

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
To: Brian Josephson <[REDACTED]>
CC: "Stanley A. KLEIN" <[REDACTED]>, JACK SARFATTI <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, David Kaiser <[REDACTED]>, Jim Johnston <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, Bernard Carr <[REDACTED]>, "Stuart R - (hameroff) Hameroff" <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, John Horgan <[REDACTED]>, "George Johnson" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Josephson's confusion - the hard problem is a physics problem not a problem in biology.
Date: Mon, 08 Aug 2016 09:56:57 +0000

Body/Mind/ Universe are all symbols for experience and the knowing of experience in awareness . Pure awareness is non symbolic

Deepak Chopra
[REDACTED]


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

On Aug 8, 2016, at 5:21 AM, Brian Josephson <[REDACTED]> wrote:

On 8 Aug 2016, at 04:41, Stanley A. KLEIN <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Could Jack or Brian clarify what is the problem that you think you have solved. I presume it isn't anything measurable since I haven't heard what measurement needed a different solution than what standard methods give.

It depends what you mean by measurement. It is a well-established fact, I suggest, that experienced mathematicians regularly come up with solutions to difficult problems, even if we don't measure this in the way that we measure physical things. I don't accept Penrose's view that the brain can't do this because of limitations what algorithms can do, since physical processes are not necessarily reducible to an explicit algorithm, but on the grounds that learning from experience doesn't seem adequate as an explanation, higher maths being way beyond ordinary experience. You could argue instead (cf. <http://sms.cam.ac.uk/media/1813962>) that nature has had infinite time to learn what works and what doesn't, and this knowledge is what we can connect with to do maths. Yardley's point that symbols are what we use to connect with mind is relevant here:

We invented [symbols] so we could have some way of articulating the hidden reality we know as mind.

The concepts involved go beyond back-action, which in Peirce's terminology is Secondness, and include his Thirdness, which corresponds to Yardley's 'pi'. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semiotic_elements_and_classes_of_signs#Semiotic_elements for details about these concepts. This, I argue, makes possible a kind of ordering process unknown in regular physics, but is manifested in phenomena such as the emergence and development of language, whose existence shows that this is in principle a valid concept rather than just an idea. The challenge is to describe all this more rigorously.

Brian

Brian D. Josephson

