

From: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Proposal for a psi experiment
Date: Sat, 13 Aug 2016 16:54:08 +0000

Why did they invent ? Offense and defense ?

On Saturday, 13 August 2016, Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Reality = Existence (that which exists) = Awareness = Being

We are a species of awareness

as are dogs cats insects and all sentient beings with their (within species) shared perceptual experiences .

There is cross species leakage although we have no access to the inner experience of other species .

Fundamental reality is transpersonal and trans species - pure awareness the common ground of all being

Humans invented language - linguistic and now scientific and mathematical - symbols to communicate

experience and knowing of experience - thus creating an " objective " reality from shared inter subjectivity .

Deepak Chopra
[REDACTED]

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

On Aug 13, 2016, at 9:37 AM, Michelle Kathryn McGee <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Do you make distinctions between:

reality and existence?

subtle reality and overt or shared reality?

On Sat, Aug 13, 2016 at 9:53 AM, Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]> wrote:

99.9 and more of reality is sub empirical

That which is empirical is an expression of probability waves that exist in mathematical imagination.

There is no known "physical " basis for imagination, cognition or imagination. All we have left is model making in consciousness

Reality is not and cannot be a system of thought--religious, theological, scientific, or mathematical. Reality can only be the very source of thought -the consciousness from which sensations, images , feelings and thoughts arise and into which they subside


[The Chopra Foundation](#)



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

From: Michelle Kathryn McGee < >

Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2016 8:27:18 AM

To: Henry Stapp

Cc: Wolfgang Baer; Stanley A. KLEIN; Dean Radin; Deepak Chopra; Brian Josephson; Christopher Cochran; David Kaiser; Jim Johnston;  ; Bernard Carr; Stuart R - (hameroff) Hameroff; John Horgan; George Johnson; Paul Zielinski; C Langan

Subject: Re: Proposal for a psi experiment

Dear Henry,

You say,
[a critical experiment that can remove part of that doubt and confusion.](#)

I agree that's true for the doubt and confusion among theoretical physicists and as such would be a useful exercise. I also suggest it's appropriate to embrace belief without proof, something most young scientists are quite comfortable doing in relation to various mentors' guiding projects. I'm not at all opposed to seeing it funded, I just don't think the value of such questions should be contingent on funding.

You also emphasize the following - to
[falsify the physicalist philosophy that now dominates mainstream neuroscience and biology](#)

I'm not sure I believe that resistance to such change is without merit. Replacing conceptual doubt and confusion with the sort of darkness of immateriality carries the risk of pulling the rest of science into theoretical physics' existential crisis. I wrote the brief essay "Metaphysical Yoga" 6 years ago -- when the crisis was still afoot...

<http://healinggeneration.com/hiddenblog/metaphysical-yoga/>

I'm not a physicalist, nor whatever you call its opposite. I advocate an intermediate position as more plausible and meaningful, that things are not completely material nor completely immaterial. Again, re:

other scientific fields -- positing that they take up the oppositional stance (not physicalist) has to be appreciated as risky while physics itself is in crisis.

I very much appreciate one view I heard you express at FoM, if I understood correctly, that QM is not all of reality but how mind can conceive Mind. Whether intended or not, I take that to mean that the importance of QM is not as a physical mechanism but a complex process model. That also corresponds to why you would see it as essential for neuroscience to open its physicalist doors. I like this application of QM precisely because it combines routines and abstractions *independent of beliefs* (my guess as to why Deepak doesn't like QM). In such an approach, the beliefs of individuals are made moot. Such a model of mind is uniquely belief-neutral, which has a useful place, for example in understanding ideal scientific inquiry. How it might give rise to idealizations of brain functioning and conscious awareness are fascinating questions.

- michelle

On Sat, Aug 13, 2016 at 5:45 AM, Henry Stapp <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Michelle,

You say that

"One 'remedy' is to remove the fuel from the fires of infighting -- which demands acts of doubt and confusion in place of resignation or even despair. Anything that causes a fight and requires despair does not belong in an ultimate reality debate."

But better than (and subsequent to) "acts of doubt and confusion" is the act of performing a critical experiment that can

remove part of that doubt and confusion. That is the method of science. Unfortunately, a critical experiment that could

directly and immediately falsify the physicalist philosophy that now dominates mainstream neuroscience and biology

[but that has provided no clue as to how consciousness could possibly arise from the physically described activities of the brain, as required by that philosophy (Popper's Promissory Materialism)]

is not being mounted, due to lack of funding.

So infighting and resignation persist! Truth remains veiled. Economics rules!

Henry

From: Michelle Kathryn McGee [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 6:05 PM
To: Wolfgang Baer
Cc: Stanley A. KLEIN; Dean Radin; Deepak Chopra; Brian Josephson; Henry Stapp; Christopher Cochran; David Kaiser; Jim Johnston; [REDACTED]; Bernard Carr; Stuart R - (hameroff) Hameroff; John Horgan; George Johnson; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposal for a psi experiment

Wolf, you've given some great examples of the acts of doubt and confusion I was referring to. (I was not speaking of acting out / reacting from places of confusion and doubt.)

Overlap between different words/phrases as well as words that are not finely enough discerned for a given purpose are great ways of maintaining flow within inquiry.

On Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 1:22 PM, Wolfgang Baer <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Michelle:

good essay, expresses a truth that needs being said. In my own words I would say "we are all bound together by a belief that main stream thinking (I specifically mean physics) has gone off the rails and our society will suffer. What holds us apart is that we have different approaches to a solution and in many cases believe pointing out the problem is sufficient." This we need to fix.

'One "remedy" is to remove the fuel from the fires of infighting -- which demands acts of doubt and confusion in place of resignation or even despair. '

lets stick to 'remove the fuel from the fires of infighting' - I would submit that much of the infighting is due to the use of different words referring to similar underlying concepts. So that much of our fighting are semantic arguments about who's vocabulary should be used. These arguments have a legitimate basis because vocabulary is tied to memory and learning. Adopting or even understanding someone else's language is painful. We defend ourselves against such pain, especially after we've graduated. And further the painful effort of learning an others language is seldom rewarded by finding new discoveries. I get very little new understanding by knowing German and English for example.

So we need a translation dictionary between words.

some examples from a previous E-mail with Deepak and Kafatos

does 'consciousness' equal 'space time continuum'

does 'Do the Greek Titans' equal 'primitive forces like electricity and gravity'

does "God" equal "Nature, ie. binding of primitive forces into rational systems"

does 'prayer' equal "Stapp's Question asked of nature"

In our psi experiment

Does "retro causation" equal "predicting the future"

If these are two different words for the same concept then it might make sense to set up the experiment in Las Vegas and see whether participants who are on a winning streak have higher success rates in the Bem experiments.

Just a though.

Wolf

Dr. Wolfgang Baer



On 8/12/2016 9:07 AM, Michelle Kathryn McGee wrote:

As reality scientists we should be treating any testing type work not as empirical but as a sort of applied statistics (likelihood tests) of the universe. This would be much more useful than approaches that end up in misguidance and hype because they are pursued as "the amazing things that could be accomplished by us IF ONLY." If Only is the death knell of alignment with cosmic logic. It's also the invitation for in-fighting to replace open inquiry.

The impact of disagreements among groups (for example of scientists in various fields) is trivial compared to the issue of infighting. Not just in-fighting itself, but the belief that infighting is necessary, is where we, most often without our awareness, hide our inseparable love and good will such that we instead focus, together with our internal enemies, on those outside of us who we deem as close-minded, destructive, etc compared to us.

It does not appear to me that skeptics are the issue. What I see is the erosive effect of in-fighting about reality science. It's super tough of course because of the hype-focus of love and good will we feel for the very people we are infighting with.

Naturally we all want it to stop -- from our child's mind-eye [return to the good old days](#), if you will -- which means facing the strange structures within which we find ourselves seeking comfort and meaning.

One "remedy" is to remove the fuel from the fires of infighting -- which demands acts of doubt and confusion in place of resignation or even despair. Anything that causes a fight and requires despair does not belong in an ultimate reality debate. It belongs in the respectable category of "how might a different approach be useful in everyday terms."

Psi research aimed at resolving in-fighting (which QM is right) or advancing reality science gains meaning only in the face of a jaded capacity to believe in and pursue what feels right no matter what! For example, "Henry Stapp is right re: QM and I experience more hope and passion in light of that perspective." If you believe so, act like it's so regardless of "likelihood tests" that side with you but necessarily do not eliminate other possibilities.

In a related research vein, I am wondering about research efforts of similar structure that could be aimed at determining whether scientifically credible psychic certification / testing programs might be feasible? That strikes me as fundable and of public service. (Does such a thing already exist or get traction in proposals?) The cultivation of psychic ability and people who seek out "good" ones is big business. Why not tap into that and let reality science credibility among broader scientific community be moot in light of rubber-hits-the-road usefulness.

No it does not, in a singular way, solve the issue of global quality of life decline, but to think psi research will is rather unrealistic. As Wolf pointed out, the "why" questions that might be addressed are not close to directly penetrating our understanding of the systematic issues. It doesn't mean they're not worth asking, it's that only with honest and thorough framing can we survive the mind's own inner degradation.

--

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, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved