

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
To: Anoop Kumar <[REDACTED]>
CC: Tam Hunt <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Please see one explanation for why we see same " reality "
Date: Wed, 06 Sep 2017 14:22:14 +0000

Personal "I " is a learned construct as a result of the hypnosis of social conditioning .
In the same way space time as containers of objects called an external world are mental constructs .
Mind is the conditioning of pure consciousness
Both personal observer and local objects in space time are convincing hallucinations.

Deepak Chopra MD

[REDACTED]
[Chopra Foundation](#)
[Jiyo](#)
[Chopra Center for Wellbeing](#)



[Home: Where Everyone is Welcome](#)

On Sep 5, 2017, at 7:19 PM, Anoop Kumar <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Tam,

Good articles. I like the points you make about inferring space from experience. Space is inferred from the localized I.

Yes there appears a personal I and also a big self. No, the personal I is not the first thing known.

The first thing "known" is the unknown, existence without boundaries, boundlessness. Within existence, there can occur localization. Then the thought comes "I exist." The personal I is the *second* thing "known." It is a thought. The personal I is a thought. It's a calcified, anvil-like, chameleon-like thought. We can also say it is an energy or felt-sense, whichever you prefer. But it is second.

Yes, we can say "I exist" is first. But then we must examine the I, which is what I think you are also saying. We can keep explaining apparent duality, but I think there are good explanations. The pieces are in place. Of

course, they will always be revised and modified, accommodating new observations. I commend you on fleshing out these theories.

Best,
Anoop

On Tue, Sep 5, 2017 at 8:23 PM, Tam Hunt <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Anoop, but identity does very obviously and incontrovertibly localize in a personal "I." This is the first and foremost thing that we do know, each of us, here and now, through a simple assay of any moment of experience. Everything else is inferred. Everything. So how do we explain this apparent duality between little self (the personal I) and the larger sense of Self we experience at times of mystical immersion or logical deduction? That's what I feel is missing in your views as stated so far. In terms of inferring internal/external from our experience, I wrote a piece on this that I think agrees with some of what you've stated:

<http://www.collective-evolution.com/2014/12/17/what-can-we-really-know-about-the-external-world/>

And here: <http://www.collective-evolution.com/2014/12/10/building-a-firm-foundation-for-an-integrated-approach-to-science-and-spirituality/>

On Tue, Sep 5, 2017 at 11:44 AM, Anoop Kumar <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Tam,

I challenge that I'm ignoring vast amounts of data from scientific instruments. Yes, there are vast data that *are consistent with* perception. There is no "supporting" or "not supporting" perception. There is an experience of perception. We can all start from that proposition... I think (!)

And, without ignoring any data, we can still ask the question - is perception merely an appearance? Does it merely appear as here/there and internal/external, or, is perception fundamental or close to fundamental? This intelligent question, and its subsequent answer, does not mandate ignoring data, only probing its nature. Interpreting data is an indispensable horizontal movement. Probing the very nature of data is a vertical one. There is no conflict with data or apparent perception.

Let's be clear: When we refer to perception as internal/external we are talking philosophy, not science. "Here" or "within this" or the sense of internality as opposing externality is created by the appearance of a locus of identity and nothing else, certainly not by rational thought, which comes along later to create a useful theory to fit experience. If identity does not localize in a personal "I", there cannot be a you, nor a there, nor the sense of externality.

Best,
Anoop

On Tue, Sep 5, 2017 at 4:01 PM, Tam Hunt <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Sorry, this provides no support for your argument. Even if Hofmann was correct (which I don't think he is b/c he's ignoring of course the vast amounts of data we have from scientific instruments that confirm much of the data of our senses, as are you two in your writings), he cannot argue rationally that because natural selection has designed us for fitness optimization rather than veridicality in any way suggests that there isn't an external world. Rather, it would only go to the degree to which our senses do or don't give us reliable data about that external world. It in no way helps arguments that there isn't an external world.

On Mon, Sep 4, 2017 at 6:18 AM, Anoop Kumar <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thanks! Welcome, my friend

On Sep 4, 2017 11:18 AM, "Deepak Chopra" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

--

Tam Hunt

UC Santa Barbara

Check out Hunt's book of essays [Eco, Ego, Eros](#)

And see Hunt's latest book, [Mind, World, God: Science and Spirit in the 21st Century](#)

--

Anoop Kumar

[Visit my author page](#)

--

Tam Hunt

UC Santa Barbara

Check out Hunt's book of essays [Eco, Ego, Eros](#)

And see Hunt's latest book, [Mind, World, God: Science and Spirit in the 21st Century](#)

--

Anoop Kumar

[Visit my author page](#)