

From: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>

To: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Josephson's confusion - the hard problem is a physics problem not a problem in biology.

Date: Mon, 08 Aug 2016 10:04:04 +0000

its clear that for hundreds of years. many great minds have failed at even a basic understanding of the issue. so far- no theory supported by repeatable experiment. and evidence. - so- most of the thought on this are just that. thoughts _ great discoveries often were pulled , enabled encouraged by the tech of the time. . electric, microscopes. , telescopes. I am confident that the INternet as a tech tool . MUST be part of the inquiry, the newest of tools. - otherwise its just some thinkers, most not as good as plato or aristotle. still doing the exact same thing.

On Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:56 AM, Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]> wrote:

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



--

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