

**From:** Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness  
**Date:** Sat, 06 Aug 2016 10:49:18 +0000

---

Agree re Paul Selig  
Don't know the Sci Foo conference  
All " respected " thinkers are part of a club .  
Your point re reductionist science and locker room motivation is true  
In my opinion science does not explain the scientists desire to unravel the mystery of existence either nor does it explain longing aspiration or the desire to understand truth goodness beauty .  
The highest science is based on mathematical imagination in consciousness . There is no explanation for that either . Why is it so difficult for scientists to acknowledge that without an explanation for mental or perceptual experience we cannot know truth only shifting models that help create technology  
Also 99.9 % of reality is sub empirical and the 0.1 % that is empirical is made of probability waves in mathematical space  
" something unknown is doing we don't know what " Sir Arthur Eddington  
On the train back to Paris  
To NYC tomorrow  
I would have enjoyed your meeting except I'm not part of that club



Deepak Chopra  
[REDACTED]



[\*Super Genes: Unlock the Astonishing Power of Your DNA for Optimum Health and Wellbeing\*](#)

On Aug 6, 2016, at 12:28 PM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

paul selig was amusing no more no less- he was off to give a lecture to 60 housewives in wisconsin ( punishment for his transgressions i guess ).

I do not know if you are aware of the Sci Foo. conference. its the most respected gathering of thinkers. I suggest we do a SCi WOO. , where we invite the scinents to teach and learn as well as the woo woos to do the same. I tell the science guy , that motivating a group of players in the locker room at half time. does not lend itself to reductionism.

I wish you were here today. I am putting together , chomsky, wolfram, hillis negroponti. should be lots of fire works

On Sat, Aug 6, 2016 at 4:25 AM, Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]> wrote:

All experience and knowing of experience is in consciousness . Consciousness has no form and hence has to be non local . Matter as such does not exist . It is an interpretation of a combination of sensations images

feelings and thoughts in consciousness .

Mind /,Body/ Universe are human concepts - of experience and the knowing of experience .

In other words there is only consciousness . The is the monistic Advaita understanding based on exploring consciousness as self awareness .

Deepak Chopra  
2013 Costa Del Mar Road  
Carlsbad, CA 92009



[Super Genes: Unlock the Astonishing Power of Your DNA for Optimum Health and Wellbeing](#)

On Aug 6, 2016, at 9:28 AM, Kalluri Rao <[REDACTED]> wrote:

As per my immature understanding of the subject, One group of thinkers seem to believe that consciousness exists in both living and non living material.

While the other group thinks that consciouness is the property of living only.

KSR

On Tue, Aug 2, 2016 at 5:50 AM, 'Serge Patlavskiy' via Sadhu-Sanga Under the holy association of Spd. B.M. Puri Maharaja, Ph.D. <[REDACTED]> wrote:

[Stephen Jarosek] wrote:

>All I know with certainty is that current interpretations fail to take  
>seriously the implications of entropy and the persistence of  
>complexity across time.

[S.P.] I agree. Therefore I have constructed my own explanatory framework, and I started from scratch for not to repeat the mistakes of others. My integrated information system (a model I use to formalize the object of study) does take into consideration "the implications of entropy", and it helps to cope with complexity of the modeled object. So, I take a professional interest in other persons' "axiomatic assertions" to compare with my own, and I would be much obliged if you send me in private a page or two of the fundamentals of your approach.

Kindly,  
Serge Patlavskiy

---

**From:** Stephen Jarosek <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 2, 2016 12:27 PM  
**Subject:** RE: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness

>"[S.P.] So, what's your "paradigm" -- your set of axiomatic assertions? Where is your "sufficiently complete" model of how the DNA works? How do you know that the existing mainstream interpretation is "incomplete, if not fundamentally broken"? You can know this ONLY by comparing it with your own "more complete" model. Otherwise there is no sense in your words."

For an example of the sort of axiomatic framework that I have in mind, refer to my post of 9 January this year in the thread "RE: Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Paper Refuting Darwinism Published in Journal 'Communicative & Integrative Biology'".

There are other issues that I have to be more specific about, beyond a cursory mention in a list of

axioms. For example, as they relate to entropy and the persistence of complexity across time, as well as pragmatism and Peircean biosemiotics.

I do not have a "sufficiently complete" model of how DNA works, and I make no pretense that I do. I am guessing on DNA (atomic/molecular) entanglement, and in my frustration with the persistence of a broken paradigm that refuses to address the obvious, I am pushing ahead with my own best guess, keeping an open mind. All I know with certainty is that current interpretations fail to take seriously the implications of entropy and the persistence of complexity across time. If it looks like a crock and smells like a crock... Why should we waste our time entertaining a broken paradigm? I don't need to compare it with anything. By contrast, my hunch is motivated by my interest in consistency across principles... it's not just a blind guess informed by woo.

Imagine if Christopher Columbus had stuck with the accepted assumption of a flat world... a broken assumption is a broken assumption, get rid of it, don't even entertain it. Christopher Columbus had to act on his hunch, and a new discovery was made. But he had to rely on funds from the monarchs of Spain to make it happen. Because I have no comparable source of funding, my hunch must remain a hunch until others might accept that it is worth taking a closer look.

>"[S.P.] Our consciousness always constructs a "model of Noumenal Reality" for us. This model is just a model -- it may be as enough close to real state of affairs, but it may also be just an illusion (be too far from real state of affairs). To see whether our model is good or not, we conduct additional experiments, or, even simply, we ask the others: "Do you see what I see?", "Do you hear what I hear?", "Do you have the same research data as I have?", and so on."

You are missing my point. The essential point is that if every last aspect of our **and every other organism's** perception of reality is dependent on experience "wiring brains", then we are locked into this subjectivity, and there is no way of stepping beyond it. And the noumenal reality of space is perhaps the most intransigent. Sharing a cultural consensus has nothing whatsoever to do with objective truth. Sharing in a hallucination does not make anything more real. How culture confines us to subjective cultural experience relates to pragmatism, so you would need to bone up on semiotic theory to appreciate why pragmatism is important... and if you don't want to do that because it does not agree with your mechanistic assumptions, well, I'm not going to teach you.

And as for your trust in experimentation and everyone agreeing with it... confirmation bias... confirming accepted biases is all that you are doing. It contributes nothing to establishing consistency in any framework that hangs together.

>"[S.P.] It is known that to reconstruct the old building requires much more time and resources than to build a new one."

On this much we can definitely agree... but to build a new building, you still need to know what you are doing, you need to be reading all the relevant cues. Drawing the best idea out of a barrel of bad ideas is still a bad idea, so your earlier proposals relating to battling it out in a contest of paradigms (if I remember correctly, from other forums) is definitely not the way to proceed.

cheers, sj

---

**From:** 'Serge Patlavskiy' via Sadhu-Sanga Under the holy association of Spd. B.M. Puri Maharaja, Ph.D.  
[mailto: ]

**Sent:** Monday, 1 August 2016 9:14 AM

**To:** [ ]

**Subject:** Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness

[Stephen Jarosek] wrote:

>We need to establish the right paradigm first

[ ] So, what's your "paradigm" -- your set of axiomatic assertions? Where is your "sufficiently complete" model of how the DNA works? How do you know that the existing mainstream interpretation is "incomplete, if not fundamentally broken"? You can know this **ONLY** by comparing it with your own "more complete" model. Otherwise there is no sense in your words.

[Stephen Jarosek] wrote:

>We must regard our illusions, and therefore our assumptions, with the deepest suspicion

[S.P.] Our consciousness always constructs a "model of Noumenal Reality" for us. This model is just a model -- it may be as enough close to real state of affairs, but it may also be just an illusion (be too far from real state of affairs). To see whether our model is good or not, we conduct additional experiments, or, even simply, we ask the others: "Do you see what I see?", "Do you hear what I hear?", "Do you have the same research data as I have?", and so on.

Best,  
Serge Patlavskiy

---

**From:** Stephen Jarosek [redacted]  
**To:** [redacted]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 29, 2016 1:15 PM  
**Subject:** RE: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness

>"[S.P.]... However, what about the partial problem of the mechanisms of consciousness, namely, the problem of how the physical (sensory) signals become transformed into the elements of subjective experience. How DNA's role may be here? Do you have any model explaining this?"

A sensible question, Serge... but one thing at a time. We know that the existing mainstream interpretation of how DNA works is incomplete, if not fundamentally broken. We need to establish the right paradigm first, and then we might be better placed to enjoy the insights that unfold from there.

>"[S.P.] First, these two atoms are NOT identical, if only because of the fact that they occupy different portions of space."

As I've suggested before in these forums, space is one of the illusions established by virtue of our experiences wiring our neuroplastic brains. Obviously, meteorites and Mac trucks colliding with you are the objective evidence of real consequences thanks to their motion through the reaches of space, with the suggestion that this thing that we call space is indeed "real". But whatever space "really" is, whether or not its reality can be mathematically (or otherwise) understood in any kind of objective sense, ultimately your experience of it can *only* ever be a subjective illusion, and there is no way around that. So don't get too hung up on atoms occupying different portions of space. "In here" versus "over there" is just a part of the space illusion that has conned you into believing the assumptions that you are making... the assumptions based on the experiences that have wired your bucket of bugs. We must regard our illusions, and therefore our assumptions, with the deepest suspicion. Questions of self and identity therefore become relevant, because the notion of self is itself an illusion.

Cheers, sj

---

**From:** 'Serge Patlavskiy' via Sadhu-Sanga Under the holy association of Spd. [redacted]. Puri Maharaja, Ph.D.  
**[mailto: [redacted]]**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 26 July 2016 3:05 PM  
**To:** [redacted]  
**Subject:** Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness

[Stephen Jarosek] wrote:

> I suspect that DNA might be absolutely fundamental to consciousness,

[S.P.] It is an organism as a whole complex system that possesses consciousness. So, the above conclusion, in general, is correct. However, what about the partial problem of the mechanisms of consciousness, namely, the problem of how the physical (sensory) signals become transformed into the elements of subjective experience. How DNA's role may be here? Do you have any model explaining this?

[Stephen Jarosek] wrote:

>Can it be said that two identical atoms are independent "selves",

[S.P.] First, these two atoms are NOT identical, if only because of the fact that they occupy different portions of space. Second, the "self" pertains only to consciousness-possessing organisms. Atoms do not possess consciousness. However, you may disagree (in case your "axiomatic framework" is based on panpsychism).

Best,  
Serge Patlavskiy

--

-----  
Fourth International Conference 'Science and Scientist - 2016'  
August 26 — 27, 2016, Bangalore University  
<http://scsiscs.org/conference/scienceandscientist/2016>

Sponsorship and Donations for Vedanta and Science Dialogue: <http://scienceandscientist.org/donate>

Reply to Gustavo Caetano-Anollés: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19420889.2016.1160191>

Why Biology is Beyond Physical Sciences?: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5923/j.als.20160601.03>

Life and consciousness – The Vedāntic view: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19420889.2015.1085138>

Harmonizer: <http://scienceandscientist.org/harmonizer>

Bhakti Vedanta Institute of Spiritual Culture & Science  
Princeton, NJ, USA: <http://bviscs.org>

Sri Chaitanya Saraswat Institute: <http://scsiscs.org>

Darwin Under Siege: <http://scienceandscientist.org/Darwin>

Online Classes: <http://mahaprabhu.net/satsanga/about/#instructions>

Sadhu-Sanga MP3s: <http://mahaprabhu.net/satsanga>

Contact: <http://scsiscs.org/contact>

---

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Sadhu-Sanga Under the holy association of Spd. [REDACTED]. Puri Maharaja, [REDACTED]." group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to

[REDACTED].  
To post to this group, send email to [REDACTED].

Visit this group at [REDACTED]

For more options, visit [REDACTED]

--

*Knowledge & Information can be communicated, but not wisdom.*

Kalluri Subba Rao, PhD.,D.Sc (IISc), FNA.

--

-----  
Fourth International Conference 'Science and Scientist - 2016'  
August 26 — 27, 2016, Bangalore University  
<http://scsiscs.org/conference/scienceandscientist/2016>

Sponsorship and Donations for Vedanta and Science Dialogue: <http://scienceandscientist.org/donate>

Reply to Gustavo Caetano-Anollés: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19420889.2016.1160191>

Why Biology is Beyond Physical Sciences?: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5923/j.als.20160601.03>

Life and consciousness – The Vedāntic view: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19420889.2015.1085138>

Harmonizer: <http://scienceandscientist.org/harmonizer>

Bhakti Vedanta Institute of Spiritual Culture & Science  
Princeton, NJ, USA: <http://bviscs.org>

Sri Chaitanya Saraswat Institute: <http://scsiscs.org>

Darwin Under Siege: <http://scienceandscientist.org/Darwin>

Online Classes: <http://mahaprabhu.net/satsanga/about/#instructions>

Sadhu-Sanga MP3s: <http://mahaprabhu.net/satsanga>

Contact: <http://scsiscs.org/contact>

---

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Sadhu-Sanga Under the holy association of Spd. B.M. Puri Maharaja, Ph.D." group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to [Online\\_Sadhu\\_Sanga+](mailto:Online_Sadhu_Sanga+)

[\[REDACTED\]](mailto:).

To post to this group, send email to [\[REDACTED\]](mailto:).

Visit this group at [\[REDACTED\]](http://)

For more options, visit [\[REDACTED\]](http://)

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved