is president and founder of the Society for Consciousness Studies, which now has 150 expert members including Deepak Chopra. Sincerely,

Soren Brier

**Comments:** Our institute is organizing an annual conference series entitled, *Science and Scientist* just to explore this kind of most important exchange. Our emphasis to encourage both the Eastern and the Western Intellect as well as Philosophy in the light of advancements of Modern Science especially in Biology, QM and other fields for a lasting good for all human beings and all life. Your advice for taking such an initiative is highly appreciated.

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 18

Dear Lee,

I can't remember how I got added or when I elected to be a lurker in this conversation, but you are doing an amazing job with what seems to be a teaching moment. If you have a moment, could you clue me in to what the others are bringing to this conversation? Are they interested in bridging the humanities and natural sciences, or just in attempting to refute evolutionary theory (and empirical observations)?

If you don't have a moment, I understand and I'll just keep lurking, or get off! BTW I am an evolutionary ecologist. Many thanks.

Les Kaufman, Professor of Biology, Boston University Marine Program and Marine Conservation Fellow

**Comments:** We focus on the advancements in Science that is positing a less mechanistic concept of nature and life. The forum is based on a scientific understanding and presentation of these developments

for the benefit of all. Additionally the cognitive concepts that are emerging from within biology and other subjects like QM, where Reality is described as inseparable from the observer dependent knowledge are discussed. Additionally semiotics, philosophical topics focusing on the question of origin of life and universe, its ontology and epistemology are also welcome.

-----

SV: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative Biology' Jan 18.

Dear Basudeba

I do not question the Veda's themselves, like I do not question the Bible if I am criticizing the Jehovah's witnesses interpretation of it; but I ask how do we handle all the different interpretations in a knowledge-improving way that is compatible with out scientific and philosophical traditions? In all parts of the world we have had wars over the interpretation of texts that some organization declares to be holy. And I complain about that each interpretation seems to only mention its own interpretation as the actual and only content of the texts and do not discuss its interpretation in relation to other interpretations. Warm greetings.

Søren Brier

Not Christian or Jew or Muslim, not Hindu, Buddhist, Sufi, or Zen. Not any religion or cultural system. I am not from the east or the west, not out of the ocean or up from the ground, not natural or ethereal, not composed of elements at all. I do not exist, am not an entity in this world or the next, did not descend from Adam and Eve or any origin story. My place is the placeless, a trace of the traceless. Neither body or soul. I belong to the beloved, have seen the two worlds as one and that one call to and know, first, last, outer, inner, only that breath breathing human being. jلالuddin rumi.

**Comments:** Modern Science has been a blessing to mankind in many ways. All religions contain truth although we may have differences in language and some other details. By a comparative analysis, we can appreciate these truths according to the degree of insight being provided. The rational approach is therefore to harmonize all these different systems of knowledge for the common good of all. This has been the focus of this initiative.

-----

SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 18

Dear Jo

I am primarily worried about how we deal with all the different interpretations in a fruitful and synergetic way. I do agree that a metaphysics for a unified world in which science is possible we do need a non-dual ontological concept describing what reality is made of. Ray Bhaskar – with his English-Indian background – did a lot of work on this the last 10 years of his life with a row of books. Sincerely,

Søren Brier

**Comments:** By respectfully sharing ideas and accepting what is the best presentation and harmonizing everything in terms of this. At the same time there are different angles of vision. Different authorities explain the truth from slightly different angles of vision. But that is a beauty of the higher truth and there is also a harmony among these. Existence of different branches of science is not a problem. Rather it is its beauty. Similarly existence of different religious systems is not a problem rather it nourishes the humankind. They address different persons in different stages of thinking. So one has to be first a student of the great authorities and then by applying the knowledge that he has received he should apply it in his actual field of work. In this way one can dive deep into reality and excavate gems and pearls of wisdom and share that with others without any external desire. And that process is so nice that the process itself will give satisfaction and all solutions as one makes more and more progress in the path.

-----

Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative Biology' Jan 18

Dear all,

I follow these mails with a bit of uneasiness that some learned opinions are directed towards a point to disprove the established methodologies of science 'to search reason ' a long thought process towards the possibilities of experimental observations and other courses to add to the existing knowledge. While Vedic vocalists ( who prefers to add word like 'science' to say' vedic science' ) starts from a thought process alone. Since observations ( reality) are apparent and certainty is an elusive "maya" one, should we accept the vedantic view without a procedure? I disagree with Dr. Brier when he says " science is a very imperfect tool for the search of knowledge..."

The debate can continue endless but evolution took stages to life..speech . discovery of senses....memory...logic... hypothesis...theory or further logic and development. Sincerely,

S.K. Adhikari , Ph.D

**Comments:** The Vedantic method is based on evidence. There are 3 kinds of evidence. (i) Direct sense perception (*pratyaksha*), inference (*anumana*) and Revealed Knowledge (*Sabda Brahman*). Scientific knowledge is based upon (i) and (ii) and does not include (iii). But the Vedantic system urges us to see the Reality based upon the hints provided in (iii) and utilize (i) and (ii) to form valid knowledge about the objects of inquiry. Secondly the world of our perception is not an illusion. It is also Real but it is temporary. We all (Vedantists or Scientists) do take the advice of doctors when we are having a medical problem. But when we come to deal with more fundamental problems regarding origination, consciousness etc we think that we can solve the problem on our own. But scientists regularly indicate that consciousness is different problem because consciousness implies a subject who is his own object at the same time. Scientists from AI, Consciousness, Physics, Biology and Mathematics are struggling for solutions to these problems and many have respect for the profound wisdom of Vedantic learning. Example is Schrödinger. Our position is that because of the advancements in science, we are in a better position to appreciate the Vedantic wisdom. Vedantic wisdom tells us to be humble and develop the rational and further the more spiritual process of inquiry about the Self, World and God. And that is exactly what is being encouraged here with humility. Thus science also must become a humble process and accept to broaden its epistemological systems so that it can develop a rational concept of Reality with which every sincere inquirer is faced with.

-----

Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 18

Dear Jo, Alfredo, and Søren,

Thanks for the comments. It seems that there are many meanings assigned to terms, such as consciousness (over 40 meanings as elaborated in (Vimal, 2009f)), life, God, Soul, Ghost, and so on. To have a useful discussion, let us first list various meanings assigned to the terms 'God' and 'Soul'. Please edit the following if I misquoted and incorrectly paraphrased.

Meanings assigned to the term 'God':

1. Edwards: God is the totality of reasons for everything ((Leibnitz (Edwards, 2014)), where reasons are NOT creations of conscious systems. Those reasons do not require anything to have a concept of them for them to exist. If all subjectivity were erased from nature, there would be no totality of reasons because there would be nothing (like experience) to have any reasons for.

2. Pereira: God is the totality of reasons for everything, where reasons are creations of conscious systems. In other words, God is an intentional conscious entity. If all consciousness was erased from Nature, God would cease to exist too. One single God for science and all religions.

3. Brier: We do need a non-dual ontological concept describing what reality is made of.

4. The eDAM framework: A state of God/Brahman has inseparable mental and physical aspects. The degree of manifestation of aspects varies with the level of entities and contexts. The aspects of unmanifested state of Brahman are latent. For further detail, please see (Vimal, 2012b, 2012c).

Meanings assigned to the term 'Soul':

1. Edwards and Pereira: A soul is whatever an observer really is. Without observers we have nothing by which to define physical dynamics.

2. The eDAM framework: The soul/self is a manifestation of Brahman. The degrees of manifestation of both physical and mental aspects at wakeful conscious state are very high as elaborated in (Vimal, 2013). If soul exists after death (theist version), the degree of manifestation of mental aspect soul is very high and that of physical aspect is latent; in dead body, it is other way around, that of mental aspect is latent and that of physical aspect is very high. For further details, please see (Vimal, 2012b, 2012c). Regards,

Rām Lakhan Pāndey Vimal, M.S., Ph.D.

**Comments:** Hegel gave a definition of God as Reality is by itself and for Itself. That is God is both the Substantial Truth of Reality and at The Same Time He is the Original Person and everything exists for His satisfaction.

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative Biology' (show original) Jan 18

Dear all

Forces Against Natural Selection

Another paper, this one in PNAS, seems discouraging to believers in evolutionary theory. A team of Harvard biologists found that numerous forces act to counteract variation and selection. What's "the fate of a mutation in a fluctuating environment"? It's not good, if evolutionists want to hope that a rare beneficial mutation will get established and lead to a new structure or function. The reason is that the environment fluctuates. A beneficial mutation in one environment may become deleterious when the environment changes:

Evolution in variable environments depends crucially on the fates of new mutations in the face of fluctuating selection pressures. In constant environments, the relationship between the selective effect of a mutation and the probability that it will eventually fix or go extinct is well understood. However, our understanding of fixation probabilities in fluctuating environmental conditions is limited. Here, we show that temporal fluctuations in environmental conditions can have dramatic effects on the fate of each new mutation, reducing the efficiency of natural selection and increasing the fixation probability of all mutations, including those that are strongly deleterious on average. This makes it difficult for a population to maintain specialist adaptations, even if their benefits outweigh their costs.

They claim that selection is “well understood” for “constant environments.” How many environments, though, are constant? The world is always changing, especially when geologic ages are assumed. Continents get subducted, volcanoes erupt, climate changes, and major extinctions occur. At large scales, therefore, every environment fluctuates. If any rare, beneficial mutations try to get fixed, so as to “maintain specialist adaptations,” they are like blind swimmers trying to reach a target in cross currents and rip tides. More likely, harmful or neutral mutations will get fixed, reducing fitness.

We find that even in enormous populations, natural selection is often very inefficient at distinguishing between mutations that are beneficial and deleterious on average. In addition, substitution rates of all mutations are dramatically increased by variable selection pressures. This can lead to counterintuitive results. For instance, mutations that result in a trade-off but are predominantly deleterious during their lifetime can be much more likely to fix than mutations that are always neutral or even beneficial.

Readers should note that neutral drift is the enemy of natural selection. As their paper indicates, selection is blind to goodness and badness of mutations; what gets fixed in the genome is just what happens in a dynamic environment (see Stuff Happens Law). Another enemy is pleiotropy: the tendency of a beneficial mutation to have harmful effects elsewhere in the genome. It was hard enough for natural selection to achieve macroevolutionary progress without these “counterintuitive results.”

This theoretical paper, math and all, offers little hope for classical mutation-selection theory. Do the authors provide any example of an actual, observable

mutation that produced a clear increase in fitness in any organism? No.

- See more at: <http://crev.info/2015/08/more-flaws-in-darwins-mechanism/#sthash.pm5gh7Lr.dpuf>

Avadhuta

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 19

Lee and Bhakti Niskama Shanta,

Could both of you clarify what you mean by the word "equations". For the fitness calculation I don't think equations are needed. I very highly recommend having a look at Feynman's QED book where he shows how to do calculations without equations. He uses things like how the Mayans did their math with rocks. Kind of like how to build a bridge with dumb brick and no human intervention.

Sklein

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 19

Hi Stan,

Nothing I'm trying to say has anything specific to do with physics. But if you give a genetic programming system a table of data that lists corresponding values of energy and mass, and you ask it to find an equation that expresses one in terms of the other, and primitives that include squaring or even just multiplication, and especially if you give it the value for  $c$ , then it will surely find  $e=mc^2$ , probably very quickly. If you don't give it  $c$  then it will have to invent that as a combination of the primitive numbers and operations that it has, which may take a while, depending on the primitives you give it ( $c$  is big!), but it may still find it eventually.

-Lee

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 19

Actually, you need to support your claim. In my opinion, the neo-Darwinian synthesis is a very good working hypothesis, although in need of further development and improvement. What is your alternative suggestion?

Burt

**Comments:** Neo Darwinism underestimates the complexity of the situation. We have to first realize

the statement of the problem adequately. We need a science of sentience and concept of species in terms of sentience that will include subjective terms like mind, desire, choice etc. From our Vedantic Point of view, two perfect axiomatic structures are offered that can be empirically verified:

- (i) Life comes from Life, and
- (ii) Matter comes from Life

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 19

Respected Sir (Dr. Søren Brier ),

One disturbing thing we find here is the emphasis on personalities - who said what - and defending one's view even when we are talking about the same thing in different languages. We should be more worried about finding the TRUTH - which description corresponds to reality beyond spatio-temporal inhibitions. We may find that each one is describing reality partially. The need is unification of harmonising views and not insistence on division. Problems multiply by division. Hope you agree. Regards,

Basudeba

-----

SV: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 19

Dear Basudeba

Then it is a problem when one party claims to hold the books that contain the objective truth. It is even more problematic if they claim that it is self-interpretating. Sincerely

Søren Brier

-----

Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 19

Dear Alfredo,

For me a reason in this context is not an idea, although we use the word to mean an idea also in other contexts. Leibniz's writing seems odd at first because he seems to make both meanings the same. But I think this reflects our prejudices rather than his writing. I see a reason as some form of generalized type of causal relation or disposition to causal relation. Why does the sun shine - because when hydrogen is converted to helium energy is emitted. That is the reason and it would be the reason if there were no chemists. There would be no chemists with an idea of that reason that in common parlance can be given as 'a reason' in class. But we are not concerned with that.

I have been reading the excellent Stanford Encyclopedia analysis of Kant's views on space and time and it strikes me that a lot of confusion arose because people like Kant wanted to shoehorn seventeenth century thinking into a word straightjacket owing much to Aristotle. Kant completely misses the point of the complex layers of concept that Leibniz is handling with polysemic terms like space and reason.

And I do not think praying has anything to do with the sort of God I am proposing. Praying is for intervention - calling for some deviation from what is seen as an otherwise mercilessly mechanical progress of the world. But Leibniz's God is not that God. His perfection is in the regularity of the progress of his world - his physics. Asking God to turn down the heat with the helium production is not what God is there for. We can deny the existence of a God of intervention and not be atheists. I never pray but I wonder at the richness of the world that is how it is because of the ultimate reasons that govern it.

Jo

**Comment:** You are correct when you say that God is not for praying to Him to intervene and solve our problems. Although, that can also be admitted. Ultimately God is to be prayed to for His mercy so that we can become the servants of His servants. That is the meaning of God and all are His servants. Therefore science, philosophy and religion everything can be used for His Service. The arrangement is Perfect. The environment is also a *de facto* manifestation of God. So we can't complain. But only our attitude needs to be adjusted into serving temperament.

-----

Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 19

Dear Alfredo,

When I said: I see a reason as some form of generalised type of causal relation or disposition to causal relation. I was choosing my words very carefully. A reason is not a cause. I think Leibniz had that clear. A (if you like token) reason is not a token cause, or instance of causation. It is more like a type of causal relation - something people might call a universal, but I think that takes one down the wrong route too. I do not think one should try to shoehorn these concepts into Aristotle - as you are very definitely trying to do! Token reasons are at no particular place or time, whereas tokens of all the four cause types are.

Jo

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 19

Dear Bhakti Niskama Shanta,

You seem to think that if variation and selection can produce new and significant things, then this somehow lowers the status of humans. I prefer to see it as raising the status of variation and selection.

In any event, how we feel about this does not alter the fact that variation and selection can produce new and significant things. Whether we call this "creativity" is another interesting question, and I don't think I've made any explicit claims about that here. That said, I do suspect that if we were to show unbiased people some of the results produced by evolutionary computation, without telling them how the results were produced, that many of them would say that the source of those results has exhibited creativity.

-Lee

-----

Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism  
Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative  
Biology' Jan 20

On behalf of of evolutionary biologists everywhere (or not), allow me to express my astonishment at this series of sentences:

The reason we are placing so much emphasis upon this rather mundane or earthly issue of evolution is because it is the main obstacle for bringing science and religion into harmony in today's world. This problem is going unrecognized by most scientists. Religion [consciousness of God] is essentially rational, conceiving that it is necessary for Nature to be rational or a system of necessary laws because it has a rational creator. It is this rational essence of religion that has given rise to science as a rational system of knowledge. Atheists were quite content to think that things just happen. Thus we find in history that religious or theistically inclined persons were most influential in the creation of science. Evolution is based on a foundation of non-rational chance and the oblivion of reason drowned in the dark obscurity of millions or billions of years or thousands or millions of iterations. Selection comes as an uncomprehended magical wand that helps randomness along without understanding in the least of the real significance of what selection must actually imply - an entelechial guiding idea or concept.

Science expects that religion should be open to its theory of evolution, but religion should respectfully deny that request on the basis that evolution is not science. Religion and science are supremely compatible, but not with a pseudo-science such as

evolution. True religion is bringing science back from the suicidal cliff of going off into the world of imaginary 'sugar plums dancing in their heads' and leaving reality behind. Its admonitions are meant to promote science not to diminish it. A re-discovery of actual science is needed, and this requires disposing of the theory of evolution, as was done with the theory of phlogiston, into the dustbin of history. The majority is wrong. The abdication of real science to evolution has to be rejected - a regime change is needed. This problem has to be addressed first, then the harmony of science and religion can be effectively addressed IMHO.

TO ANNOTATE:

Religion [consciousness of God]: MY SENSE IS THAT VERY FEW DISCIPLINES (INCLUDING PHILOSOPHY, SOCIOLOGY ANTHROPOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, EPISTEMOLOGY, ECOLOGY, SOCIOBIOLOGY, YOU NAME IT) WOULD EQUATE RELIGION WITH CONSCIOUSNESS OF GOD.

Religion [consciousness of God] is essentially rational: WHERE IS THERE ROOM FOR ANY 'RATIONAL' DEBATE AFTER THIS STATEMENT?

Atheists were quite content to think that things just happen: A CARICATURE. WHERE IS THE ROOM FOR DEBATE?

Evolution is based on a foundation of non-rational chance: AGAIN, A CARICATURE. WHERE IS THE ROOM FOR DEBATE?

THE REST IS POETIC - I ENJOYED READING IT - BUT WHERE DOES IT GO BEYOND RHETORIC. I THINK ALL SELF RESPECTING BIOLOGISTS / SCIENTISTS ACCEPT THAT WE HAVE MUCH TO LEARN ABOUT MECHANISMS, BUT ELOQUENT LANGUAGE IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR EVIDENCE NO ? AND AS MUCH AS EVOLUTION IS ACCUSED OF LACK OF EVIDENCE THERE IS EVEN LESS EVIDENCE FOR ANYTHING ELSE. HAVING SAID THAT, THERE IS PRETTY GOOD EVIDENCE FOR THE DEFAMED (ON THIS LIST ONLY) EVOLUTION.

QUESTION: DO WE BELIEVE IN CLIMATE CHANGE OR IS THAT A FICTION TOO ? DOES THE EARTH REVOLVE AROUND THE SUN ? JUST TWO QUESTIONS TO WHICH THE ANSWERS DERIVE FROM EXACTLY THE SAME PRINCIPLES THAT OUR INFERENCES AROUND EVOLUTION DO.

Its interesting though that our views of each other as irrational are pretty well matched. Perhaps we should stop arguing and let this sort itself out over the centuries.

best

Kartik

**Comment:** Problems of Science and Philosophy are not solved by ignoring them.

-----  
Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 20

Dear Jonathan, please explain more clearly. Is God a type of causal relation? I tried to understand this concept, but was not able to. In Aristotle God is the Final Cause, the First Mover. From Aubenque's interpretation, the Final Cause is an object of desire of human consciousness. We project into God our ideals of perfection, and then we use this projection to transform ourselves and the world into that direction. Best,

Alfredo

-----  
Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 20

Dear Alfredo,

This is very interesting. Thanks. I agree: (i) our existence in the spatiotemporal region cannot be erased, and (ii) whatever we publish in reviewed journals, good or bad work we do, God as socio-cultural entity/concept and so on might remain if opponents do not destroy them.

What I am referring to simple mundane concept of death: what happened to our dead relatives' souls? Theists have different views about souls after death; for example, as elaborated in Garuda-Purana, which priests read to family members during post-death ceremony in Hinduism. You may like to read it; it is interesting and let me know you still like me to put it in theist version. Regards,

Rām Lakhān Pāndey Vimal, M.S., Ph.D.

-----  
Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Possibility, Imagination and Conception / World Journal of Pictorial Philosophy Jan 20

Respected Prof. Jean-Yves Beziau

Thanks a lot for such excellent way of looking at logic. I am also very much interested in these types of logic systems. Actually I am Dr. Surendra Singh Pokharna from India and was a senior scientist at Indian Space Research Organization. Recently we constituted a group to discuss the problem of consciousness and have arranged a series of lectures on this topic. As a part of this series, we have also written a paper dealing with meaning of truth, logic and consciousness etc. It includes a system of logic available in ancient Jainism. It is known as Anekantvada and Syadvada, means multiple and contradictory ways of looking at reality. A seven fold way of logic is very popular to describe the truth and

multiple aspects of reality. Its application in quantum physics is given below:

- May be Electron is a wave.
- May be Electron is not a wave ( but a particle).
- May be Electron is both a wave (and a particle).
- May be Electron is indeterminate.
- May be Electron is a wave and is indeterminate.
- May be Electron is not a wave and is indeterminate.
- May be Electron is wave, and is not wave (particle) and is not determinate.

I am enclosing this paper. It was written by me and my senior colleague Dr. Narendra Bhandari, who is a world renowned scientist. I request you to find some time from your tight time schedule to go through it critically and give your kind comments. Best regards  
Surendra Pokharna

**Comments:** Reality exists as possibilities. We will find what we look for. It depends upon our angle of vision. For example if we design an experiment for locating a particle, we will get particle idea (Compton's scattering experiment) and if we search for wave, we will get wave (double slit experiment). Non-locality has been shown in QM at the subatomic level. Hence in the Vedantic concept, consciousness is foundational and it cannot be manufactured from waves and particles. Rather waves and particles are the contents of consciousness.

-----  
Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 20

Dear Ram:

I consider all religious texts as metaphors of reality; they should not be taken literally by serious philosophers. I would put myself in the agnostic category, in the sense that I do not take the religious messages literally. However, I do not consider myself atheist. I am Catholic, but without attachment to the dogmas of the Church(es).

My concept of God is close to the concept of the Holy Spirit (one that is instantiated when people share feelings and ethical values for a better world. There is a Greek word for such a "meeting of feelings", the "Agape"). I think this idea can be applied to all religions. Best,

Alfredo

**Comments:** Everyone is evolving into a higher system of thought and you are no exception. Your stage is one stage of human life. When you become more rational you will be able to harmonize the scriptures in your own heart and by practical applications. We should

take the direct meaning of Vedantic literature and avoid indirect meanings or our own interpretations.

-----  
Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 20

Dear Alfredo and Jo, Thanks.

Alfredo: My concept of God is close to the concept of the Holy Spirit (one that is instantiated when people share feelings and ethical values for a better world).

Ram: Does your concept of God imply that when we all (living entities, especially humans) are dead then your God is also dead because there will be no one to share feelings and ethical values?

Jo: God is the totality of reasons for everything [both living and no-living entities].

Ram: If Alfredo's God is dead than your God will still be alive for non-living entities: is this correct Jo?

Alfredo: There is a philosophical issue about the concept of death. If we think in terms of the space-time in general relativity, what happens in a region of the space-time will always be there. With death, the (living) system cannot carry its activities along the space-time cone, but his/her existence in the region it happened cannot be erased. Another issue is that the death of one individual does not eliminate God as a socio-cultural entity.

Ram: The theist-atheist phenomenon seems to be genetic and/or acquired, which is discussed in (Vimal, 2012c). Therefore, the eDAM (the extended dual-aspect monism (Dvi-Pakṣa Advaita Vedānta: (Vimal, 2008b, 2010c, 2013, 2015f, 2015g) has two versions one for atheists/scientists and another for theists. In scientific (atheist) version, when we are dead, our all four states are also dead, so self (1st three states) and the "God" defined as the 4th state (very high manifestation of both aspects of Brahman) are also dead like the dead body, i.e., transformed into high degree of physical aspect and latent (zero degree) mental aspect in the dead body; this is also called merging into Brahman. In theist, soul (if it exists, so far no scientific evidence!) acquires subtle body and follows what Garuda-Purana metaphorically proposes. Regards.

Rām Lakhan Pāndey Vimal, M.S., Ph.D.

-----  
Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga]: Status of Vedānta Jan 21

Dear Ram:

Ram: Does your concept of God imply that when we all (living entities, especially humans) are dead then your God is also dead because there will be no one to share feelings and ethical values?

Alfredo: In this case God also dies as an actual entity, but remains a potentiality for other beings. This kind of event already happened with native populations that disappeared.

alfredo.pereira.

**Comment:** This is for Ram to answer. But God in Vedantic view is not a construct of Human mind. He exists by Himself. He is the Absolute Unconditioned. Therefore He is the Independent being. All other beings are dependent on His being for their being. Therefore God is the life of all life. He is the consciousness of all consciousness. Death is the negation of life. Life instantiates itself in the form of an individual. But the independence to exist in some form is being negated by Reality. Thereby Reality is above the individual living entities. God is not dependent on us. But when we recognize His position and serve Him, then we can get the purpose and fulfillment of existence, because our position is a dependent position as servants.

-----  
Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative Biology' Jan 21.

Dear Bhakti Niskama Shanta,

As an interested observer of this dialogue, I have seen honest attempts to engage with unfamiliar ideas, and visible frustration when the clash between different perspectives seems unresolvable.

#### References

1. Google. <http://www.google.com>. 2016
2. Ma H, Cherg S. Nature of Life. Life Science Journal 2005;2(1):7 - 15.
3. Ma H. The Nature of Time and Space. Nature and science 2003;1(1):1-11. Nature and science 2007;5(1):81-96.
4. National Center for Biotechnology Information, U.S. National Library of Medicine. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed>. 2015.
5. Wikipedia. The free encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org>. 2015.

2/24/2016