

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
To: Jeff Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: We are a universe claim
Date: Wed, 10 Aug 2016 09:03:29 +0000

Deepak Chopra
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Begin forwarded message:

From: Menas Kafatos <[REDACTED]>
Date: August 10, 2016 at 3:22:10 AM EDT
To: Wolfgang Baer <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>, Carolyn Rangel <[REDACTED]>, menas <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: We are a universe claim

Wolfgang:

By definition a postulate in mathematics is "A statement, also known as an axiom, which is taken to be true without proof". So the postulate that we are "the" (not "a") universe is unprovable. But so is the (postulate) that there is an external world, independent of observation. The latter is assumed to be self-evident or something by the majority of scientists (sort of God-given, although they would rarely use those words). These statements (postulates) are ontologically given but most scientists shy away from getting close to ontology because (foolishly I may add) consider philosophy a worthless pursuit. So they take on a metaphysical assumption (axiom-postulate) without even knowing they are doing that. All this was laid out in great detail in the *Conscious Universe* (Springer-Verlag, 1991 and 2000).

But mother Nature in an interesting irony, turned the tables on us: We now know from QM and particularly the refutation of hidden variables, the refutation of local realism, shown with high accuracy in several quantum experiments, that this is not the case. So the irony is that ontology or metaphysics has physical consequences that can be tested in the physics.

You might say that why should it not be the case with the postulate of the conscious universe? I would actually prefer to say that fundamental Consciousness is the underlying reality. Because,

ANY physical theory (including yours or anybody else's for that matter) is a construct of the mind (a part of Consciousness) and, therefore, you cannot take consciousness out, as Planck, Schroedinger and Pauli (and ultimately von Neumann) held. So the best we can hope is to get to the basics of consciousness, the most fundamental qualia of experience, through mathematics. This is explained in the paper that you can find on my website www.menaskafatos.com (the mathematics paper) while the other paper with Neil Theise puts out the whole ontology that I just explained and shows that it parallels the great contemplative traditions (we gave a few examples for brevity but in fact it is all, in different styles, languages etc. but the message is the same).

So even though I am a physicist by training, I have turned to the support of mathematics as this is the most refined way to address the universe (being the language of communication with Nature).

You might say but when you say "Nature", don't you take it as granted duality? No, because this is an *apparent* duality. We have shown that the veiling of nonlocality is equivalent to the "illusion" (a better term is veiling) of Consciousness.

On the gravity itself, of course "isolated from" implies an external reality. But that is again a postulate so all the multiverse arguments etc. are based on that, which take gravity as the only thing that exists, i.e. actually assuming a universal space-time.

So that's as far as your previous e-mail. With respect to your most recent e-mail, what is the difference between internal imagination and sensation? Aren't they both qualia? Deepak and I have argued that instead of particles and waves, we should be talking about qualia.

Wolfgang, with all due respect you are a physicalist. Which is fine, after all a lot of good science is based on that framework. But in that case, you have to take physicalism to its logical end and accept (as most physicalists do) that the mind itself is a physical entity or created in the brain. That you end up to the huge (it really is huge) problem of fine tuning which then directly leads to the multiverse idea, which although could be "true" in some sense, is a circular argument.

WE (Deepak and I, the great traditions of both East and West and an increasing number of scientists, I would say) take the opposite postulate, Consciousness is fundamental. Which leads you then to the conscious universe framework.

As Planck said, you cannot get out of consciousness.

Best,

Menas

On Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 2:44 PM, Wolfgang Baer <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thanks:

That would be great:

In my wildest dreams I'm imagining defining an experiment that involves the human consciousness based detector that respond to gravity waves

I've had several experiences during which my mental perception was effected by the movement of heavy objects, but its very hard to separate internal imagination from actual external sensation so who knows what I felt.

Thank again,

Wolf

Dr. Wolfgang Baer
Research Director
Nascent Systems Inc.

E-mail [REDACTED]

On 8/9/2016 2:17 PM, Deepak Chopra wrote:

We can send you our book galleys if you want

Carolyn please note

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[The Chopra Foundation](#)



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

From: Wolfgang Baer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2016 4:54:27 PM
To: Deepak Chopra; Menas Kafatos
Subject: We are a universe claim

Deepak and Kafatos;

For a long time I've wanted to find a proof for the postulate that we are a universe.

If possible what or where is your argument for such a claim.

My own reasoning goes something like this:

First build a model of a cognitive observer by identifying the cognitive aspect as occurring in the intrinsic interior domain. This domain is initially described by quantum theory, but more generally by a flow of change between the interior and exterior aspect of material as we see it. i.e. an self measurement and explanatory action cycle becomes the cognitive observer model.

The equations for an isolated system, whether the size of the universe or my body, are identical and differ only in size i.e. the number of degrees of freedom. This allows me to postulate that all isolated systems are like the Universe. Or simply, when isolated I, am a universe. This fits well with eastern thinking since isolated systems can be associated with a Nirvana state accessed during deep meditation.

However we are never isolated gravitationally. Gravity itself can isolate us from each other electromagnetically. In our isolated state we would be described as a black hole from the outside and our universe of experiences as an isolated being would be described as the inside of a black hole. Thus we are a self contained sequence of activity, possibly repeating if isolated long enough.

Unfortunately even as black hole universes we are still not isolated gravitationally specifically long range inertial forces would permeate all matter. These inertial forces have been identified as intrinsic properties of "m" in Newtons $m \cdot a$ second law but may actually be due to interactions with the rest of the matter a. la. Machs Principle.

The vision of myself as black hole isolated existence is the experience of a completely rational being feeling exactly what he/she expects to experience during his/her lifetime with no surprises from beginning to end. Breaking the symmetry of isolation would then would be punctuated by signals that would appear to be irrational events such as birth and death.

This is as far as I've gotten in my thinking. The vision makes sense to me, basically it's a multi-person multi-verse of black holes which can interact, but needs proof. How could we identify, irrational to us, interactions with other cognitive beings (action loops) which do not require dramatic change such as life and death? How could we establish a communication that is not random so as to make interactions more useful.

My guess is Deepak would say we have been doing this communication with meditation practices all along.

Granted: but can we achieve some more objective scientific experiments. Could the irregularities in the Cosmic Background radiation which is being examined as evidence of multi-verse collisions be reinterpreted as person to person communication?

best, Wolf

--

Dr. Wolfgang Baer
Research Director
Nascent Systems Inc.

E-mail [REDACTED]