

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness
Date: Sat, 06 Aug 2016 08:25:33 +0000

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 consciousness 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: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness

[Stephen Jarosek] wrote:
>We need to establish the right paradigm first

[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.

[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. B.M. 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. B.M. Puri Maharaja, Ph.D." 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., [REDACTED] (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

[REDACTED].

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

Visit this group at [REDACTED]

For more options, visit [REDACTED]