

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
To: "Online_Sadhu_Sanga@googlegroups.com" <Online_Sadhu_Sanga@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Re: Einsteins Time Re: SV: [Sadhu Sanga] Consciousness
Date: Wed, 10 Aug 2016 11:52:00 +0000

On board here!

We are microbes on a speck of dust spinning around a minor star in a mindless void in the junkyard of infinity
speculating a Big Bang that was neither big nor banged
It had no location in either space or time

Deepak Chopra
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



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

On Aug 10, 2016, at 7:46 AM, Brad Bartholomew <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Yes I agree too. Spacetime which supposedly creates the curvature of our universe and is supposedly responsible for gravity is calculated by taking the Reimann curvature equations that are valid for 2-D and 3-D spaces and simply plugging in Earthly time as a fourth dimension. Einsteins famous equation actually becomes a 4-D variation of Newtons double differential equation for acceleration in classical mechanics! If that's not "humanizing the universe" I don't know what is. To my knowledge Newton wasn't around at the time of the Big Bang and nor was Reimann so its difficult to understand how there could actually be something called "spacetime" in the true scheme of things.

Kind regards
Brad

On 10 Aug 2016 05:59, "Sudhanshu Yadav" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Rightly said Deepak Sir...!!! We have humanised the whole universe as per our thinking and ideology.

On Tuesday, August 9, 2016, Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Time is an experience and the knowing from that experience based on the rotation of the Earth and its revolution around the sun .

Current theories of time based on cosmological concepts of time make assumptions about the universe in human terms i.e. When we say 13.8 billion years ago the universe began with a Big Bang we are speaking in terms of Earth time .

Hence those theories may be flawed and can be used only in terms of metaphor .

Therefore current models can only be understood as metaphors

We have humanized the universe

Deepak Chopra



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

On Aug 9, 2016, at 1:59 AM, Brad Bartholomew <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hello everyone

I am wondering if anyone can see the flaw in this logic.

Time is the speed the Earth rotates.

Humans have known time for a short while and the universe has been around for a long while.

Ergo the speed the Earth rotates can't bend the universe.

If someone can spot the flaw then Einstein was right. If there is no flaw in this logic then General Relativity is nonsense.

Kind regards

Brad

On 8 Aug 2016 11:34 p.m., "Kari Ross-Berry" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

A little Classical Samkhya, one of the six Hindu Darsanas, might be helpful here in bringing spiritual and scientific knowledge into a better understanding of one another. For those who do not know it it is an enumeration of the manifest and unmanifest cosmology. I've attached a basic chart of the enumeration of Samkhya for anyone who cares to reference it.

In Samkhya, consciousness is called Purusa and is unmanifest, which makes it unique and theoretically separate from manifest nature or Prakriti.

Science operates in the realm of Prakriti or manifest nature entirely. On a basic level science measures, proves, and qualifies. It cannot measure, prove, or qualify anything that is unmanifest. This measuring proving and qualifying are attributes of Ahamkara, or ego. Which is one step up the chain from Manas, or mind, known as the computer of the senses. Here it can only make connections and conjectures.

Science also deals in abstractions, which are based almost completely in this part of the mind called Ahamkara. These abstractions could be attributed to Buddhi, which in the chain of Samkhya, is sometimes called intellect or will. It is important here to note that will is not consciousness in the contemplative spiritual traditions of the East. Here a scientist or spiritual seeker may make a projection based on the knowledge gained in manas and qualified in ahamkara towards a revelation of pure consciousness (Puruasa). Mathematicians, physicists, and yogis work tirelessly here using known equations and practices, and sometimes they develop new ones creating new pathways, as they try to 'prove' or 'realize' these projections or explorations. A teacher who has gone beyond this stage is valuable beyond measure in helping others to overcome one's well worn pathways of thought and action towards a rewiring of the individual.

Another qualification that may be helpful to this conversation is the difference between Advaita Vedanta and Dvaita Vedanta. It is clear that there are those that understand this well in this conversation, and others that may not. Please forgive me if this is too elementary. Advaita Vedanta

believes that there is only one consciousness and that this consciousness, for lack of better language, 'underlies' the entire universe and is the same consciousness that dwells within all of us--a unity of consciousness. Dvaita Vedanta, on the other hand, believes in multiple souls and separates an individual consciousness from the ultimate consciousness which goes by many names.

Classical Samkhya as discussed above is Dvaitist. As is Classical Yoga and the Bhakti movements.

Advaita Vedanta also has a form of Samkhya similar to the Classical version discussed here. In this version Purusa and Prakriti are polarities within a whole rather than separate.

I hope this has been helpful to the Western scientists within this conversation. Or, those that may not have the philosophical background our Eastern sages, philosopher's and scientists grew up with. My intent is to offer up a clearer understanding of what is meant by consciousness in the Contemplative Traditions. I welcome any correction or further depth by those with deeper knowledge on this subject.

When I was a girl of four or five my father, who was an abstract mathematician, told me that $2+2$ rarely equals 4. He told me that anyone who stated otherwise did not understand mathematics.

In my studies of Vedanta I was given the Kena Upanisad which speaks to seekers of knowledge:

'I do not think that I know it well. Nor do I think that I do not know it.

He among us who knows it, knows it and he, too, does not know that he does not know it.

To whomever it is not known, to him it is known.

To whomever it is known, he does not know.

It is not understood by those who understand it.

It is understood by those who do not understand it.