

[OLSON NOTE: Here are some fun exchanges from a forum on the Study of Consciousness. Some are dopey but most are smart. The interesting thing about this topic is the view, represented elsewhere by super-smartie Martin Gardner et al, that consciousness does not really exist as an actual “thing”. Gardner’s view always puzzled me and seemed backwards and unsophisticated, based on his never having experienced a so-called “mystical experience”, feeling one with the universe, and feeling that the universe was “one thing.” Check out Mong H Tan’s thoughts from Jan 8, 07 below:]

What is Consciousness?

Teonanacatl

20th December 2006 - 07:18 PM

What is Consciousness, what is Matter?

Our current “model” of consciousness is based on the idea that consciousness is a by-product of a certain structure of matter in the Central Nervous System. It is produced as a result of “the ebb and flow of neural impulses” as some would say, and is thought of as a sort of mechanical process. According to this view the observer is a bystander in the theater of nature and will, somehow, stand outside its final model. An “observer” is operating independently from the laws of the universe, or at least from the exterior of his own head.

But now we have found that consciousness is intimately *linked* to its surroundings and it’s exerting an *influence* on matter, or it has a *relation* to it, in ways we do not yet understand. It may seem that mind, like everything else, is sewn into the very fabric of space; consciousness may be a phenomena at the very quantum level. The Newtonian/Einstein views on space time and matter seems insufficient to explain this relationship but their theories still color much of our scientific thinking. The philosophical implications of the double slit experiment and its relatives are huge, and difficult for science to come to terms with. It seems almost as if science has put on the good ol’ blindfold and refused to even consider its message. A shift of paradigm is never easy for anyone. Occam’s Razor says "All things being equal, the simplest solution tends to be the best one." Well; we have no proof that proof that consciousness is actually *generated* by the brain. That’s just an old assumption. (People have been known to have elaborate near death experiences, even while brain dead). The interesting thing is that if we give up this assumption; that there is an objective reality independent of consciousness, the paradoxes of quantum physics seem a lot more easily explainable!

The natural, (but very, very hard) thing to do then is to cast away our old views and start all over. But of course it’s a vast number of reasons to why this hasn’t already been done (and we can discuss them later).

Are we more than just spectators in these complex dimensions we call space? Where is our consciousness *really*? What *is* matter and how can it possibly create a

mind that which again affects matter? Some people believe that the Universe is conscious and that the tiny amount of visible matter we see is created by this “force”. For all we know, consciousness may be a basic characteristic of the universe. The Universe itself might be consciousness. We just don’t know and should keep an open mind. “Scientific Heresy!” of course, but yet... “Un-provable and within the realm of religion and philosophy”, may be, but *still* an important question.

Science is this cultural construct to which we have enslaved ourselves. Its attitude implies that the Universe is simple and ultimately comprehensible, and that we are but a few calculations away from understanding it all. We are cocky and believe that when we explain something we, somehow, take away its purpose or function. We reduce things to language and equations. We lock ourselves up in static ideas and bombastic knowledge. We like to de-mystify stuff and therein lies our problem; we are creating, for ourselves, an illusion of knowledge!

That is, and always has been, the most difficult obstacle for science to overcome. I too believe that the universe is governed by some kind of definite laws, but we may be far from any “unification of theories” yet, or a formula that will somehow state that the Universe is a dead, predictable mechanism of which life and consciousness are nothing but “random creations”. What is this ever-increasing biological complexity anyway? Life and consciousness seems, to my mind, to be what the Universe is all about...

A study recently took place at The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore (by Roland Griffiths) regarding the chemical psilocybin and its effects on the mind. It probed the questions of “mystical/religious experience” in altered states. These experiences include deep feelings of *connection* with the universe, powerful dissolving of the ego (the feeling that you are “one” person) and fantastic, fractal, symmetrical, vivid images in ones mind. I have since tested this substance myself, and from what I experienced in those altered states of consciousness, our thinking about consciousness seems pretty ignorant.

It may be a hard swallow, but it is possible that the matter/consciousness relationship is something else than we think *entirely*, and that we have been looking at it wrong for too long to realize?

Read more about the Hopkins study
[Washington Post](#)

More about Psilocybin/Psilocin [here](#)
Site on Psychoactive drugs:[Erowid](#)

N,N-dimethyltryptamine (DMT) is another tryptamine very similar to psilocybin but this is a neuro-transmitter in our own brains. Visit Dr. Strassman’s research site on

the subject [here](#)

(The scientific findings and the experiences these substances can induce are astounding and mind boggling to say the least...)

Simple animation of the [Double Slit](#) experiment

Books of interest (available at amazon.com):

- New Physics and the Mind
- The Physics of Consciousness
- Holographic Universe
- Self-aware universe
- The Quantum Brain
- DMT- The Spirit Molecule
- Mysticism and the new physics

So what's your view on this?

Zephir

20th December 2006 - 07:26 PM

QUOTE (Teonanacatl+Dec 20 2006, 10:18 PM)

What is Consciousness, what is matter?

I don't know, what the matter is, but by my opinions the consciousness is electrochemical state of complex large system of neurons, which is not fundamentally different from the analogous state of common earthworm.

Teonanacatl

20th December 2006 - 07:40 PM

But, for all we know, this extremely complex arrangement of neural networks and electro-chemical impulses may act as a "receiver" of consciousness (much like a TV-set receiving waves) or it may be something else entirely...Wild speculations of course, but it seems counter intuitive that a matter based system can affect other building blocks of matter just by observing. Are we "participants" more than "observers"? And consciousness is, of course, not limited only to humans. Plants may be conscious for all I know...

Solid State Universe

20th December 2006 - 07:49 PM

We are obviously participants. Otherwise we'd have no free will or ability to act independently.

I have a model for consciousness that stems from time awareness. There is a loop of awareness that runs from the eyes to the brain stem where energy received from light is interpreted, but this loop runs forwards in time to place this awareness at the eyes.

This looping structure is much the same as the temporal dimensional analysis

provided for the solid state universe theory, giving rise to the biblical analogy of Man being created in God's image.

StevenA

20th December 2006 - 08:41 PM

QUOTE (Zephir+Dec 20 2006, 07:26 PM)

I don't know, what the matter is, but by my opinions the consciousness is electrochemical state of complex large system of neurons, which is not fundamentally different from the analogous state of common earthworm.

That might be the brain, but not consciousness.

There are some aspects of consciousness that seem impossible to define physically, or maybe the entirety of it.

Consider something as simple as dyslexia where some people occasionally experience a reversal of information. What physically makes you perceive left as left and right as right? The universe could be swapped in direction along some dimension and as far as I know, there's nothing known in science that would differentiate between a universe physically reversed in some direction, yet consciousness still perceives an orientation that isn't (generally) arbitrarily swapped in some dimension from moment to moment (the laws of physics would be interpreted identically looking in a mirror except for a left hand/right hand reversal to electromagnetic fields, probably not unlike the difference in conscious experience between a left handed person and right handed one - entirely different in some conscious aspects, yet 100% physically compatible with laws of nature).

So the brain might act as a filter and provide (the vast majority of?) physical information for consciousness to interpret, but the experienced sensations and at least many specifics of how these are interpreted seem impossible to have physical mechanisms that determine them - they just are, and as far as I know, they seem arbitrary. Can someone determine by introspection alone whether or not they are color blind? How could they without consciously experiencing that different state? The only reason why someone knows they are color blind or not is by communicating with others who may or may not perceive the same set of colors - when one person can see a color that someone else cannot, there's more to consider than simply whether or not some specific neural signals or brainwaves are physically present - you should ask why is a color, or a direction, or a physical sensation etc. perceived in a specific manner consciously, compared to possibly an infinite number of other, physically compatible or identical and indistinguishable ways, yet consciously perceived as different - if two people can live and communicate with each other in the same universe, sharing the same physical laws, yet one doesn't see the same thing or may not hear sounds the same, or be able to smell things the same way etc. then the universe could be perceived consciously in ways that could make things appear more warped than the funkiest sci-fi story could dream of and yet somehow do this sharing, what appear to be, the same and physically identical atoms, photons, or quanta (supposedly only differentiated by

location). If one electron is the same as another, then obviously the network, interactions or "field" between these would need to provide additional information that allows for the differentiation of one electron, perceived in one fashion, versus another electron perceived in a different manner.

Anyway, just consider that a left-handed person may feel being left handed is just as entirely natural as a right handed person would feel being right handed isn't unnatural and then try to determine in what physical manner this orientation could be determined for conscious perceptions and I believe you'll find there's nothing there to do this. The universe could be symmetrically mirrored along one axis and there doesn't appear any way one scenario could be physically differentiated from the other, yet somehow that reference is available to mind yet not the physical brain (imagine swapping the left and right hemispheres of the brain so that physical perceptions were reversed, is there some physical reason this would be impossible? I don't believe so. So if there's nothing physical that could distinguish between one and the other, yet consciousness maintains a preferred orientation, then that orientation would need to be determined in a non-physical manner. You might say that some physical property present when conscious "arose" determined this initial orientation and that it remained, but you're still left with lots of questions over how this property could remain when the physical matter of the body is continually replaced as well as how such a conscious orientation would be available in the first place, in order for it to be set to one state versus another).

The brain is physical and appears to obviously be a filter through which likely the vast majority (or maybe even all, though I tend to doubt it) of conscious experiences are shaped or molded - it's a process through which information is translated for the conscious mind, and when you extend upon this, it's not unlike the rest of the physical universe - a channel through which experience is shaped, but isn't necessarily directly consciously sensed during this process - anesthetics can render someone unconscious, yet the brain still operates to some extent and the same is true during sleep, so not all activity within the brain would appear to be consciously detected, yet what differentiates the flow of an electron in one molecular chain in the body versus another? I'd have to say that the *network* of connections has properties that aren't present in any one of the parts and that consciousness would be more closely associated with relationships in the exchanges of information that occur, and not with any particle of either matter or energy, and it turns out these exchanges are part of a flow of information that extends beyond the brain and the body and are determined just as much by physical relationships outside the body as those inside the brain.

And as Solid State mentioned, the appearance of a conscious will has a lot of generally overlooked or ignored physical implications. If there is no free will, then my actions are determined by the universe, and hence the universe would necessarily be conversely determined by my actions, as it must match them - so without free will, I must be the creator of the entire universe as that's the only way that the illusion of free will could be maintained - what I decide to do would need to

be preordained by physical laws since the beginning of time if we're to believe in the predetermined, "clockwork" view of things. So, if I move a pencil from one side of the desk to another, did I move it, or did some universal creator who set it all in motion do it?

On the other hand, if I am able to exert control over some physical aspects of the universe, but not all, then my influences become diluted, as others or predetermined physical forces exert similar influences on the universe and it's a matter of evolution to determine how much of an impact on some future attribute of the universe each of these have.

(Then again, both these descriptions could be valid and simply depend upon the perspective taken)

amrit

20th December 2006 - 09:26 PM

we do not know what consciousness is
we now how it acts in our organism:
mind creates thoughts
consciousness watch them (witness them)

watch your mind for a few years and you will know something about consciousness
Teonanacatl

20th December 2006 - 10:22 PM

As I mentioned, Dr. Strassman's studies explored the properties of N N-dimethyltryptamine, a chemical believed to be produced endogenously by the pineal gland. The participants of his experiments received injections of the substance and reported experiences of perceiving "other realities" or "other dimensions", "meeting other entities", "seeing impossibly complex shapes and patterns" and the like. This neurotransmitter is produced when in R.E.M sleep, and when exposed to extreme trauma (like at death) but it makes one wonder if what we perceive is but one of many different realities within the same universe. Like Steven A so eloquently said, the brain could be a filter through which we perceive reality. Maybe by changing the parameters of that filter other levels/states of reality can be perceived? This is what has been done through shamanic rituals for thousands of years (through dancing, psychoactive plants, sensory deprivation, meditation etc.). Maybe that is where religions come from; observations made from altered states of consciousness?

[DMT - Erowid](#)

(funny audio clip about DMT at the bottom)

KKris

20th December 2006 - 10:44 PM

Pure consciousness is the real self of you which is God or a particle of God.

There is no thought or mind in pure consciousness hence it is considered free from the earthly pains.

Pure consciousness doesn't have a body or any matter in the universe for it is free from the five senses of this material body.

If you really want to realise your 'Self' and 'God' and understand what conscience means then you can meditate. Meditation is different from concentration. Concentration involves fixing your thought on a object/something. But meditation is thinking about nothing. It is easy but not easy as you presume as our brain is designed to keep thinking about something or other. When you stop thinking about everything you will realize the true 'Self' and the ultimate bliss. Remember! even the inner voice of you should stop speaking to you.

Beginning stages of meditation will be difficult as it is difficult to control your thoughts (practice it without any outside disturbance especially noise; make sure people are aware that you are meditating and not bothering you) . As you go on, your feelings below your neck will cease and you will gradually feel sitting in nowhere.

At the highest degree of meditation you will realize 'God' and this world will mean nothing to you.

If you think I'm blabbering then just try it for one minute by closing your eyes and stop the chain of arising thoughts.

Teonanacatl

20th December 2006 - 10:59 PM

Well, I cant see how an entire culture would put such tremendous focus on it otherwise, though I believe such a revelation would make this world mean *very much* to you

Solid State Universe

20th December 2006 - 11:03 PM

Consciousness is a time loop.

Or the awareness that such a time loop exists.

amrit

20th December 2006 - 11:13 PM

time is a mind frame into which you experience motion into a-temporal space once you become conscious of it you can get the a-temporality concept in physics that i publish here 100 posts.

Solid State Universe

20th December 2006 - 11:40 PM

I just assumed it was a given.

The mind becomes a singularity or soul (hence sole) then experiences and recognises the nature of this loop.

B_Sharp

21st December 2006 - 12:31 AM

QUOTE (Zephir+Dec 20 2006, 12:26 PM)

the consciousness is electrochemical state of complex large system of neurons

Impossible.

A property of consciousness is that I know that I am conscious but I do not know that others are or not. Therefore consciousness contains a uniqueness.

But chemical processes do not have uniqueness. They have commonality.

So your statement is proven incorrect.

Mong H Tan, PhD

22nd December 2006 - 05:11 PM

Hello, PhysOrg Readers-Thinkers, Everybody, Mind, and Spirit!

QUOTE

Teonanacatl: A] As I mentioned, Dr. Strassmans studies explored the properties of N N-dimethyl tryptamine, a chemical believed to be produced endogenously by the pineal gland. The participants of his experiments received injections of the substance and reported experiences of perceiving “other realities” or “other dimensions”, “meeting other entities”, “seeing impossibly complex shapes and patterns” and the like.

This neurotransmitter is produced when in R.E.M sleep, and when exposed to extreme trauma (like at death) but it makes one wonder if what we perceive is but one of many different realities within the same universe.

Like StevenA so eloquently said, the brain could be a filter through which we perceive reality. Maybe by changing the parameters of that filter, other levels/states of reality can be perceived? This is what has been done through shamanic rituals for thousands of years (through dancing, psychoactive plants, sensory deprivation, meditation, etc.). Maybe that is where religions come from; observations made from altered states of consciousness?

B] Well, I can't see how an entire culture would put such tremendous focus on it otherwise, though I believe such a revelation would make this world mean *very much* to you [Kkris].

Briefly, if I may, I would suggest you get familiarized with my latest theory of “Memophorescencicity” that I presented here, **Infinity** (Physics-philosophy-metaphysicsAU; September 21), and more recently about the Evolution of God (or our emotional spiritual Mind in all psychodynamics that you and others described above) here, **Let's begin the Dialogue and Reconciliation of Science and Religion Now!** (PhysOrgEU; December 5).

Specifically, the particle-wave functions, or the mechanisms of memophorescencicity that would respond (or resonate) to neurochemicals (intrinsic and extrinsic impulses) in our brain, is the Quantum Mechanics of Consciousness, that you might be looking for!?

Thank you all for your kind attention and cooperation in this matter. Happy reading, thinking, scrutinizing, imagining, and enlightening!

Best wishes, Mong 12/22/6usct11:10a; author **Gods, Genes, Conscience and Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now**; a cyberspace hermit-philosopher of Modern Mind, whose works are based on the current advances in interdisciplinary science and integrative psychology of Science and Religion worldwide; ethically, morally; metacognitively, and objectively.
vkamath

24th December 2006 - 03:45 AM

QUOTE (Teonanacatl+)

What is Consciousness, what is Matter?

It seems to me that Consciousness is the creative force which creates the illusion of the material universe. Matter is a illusion. Ultimately everything is energy and its manifestations.

QUOTE (Teonanacatl+)

The philosophical implications of the double slit experiment and its relatives are huge, and difficult for science to come to terms with. It seems almost as if science has put on the good ol' blindfold and refused to even consider its message.

Agree. Science is based on the philosophy that everything can be explained by breaking down into smaller parts and explaining the properties of these parts. Sometimes we also need to look at the bigger picture and try to think what these observations imply.

QUOTE (Teonanacatl+)

Science is this cultural construct to which we have enslaved ourselves. Its attitude implies that the Universe is simple and ultimately comprehensible, and that we are but a few calculations away from understanding it all.

...and when these calculations fail to explain certain results scientists create probability waves, multiverses and multiple dimensions. These are simply different possibilities and there is only one reality.

QUOTE (Teonanacatl+)

It may be a hard swallow, but it is possible that the matter/consciousness

relationship is something else than we think entirely, and that we have been looking at it wrong for too long to realize?

The blind men and the elephant
fivedoughnut

24th December 2006 - 04:00 AM

Consciousness to me: Simply the ability to understand the 'reflection' of ones self in nature.

Solid State Universe

24th December 2006 - 04:23 AM

I like the idea that the chemical interactions caused by an active brain create a quantum singularity that can be referred to as consciousness.

For example. Your eyes receive light, which transmits a signal to the rear of your brain where it is interpreted.

However, your conscious mind makes a leap and places your awareness of the world back in front of your eyes.

Quantum organic singularities would also allow for reincarnation and explain the white light effect of being born again.

Quantum organic singularities = observer = point of view = point = sole = soul.
purebeing

29th December 2006 - 10:25 PM

In order to understand the origins of consciousness one needs only to look at the animals. If the animal has 2 eyes in the front of its head then it is likely that it has a primary consciousness which is required to integrate the dual images from the eyes. This is the reflective projection which we perceive as the 3-D reality before our eyes. This is the primary consciousness. If you don't believe me, close your eyes and observe how quickly your consciousness is altered. I think that the smoothness of consciousness stems from its long evolution. Think about that the next time you are chewing on a cow.

True science requires that the internal and the external view of a human individual coincide. Consciousness and how people act are two sides of the same coin. I strongly suggest that everyone stay away from hallucinogens because you may spend your life going in and out of mental hospitals like some of my friends. The third point I'd like to make is that consciousness is the individual reality. That the concept of the universe did not enter the collective reality until after the brilliant work of Copernicus. Yes Virginia, the universe and your consciousness are integrally related because it is created in your own head.

Zephir

29th December 2006 - 11:55 PM

QUOTE (fivedoughnut+Dec 24 2006, 07:00 AM)

What is Consciousness?

I suppose. this is the ability to reflect the causal abstract models of reality. Even blind earth worms have such ability, though.

Solid State Universe

30th December 2006 - 01:49 AM

Before you question about consciousness, why not ask yourself about the origin of the observer who can ask questions about consciousness?

Imagination

30th December 2006 - 08:38 AM

*I think that 'Emotion' proceeds any real thought worth a thing. I think our Limbic system develops first too.

*Too 'Feel'(Emotion), is First 'Cause'. It Proceeds everything.

Solid State Universe

30th December 2006 - 08:40 AM

We have two brains.

And two eyes.

They talk to each other in fragments.

Eric England

2nd January 2007 - 09:27 PM

QUOTE (Solid State Universe+Dec 29 2006, 06:49 PM)

Before you question about consciousness, why not ask yourself about the origin of the observer who can ask questions about consciousness?

Yup.

Solid State Universe

2nd January 2007 - 09:48 PM

I had a realization.

Heisenburg's Paradigm window that saved quantum mechanics from the Dirac Sea does not imply the window closes afterwards.

If current understanding of physics theory skirts the edge of Dirac's Sea, we just choose to ignore the obvious line of reflection created by existing on the edge of the Sea.

Consciousness arises because of Dirac's Sea.

One brain is wired to understand quantum mechanics.

The other is wired to understand physics of the Sea.

Where the two meet, a singularity arises.

That's us.

Teonanacatl

6th January 2007 - 03:59 PM

The neurotransmitter, dimethyltryptamine (DMT), seems capable of producing a vast array of effects associated with “near death experience”, “religious-” and “out of body experiences”. The past decades doctors have managed to bring many people back from states of clinical death and the like, and many of them (over 13 million registered in USA alone) has told detailed accounts of “flying outside ones body”, through space, through tunnels, towards a “infinite loving light” or to a “merging with the Universe” etc. (Keep in mind the difficulties involved relaying these utterly "alien" experiences through language) One could of course dismiss these stories as hallucinations caused by this neurotransmitter, but isn't our whole world then as much a hallucination? It is easy to dismiss such stories, because they are easily associated with religions and new age-crap.

I have come to wonder about the evolutionary benefits of having these long lasting, elaborate experiences. One could of course argue that it's a mechanism to protect your brain from trauma or something like that, but it quickly gets this ad hoc feel to it. What we experience, usually have some root in reality, and who are we to say what is real and what is not? I believe we could have a long discussion about whether emotions like pain and love are “real or not” without coming to any conclusive answers. Maybe it's a problem with definitions.

If consciousness comes from chemical reactions within the brain it is as real as everything else that is created by the brain. Emotions, I believe, plays a vital role in how we perceive the world, hence it's a part of what make us define what reality is (at least at a personal level). We cannot easily separate one from the other, or say *those* neurons produce real experience but *these* do not. We see that our brain is ultimately compiled of (relatively) simple chemicals and from that we deduct that all emotions, thoughts and actions are “only chemicals reactions”, but we shouldn't forget to look at the bigger picture; what is the function of a brain? What is the function of consciousness? How can matter create it? I think *everything* within the confines of our Universe is real, even our thoughts. But our thoughts, obviously, isn't matter. Its not like you can touch or see another persons consciousness. Even our bodies are "dead" systems of matter without consciousness.

The brain may well be a sort of point of awareness and information storage in a Universe of consciousness, rather than the creator of consciousness (that would certainly explain out of body experiences more easily). Is consciousness a product of computer-like computations in the brain? This issue is now torn between the cognitive psychological view and the quantum mechanical definition. (And within these views lies the question whether we ever can produce conscious A.I. or not) I believe that physics has proven that consciousness is a very real phenomena, it's a part of the universe at the quantum level, and maybe even a more “basic” thing than matter.

We, as humans, are easily fooled when we look at space. We only perceive big structures of matter and we don't have the luxury of traveling at light speeds, so we also believe in time. But still, there is only one truth, one universe (?), and as M-Theory states; it probably has several dimensions. And it's not like every superstring (if we'll believe that theory) is an 11-dimensional universe onto itself; it's all connected in a complex, interconnected system creating vast complexity. Our consciousness perceives some of these dimensions, but I believe that the "true" Universe is VERY, VERY different than the empty space and galaxies we see all around us. In many ways it doesn't even exist the way we perceive it (at least in ordinary states of consciousness). To think of the Universe as "big" or "small" for example is then, of course, meaningless.

To say that consciousness is "an electrochemical state of large, complex systems of neurons" isn't really saying anything about consciousness as physics views it, it doesn't explain any of the observations we have made. We have learned a lot about the Universe with the reductionist method; searching for the basic constituents of matter, but we may need a more holistic view in the physics of consciousness. The holy goal is apparently "The Theory of Everything" and it requires a unification of general relativity and quantum physics. I think consciousness plays a crucial role in this synthesis, but can we understand a universe made from observation and consciousness and still keep the world as one made of ordinary objects independently of consciousness? I don't know, but one thing I'm sure of is that the only reality is the quantum reality, and within that crazy, fantastically complex realm lies unimaginable possibilities!

"Nothing lasts, but nothing is lost. Everything is always changing into something else"

William Blake

Farsight

6th January 2007 - 06:14 PM

I just love this philosophical joke:

Q: Is the Universe conscious and self-aware?

A: No. It only thinks it is.

IMHO consciousness is a derived effect involving recursion. It's a perception rather than a real ontological phenomena that can be weighed or measured. Thus you're "not really" conscious, you only *think* you're conscious. So the experience is imaginary... but *it's the only thing that's real to you*. It's quite a beautiful subject, and is set to get very interesting when somebody creates an artificial intelligence. The thing is, that computer could be every bit as conscious as you.

Eric England

6th January 2007 - 06:18 PM

That is a good one.

As long as I can still unplug the computer and it can't unplug me, I'm all for AI.

Ivars

6th January 2007 - 08:38 PM

QUOTE

What is Consciousness, what is Matter?

Matter arises when a vortex breakdown process structure create a shape out of Aether. This shape has angular momentum as a whole- that is its inertial mass,

It also may have, as it interacts with other similar structures in universe long enough , fractal angular moments on its surface.

That fractal part is matter; it is loosely repeating the shape of the first but not exactly and creating new space dimension, surface thickness, fractal, .

So we have 4 medias:

- 1) Full dimension angular moment vortex breakdown structure media (dark matter) which is connected by vortexes - falaco solitons (dark energy)-
- 2) Fractal dimension angular moment media - matter, what we see, can eat, touch
- 4) Aether in which all this exists

The first media is so called lattice of The universe, including shapes. Consciousness operates in this media and Aether only, it does not have matter, but it has mass and angular moment.

Eric England

6th January 2007 - 09:39 PM

QUOTE

What is Consciousness, what is Matter?

Here's one linguistic look at it.

Consciousness is an "event" of "being aware" of a "matter" and how much the matter "matters", equals the "gravity of the matter", to the being that is aware of the event.

I think I'll go now...

Solid State Universe

6th January 2007 - 09:40 PM

Consciousness should be described as having it's own Event Horizon.

czeslaw

7th January 2007 - 02:54 PM

It is very good and important question.

We do not need an expensive telescope and microscope. We have just observe and discuss.

My questions are:

1. Is a human conscious different than of the animal's ?
2. Is a conscious a product of the genetic DNA stucture ?
3. Is it possible to create a computer that can mimic a human conscious ?

Eric England

7th January 2007 - 06:08 PM

QUOTE (Eric England+Jan 7 2007, 08:06 PM)

Consciousness should be described as having it's own Event Horizon.

By [AWT](#) the consciousness can be described by energy spreading in special phase of Aether foam. By electrochemical energy spreading in neuron foam, be more specific.

Solid State Universe

7th January 2007 - 06:10 PM

No, the effects of consciousness results in the spreading.

Consciousness has to arise at a point. A state of observation that collapses the waveform.

Eric England

7th January 2007 - 08:34 PM

QUOTE (czeslaw+Jan 7 2007, 02:54 PM)

It is very good and important question.

We do not need an expensive telescope and microscope. We have just observe and discuss.

My questions are:

1. Is a human consciousness different than of the animal's ?
2. Is a consciousness a product of the genetic DNA stucture ?
3. Is it possible to create a computer that can mimic a human consciousness ?

Ivars

7th January 2007 - 11:00 PM

My questions are:

1. Is a human consciousness different than of the animal's ?

sure, different quality but the same principles- next bifurcation

2. Is a consciousness a product of the genetic DNA stucture ?

Consciousness appears when brain created in accordance to DNA engages , kind of hangs on aether vortexes crisscrossing universe, gets started. DNA is just a drawing. Execution matters as well.

3. Is it possible to create a computer that can mimic a human consciousness ?

Not now. It must have the speed /architecture complex enough to overcome some principal barrier.

Human brain is the most effective and fastest computer . In a process called intuition it processes $> 10^{70}$ steps in second.

czeslaw

8th January 2007 - 09:15 AM

YOU CAN COMPARE ORDER OF THE MAGNITUDE:

ATOMS IN :STARS IN :

Cell nucleus of living being $10^6 - 10^{10}$Galaxy nucleus $10^4 - 10^{10}$

Cell of living being $10^7 - 10^{11}$Galaxy $10^7 - 10^{11}$

Brain $10^{20} - 10^{22}$Universe 10^{21}

Is our Observable Universe a Hyperbrain ?

Cosmic 'DNA': Double Helix Spotted in Space

http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/060315_dna_nebula.html

Magnetic forces at the center of the galaxy have twisted a nebula into the shape of DNA, a new study reveals.

Let us recall that because the quantum potential may be regarded as information whose activity is to guide the "dance" of the electrons, there is a basic similarity between the quantum behaviour of a system of electrons and the behaviour of mind. But if we wish to relate mental processes to the quantum theory, this similarity will have to be extended. The simplest way of doing this is to improve the analogy between mental processes and quantum processes by considering that the latter could also be capable of extension to indefinitely great levels of subtlety.

<http://members.aol.com/Mszlajak/BOHM.html>

EVERYTHING TENDS TO CREATE SYSTEM OF HIERARCHIC GROUPS

All the matter tends to create a groups. In 1930 Hermann Weyl wrote "Theory of the groups and quantum mechanic" . The electromagnetic wave concentrate into the elementary particle. This particle don't diverge in the space but create atoms and complicated chemicals combinations. All the reality seems to be quantified even the space and the time. You can see many examples for this hierarchic groups:

Quark - elemental particle - atom - chemical combinations

Atom - crystals - grains - rock - comet, planet
 Atom - nebula - star - galaxy - galaxy group
 Amino acid - gene - cell - fibre - organ - living being
 Man - family - clan - tribe - nation
 Citizen - municipality - district - province - state - union
 Soldier - platoon - company - battalion - regiment - division - army
 Criminal - gang - mafia - dictatorship
 Mist - fog - cloud - drop - rain
 Brooklet - river - ocean torrent
 Sound - word - sentence - speech
 Letter - word - sentence - book - internet
 Stand - shop - whole sale - holding - trust
 Arithmetic - algebra - differential integrate calculus

You can surely find more better groups and dependency. This hierarchic groups are created easy in every movement.

Ivars

8th January 2007 - 09:50 AM

QUOTE

EVERYTHING TENDS TO CREATE SYSTEM OF HIERARCHIC GROUPS

That is obvious, just need to have a theory which will put all these things in the same framework.

czeslaw

8th January 2007 - 02:36 PM

QUOTE (Ivars+Jan 8 2007, 09:50 AM)

That is obvious, just need to have a theory which will put all these things in the same framework.

There are many different theories about it . Nobody knows which of them is better. You may create yours as well.

Ivars

8th January 2007 - 03:16 PM

QUOTE

There are many different theories about it . Nobody knows which of them is better. You may create yours as well.

Actually, there is NONE which works.

On the other hand, there is only ONE which will work everywhere. It will be no ones theory , it will belong to ALL.

Why look for others?

Farsight

8th January 2007 - 03:27 PM

czeslaw, here's my twopennyworth:

Is consciousness a product of the genetic DNA structure?

DNA is a blueprint for building a body with a brain, and the brain yields consciousness. So in a way the answer is yes. But DNA might not be the only way to do this, so I wouldn't attribute consciousness to DNA.

Is it possible to create a computer that can mimic a human consciousness?

I think so. And I think it's possible to go further than this and create a computer that *is* conscious. After all, *we* are computers in our own biological way.

Ivars

8th January 2007 - 03:38 PM

QUOTE

I think so. And I think it's possible to go further than this and create a computer that *is* conscious. After all, we are computers in our own biological way.

I agree though I am not sure how many of possible biological computers has already been created by Nature, and how many other possibilities are left.

In our Universe, there is limited number of ways to create biological computers of certain power. The more complex it becomes, the less variations are possible.
czeslaw

[OLSON NOTE: This next bit is fuckin' great. I love Mong H Tan, PhD:]

8th January 2007 - 05:24 PM

What intrigues me is the notion of whether or not a universe can exist if there is nothing to consciously recognize its existence. If the human race were to become extinct, would the universe continue to exist? I believe it would but what would be its purpose? There wouldn't be anything for anyone to discover. Planets and moons and stars would float around for no reason, at least not any reason that I could surmise.

I believe that consciousness is a collective awareness shared by everything in the universe. I believe that everyone and everything contains all or some of the information available in the universe. Everyone and everything works within the same data set. There is no new information to be created. All we are doing is discovering the information in stages and putting it where we think it belongs. We may be wrong, we may be right, does it matter?

The universe seemingly doesn't need human involvement to exist but if that were the case, what would be the purpose behind human self-awareness?

Mong H Tan, PhD

8th January 2007 - 05:40 PM

Hello, Consciousness/Matter Inquirers-Thinkers, Everybody, Mind, and Spirit!

QUOTE

Ivars: That is obvious, just need to have a theory which will put all these things in the same framework.

What a sharp observation; that would be a Theory of Everything, as I presented in **Gods, Genes, Conscience** (linked below) whose subtitle is self-explanatory: *A socio-intellectual survey of our dynamic mind, life, all creations in between and beyond, on Earth—or A critical reader's theory of everything: past, present, future; in continuum, ad infinitum*. Please review it at your convenience, of course!

Czeslaw:

1. Is human consciousness different than [that] of an animal's?
2. Is consciousness a product of the genetic DNA structure?
3. Is it possible to create a computer that can mimic human consciousness?

Well put; and my short answers are:

- 1] Yes;
- 2] No; and, please see my more recent elaborations here, **Civility: Is there a God gene?** (PhysOrgEU; January 3).
- 3] Not exactly, it's because our brain functions are very different than those of a computer; however, the particle-wave functions of the neuronal membrane—the Quantum Mechanics of Memophorescencity that gives rise to our Consciousness, imagery, memory, dreams, etc—might be analogous to the Phosphorescence of a cathode-ray tube screen, that I previously described here, **Let's begin the Dialogue and Reconciliation of Science and Religion Now!** (PhysOrgEU; December 5).

Thank you all for your kind attention and cooperation in this matter. Happy reading, thinking, scrutinizing, imagining, and enlightening!

Best wishes, Mong 1/8/7usct11:39a; author **Gods, Genes, Conscience and Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now**; a cyberspace hermit-philosopher of Modern Mind, whose works are based on the current advances in interdisciplinary science and integrative psychology of Science and Religion worldwide; ethically, morally; metacognitively, and objectively.

MDT

8th January 2007 - 06:28 PM

Consciousness is an artifact of how the brain works. If we look at a simple neuron typically the axon outputs ions and the dendrite inputs ions. The result is a single

neuron current loop where currents comes out of the axom and moves along the surface toward the dendrite, down the dendrite tubes, into the neuron and back out the axon, etc.. . Some of this leaks laterally with other neurons via synapses.

If you look at how the brain is set up, the biggest axons of the cerebral matter gets bundled with these bundled axons heading toward the core of the brain. The net result is a similar current loop as a single neuron with current going inside the bundle to the core and countercurrent back to the cerebral on the surfaces of the bundle. The lateral distributes current to the lobes of the brains.

Next if we look at the brain as a 3-D grid of firing neurons, where little clusters define each memory, an energy interference grid is projected into the cerebral matter of the brain. The forward and countercurrent flow between the cerebral and the core mingles with this grid. The result is consciousness.

The memory grid defines you and your memories. While the forward and counter flux between cerebral and core is dependant on activity and cerebral distribution. While the energy connection between these two, creates potential gradients that will lower potential to produce thought and directed impulse associated with consciousness.

If you what to get deeper. There are also personality software in the brain, that stems from genetics and birth, that make human propensity similar in all humans. It what defines us as human. This software plays a role on how the distributed conscious energy is expressed. It is sort of a starter kit that is the hub behind human nature. What this model does is make consciousness more than memory. It is sort of a secondary energy extrapolation of memory that can exceed structural memory.
StevenA

8th January 2007 - 10:13 PM

It does seem that consciousness must be a product not of any specific particles or interactions, but of the network between them.

In information theory, you could take a single binary event and have it contain more than just binary information by looking at the context in which it occurred.

As far as I know there's no direct way to determine the origin of a photon, but let's say hypothetically you could.

In this case you might have a detect that could "see" a photon emitted from either A or B. In this case, each photon would provide a single binary digit of information representing either A or B.

But if there were 3 sources, A B or C that could be differentiated, then more information is now available from that single event. You now have more than a single binary value detected (it would be ~ 1.618 bits worth of information). This

could be associated with the wavelength of a photon - if the universe only used a single wavelength of energy, it doesn't seem difficult to imagine that without such a contrast available, the universe would no longer be detectable as everything would simply see a constant stream of the same unit of information without anything else to define the time in between.

So a photon doesn't contain information in itself, except in relationship to other photons with different properties. Conscious sensations don't appear to fall into a perfect linear spectrum (I don't see how you could put these sensations on a number line) but instead appear to have multidimensional characteristics (and I wonder if such possible conscious sensations are limited to what are humanly "experienceable". I seriously doubt it as not even all humans share the same senses).

So there appears to be a multidimensional "network of sensations" that's consciously detected and it's likely not even be 3 dimensional, though I guess it's not impossible that at some fundamental level it could be described as 3 dimensional (that's an interest idea to consider).

Hmmm... well I guess that's enough rambling for now. Sometimes I even confuse myself
czeslaw

9th January 2007 - 04:46 PM

There's a conflict between the idea of a conscious will and deterministic physical laws.

A few possible ways to resolve it are:

1) Conscious will is an illusion and that you're somehow predetermined to select the action that was going to physically occur.

Though this scenario would also be the same as saying physical actions are predetermined to match conscious will. Whether it's nature forcing you to want to do something or you forcing nature to comply, it amounts to the same thing - they happen to match. (So you can't legitimately use this argument to toss responsibility for conscious decisions and actions on nature.)

2) Conscious influences occur at a small and/or distributed scale that make it difficult to observe directly.

3) Conscious actions alter unobserved influences from the past as well and assure a deterministic change of physical events occurs to match conscious alterations of the present.

4) If physical laws are seen to exist due to recognition of them by the brain and body

then conscious alterations of these would affect the appearance of how such laws operate. In other words, in this scenario, the conscious perception of the universe is largely constructed from the inside out and observed physical laws would be a product of conscious alterations.

There might be some more possibilities, but my personal opinion is that the conscious mind is in many ways very simplistic and acts like a seed constructing its physical representation according to both what's physically presented it to interact with as well as whatever conscious relationships are consciously assigned to these. Likely the level of physical influence the conscious mind has is on a very small scale altering informational connections - effectively programming a physical computer (what can I say, I'm limited to using analogies I understand).

If consciousness has no inherent physical structure itself but simply acts to detect and route information through various physical systems then consciousnesses could be physically distributed and not necessarily isolated within the brain. If you look at entangled information in quantum mechanics, you'll find that units of information aren't necessarily tied to a specific physical particle but can be passed along via interactions between them.

Also, without any inherent physical structure, if memory and a sense of self is constructed over time then space is the perfect tool for this (I believe "spacetime" is a natural requirement for a computing system as the equivalent of memory). This would mean no memories would be attached to consciousness itself, though you might assume some specific traits should be consciously maintained, it's difficult to determine what aspects those traits would/could have.

So just like a microphone and speaker amplifier allow a low level signal to be amplified into a larger action, the brain serves to detect, focus and amplify low level energies while the body converts these into larger scale physical actions and the senses filter and compress large scales of information into the most critical components for conscious attention.

Also, if there's no specific physical form to consciousness then any initial physical interactions that consciously occurred before a mind and body were fully developed would be largely chaotic as such interactions would not yet have a well defined physical structure to work with - basically, if we assume at some point(s) consciousness is disconnected from physical structures, then any future physical interactions would occur without prior physical references or history to guide it and likely any new physical structures generated from this could possess properties quite different from what we see now. In this case, the conscious mind would experience its own Big Bang but in reverse - though physically nothing would have to change, the manner in which such prior existing information would be subjectively interpreted could have the equivalent of it's own Big Bang in reverse -

where the properties of the universe as seen by such an evolving consciousness would appear to possess matching evolutionary traits over time. (The two views might be equivalent and there's nothing but intelligent design to the universe simply because we can only contemplate it via. intelligence?)

Einstein's Ghost

(OLSON NOTE: Here's my crazy man Mong H Tan, PhD again. I love this maniac. Listen up.)

10th January 2007 - 02:32 AM

QUOTE (Teonanacatl+Dec 20 2006, 07:18 PM)

What is Consciousness, what is Matter?

Our current "model" of consciousness is based on the idea that consciousness is a by-product of a certain structure of matter in the Central Nervous System. It is produced as a result of "the ebb and flow of neural impulses" as some would say, and is thought of as a sort of mechanical process.

According to this view the observer is a bystander in the theater of nature and will, somehow, stand outside its final model. An "observer" is operating independently from the laws of the universe, or at least from the exterior of his own head.

But now we have found that consciousness is intimately *linked* to its surroundings and it's exerting an *influence* on matter, or it has a *relation* to it, in ways we do not yet understand. It may seem that mind, like everything else, is sewn into the very fabric of space; consciousness may be a phenomena at the very quantum level.

The Newtonian/Einstein views on space time and matter seems insufficient to explain this relationship but their theories still color much of our scientific thinking.

The philosophical implications of the double slit experiment and its relatives are huge, and difficult for science to come to terms with. It seems almost as if science has put on the good ol' blindfold and refused to even consider its message. A shift of paradigm is never easy for anyone. Occam's Razor says "All things being equal, the simplest solution tends to be the best one." Well; we have no proof that proof that consciousness is actually *generated* by the brain. That's just an old assumption. (People have been known to have elaborate near death experiences, even while brain dead). The interesting thing is that if we give up this assumption; that there is an objective reality independent of consciousness, the paradoxes of quantum physics seem a lot more easily explainable!

The natural, (but very, very hard) thing to do then is to cast away our old views and start all over. But of course it's a vast number of reasons to why this hasn't already been done (and we can discuss them later).

Are we more than just spectators in these complex dimensions we call space? Where is our consciousness *really*? What *is* matter and how can it possibly create a

mind that which again affects matter? Some people believe that the Universe is conscious and that the tiny amount of visible matter we see is created by this “force”. For all we know, consciousness may be a basic characteristic of the universe. The Universe itself might be consciousness. We just don’t know and should keep an open mind. “Scientific Heresy!!” of course, but yet... “Un-provable and within the realm of religion and philosophy”, may be, but *still* an important question.

Science is this cultural construct to which we have enslaved ourselves. Its attitude implies that the Universe is simple and ultimately comprehensible, and that we are but a few calculations away from understanding it all. We are cocky and believe that when we explain something we, somehow, take away its purpose or function. We reduce things to language and equations. We lock ourselves up in static ideas and bombastic knowledge. We like to de-mystify stuff and therein lies our problem; we are creating, for ourselves, an illusion of knowledge! That is, and allways has been, the most difficult obstacle for science to overcome. I too believe that the universe is governed by some kind of definite laws, but we may be far from any “unification of theories” yet, or a formula that will somehow state that the Universe is a dead, predictable mechanism of which life and consciousness are nothing but “random creations”. What is this ever-increasing biological complexity anyway? Life and consciousness seems, to my mind, to be what the Universe is all about...

A study recently took place at The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore (by Roland Griffiths) regarding the chemical psilocybin and its effects on the mind. It probed the questions of “mystical/religious experience” in altered states. These experiences include deep feelings of *connection* with the universe, powerful dissolving of the ego (the feeling that you are “one” person) and fantastic, fractal, symmetrical, vivid images in ones mind. I have since tested this substance myself, and from what I experienced in those altered states of consciousness, our thinking about consciousness seems pretty ignorant.

It may be a hard swallow, but it is possible that the matter/consciousness relationship is something else than we think *entirely*, and that we have been looking at it wrong for too long to realize?

N,N-dimethyltryptamine (DMT) is another tryptamine very similar to psilocybin but this is a neuro-transmitter in our own brains. Visit Dr. Strassman’s research site on the subject [here](#)

'I'(Imagination), have described this already.

The 'Observer' and the 'Observed' are 'PI' and 'PHI'/Light and Gravity.

Now:

Path of Least Resistance(Light), vs. Path of Highest Organization(Gravity).

Observation= 1 Full Circle of the Energy Cycle of Time.

'Conscious of Time'.

The reality is that all of us are Light, or a Fraction off the electro-magnetic-spectrum.

Our 'brain' Interface, is the problem.

It inter-faces our Gravitational nature with the Universal Mind through our Autonomic Nervous System.

Our body doesn't help much either(just ask Vanderbilt University and the Astronauts who have experienced zero gravity issues).

The Truth, is that there is only One Mind of Consciousness.

I've connected to it in the past when I was high on weed.

Now, I can access innately by being 'calm'. I think I've 'Cosmo-Savant' tendencies.

Remember, 'Consciousness' is Awareness of the Energy Cycle of which we are a part with[/b].

Mong H Tan, PhD

10th January 2007 - 04:48 AM

Hello, Consciousness/Matter Inquirers-Thinkers, Everybody, Mind, and Spirit!

QUOTE

Czeslaw: Is consciousness acting against the physics laws[1]?

An instinct is acting according to physics laws[2].

Is consciousness a self-programming [entity]? Is it possible for a computer program to create a new program?[3]

Is consciousness a kind of freedom? Can a man break the physics limitations and animals can't?[4]

1] No, Consciousness is a mental mechanisms that has had evolved primarily in response to the physical laws that are all around us; a process that is electrochemically transmitted in and through our senses of sight, smell, taste, touch, sound to our brain, including thinking, imagining, etc, as explained recently here, **We are our own Memory Manipulators/Future Predictors!** (PhysOrgEU; January 2).

2] Not exactly, Instinct is only reacting to the extrinsic environmental factors more than just the physical laws; it acts according to the biological laws, intrinsic to all mobile organisms on Earth.

3] Yes, if our senses of Consciousness can be incorporated into our memory system, our memories can be manipulated, as explained in 1] above; whereas being an

inorganic entity, a computer program would not create or write a new program by itself; that's why a computer cannot be a conscious being, no matter how sophisticatedly or powerfully it's built or programmed!

4] Yes, Consciousness is associated with our freewill, creativity, intuitivity, etc, as explained in 1] and 2] above; however, neither we humans nor animals can survive outside the biological laws, including those of physics, that had had given rise our unique planet Earth, as explained in 2] above (please see also **Gods, Genes, Conscience**, Chapter 2 The Universal Elements of Life; and Chapter 3 The Physicochemical Basis of Life).

Thank you all for your kind attention and cooperation in this matter. Happy reading, thinking, scrutinizing, imagining, and enlightening!

Best wishes, Mong 1/9/7usct10:47p; author **Gods, Genes, Conscience and Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now**; a cyberspace hermit-philosopher of Modern Mind, whose works are based on the current advances in interdisciplinary science and integrative psychology of Science and Religion worldwide; ethically, morally; metacognitively, and objectively.

Imagination

10th January 2007 - 06:47 AM

Dr. Tan,

I wrote as 'Einstein's Ghost' above.

I apologize for something I misconstrued of yours a while back. You said to me 'Savant'. I think you could be correct. Maybe 'Cosmo-Savant'.

Anyway. 'Consciousness' is because we are 'Inter-faced' with something 'greater than us', and that is the Universal Mind of 'G-d'.

The connection inter-face is our Autonomic Nervous System.

***That is the answer. You will find none other.**

***This is why I've stated that these are all connected to one thing:**

- 1.Savant
- 2.Autism
- 3.Phantom Limb syndrome

czeslaw

10th January 2007 - 09:39 AM

QUOTE (Mong H Tan, PhD+Jan 10 2007, 04:48 AM)

Hello, Consciousness/Matter Inquirers-Thinkers, Everybody, Mind, and Spirit!

2] Not exactly, Instinct is only reacting to the extrinsic environmental factors more than just the physical laws; it acts according to the biological laws, intrinsic to all mobile organisms on Earth.

Best wishes, Mong 1/9/7usct10:47p; author **Gods, Genes, Conscience and Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now**; a cyberspace hermit-philosopher of Modern Mind, whose works are based on the current advances in interdisciplinary science and integrative psychology of Science and Religion worldwide; ethically, morally; metacognitively, and objectively.

I thought the biological laws are physical laws also in a larger meaning.
A self-defence instict have the animals and humans being.
It depends on your free will if you want to change natural conditions. I agree the physics law remains the same but you have a free will to choose how to use them.

I begun to read your book on line - it is very interesting.
czeslaw

10th January 2007 - 05:01 PM

QUOTE (czeslaw+Jan 10 2007, 10:52 AM)

Mayer was a medicine doctor, not a physics. He proposed an energy conservation law based on an observation.

I think there are two forms of conservation:

1) If we're limited to making relative measurements of quantities between one thing and something else, then if both quantities increase or decay, you're still left with the appearance that the ratio of them remains similar.

So for example, if space uniformly expanded, then unless it expands to a point where no further interactions occur within it, you'll be using these expanded features for measurements of times and distances and such a uniform rescaling of sizes would go unnoticed.

Or if we look at quantities of energy, imagine two cars are moving toward each other and represent the motion of thermal energy between two atoms.

If they collide and emit a high velocity piece of shrapnel, then though the two cars might be seen as being frozen and motionless relative to each other, this created a particle that's virtually infinitely hotter than them.

2) You also have a general conservation of information, but this may not be a direct product of physical laws but instead a product of how we understand the universe.

If you consider what properties of the universe would be most obvious, you'll find it the recurring properties with some stable content to the information that we can all

point to and share an understanding about. Science can't deal with differing individual subjective experiences and so only the most stable forms of matter, energy and information etc. are easily analyzed by science.

This requirement for science imposes such a conservation on quantities it observers. Are dreams conserved? No, but pencils would be (assuming they aren't physically altered)

So the physical world has characteristics that must be retained over time in order that we can recognize, understand and share physical observations of them. I'd assume all physical phenomenon must share some common property - force? Force would seem the key as it's what allows for something to be detected. If we consider that this force acts to convey information from one object to another, then you can see things in terms of a conservation of information, though I don't believe you must have 100% conservation of a quantity but instead those properties most conserved are most prominent and attributes that decay are overlooked and less noticeable, so evolution naturally favors conserved quantities (exponential growth or decay becomes incoherent and invisible).

bee

10th January 2007 - 06:10 PM

Hi,

Sensory events processed through/against experienced memory recorded functions and procedures.

czeslaw

10th January 2007 - 07:14 PM

I do not believe that our Observable Universe is a perfect closed and finite. We observe a Dark Energy effect and it might be an energy supplied from outside of our Observable Universe. Along with the energy is the information coming to us and our Universe is so complicate.

StevenA

11th January 2007 - 12:31 AM

QUOTE (czeslaw+Jan 10 2007, 07:14 PM)

I wrote that Mayer as a non physics amateur proposed a most fundamental physics law and you go much farther. It is a positive developing.

There is an information conservation too, I think. The energy is a kind of an information.

I've got a background in software and engineering, not subatomic physic but it's interesting to see how ideas from information theory can apply to physical systems. It would be great if the physical properties of the universe could be described by a small collection of basic logical operations. My guess is that the laws of nature are seen in specific ways due to the manner in which consciousness interfaces via. the body and brain but that you could simultaneously have a wildly different perspective of what properties the universe possess as well as finding that it still

boils down to a few basic principles just applied in different ways. Our universe could already be a specific expression of every possible universe but seen from one vantage point (at last this is the way the puzzle pieces seem to be fitting together for me) and that from an alternate perspective, humans could be as knowledgeable of how the universe operates as moths flying circles around a candleflame.

QUOTE (czeslaw+)

Along with the energy is the information coming to us and our Universe is so complicate.

It could be there's an infinite complexity out there and we find that it appears exactly as complex as we're able to comprehend it as being.

It's likely not a coincidence that science keeps branching and growing into new fields instead of reaching a pinnacle where some theory of everything is found. Even if such a theory were found, it would only describe some fundamental processes that would still become ever more complex when applied to larger and larger scales (unless a fractal description was discovered which could help unify physics on different scales).

czeslaw

11th January 2007 - 07:57 AM

The people in a big city leave its center and live in its suburbs. It is a natural historical tendency. There is too much energy, noise in a center.
The Black Hole Like Object does not collapse in an overdense singularity but it will grow and create its new structures. I try to prove it - <http://www.gravastar.int.pl/>

It is very fundamental what you wrote here:

"It's likely not a coincidence that science keeps branching and growing into new fields instead of reaching a pinnacle where some theory of everything is found. Even if such a theory were found, it would only describe some fundamental processes that would still become ever more complex when applied to larger and larger scales (unless a fractal description was discovered which could help unify physics on different scales). "

vkamath

11th January 2007 - 06:53 PM

QUOTE (StevenA+)

It could be there's an infinite complexity out there and we find that it appears exactly as complex as we're able to comprehend it as being.

It's likely not a coincidence that science keeps branching and growing into new fields instead of reaching a pinnacle where some theory of everything is found. Even if such a theory were found, it would only describe some fundamental processes that would still become ever more complex when applied to larger and larger scales (unless a fractal description was discovered which could help unify physics on

different scales).

It is like a formula that defines the relation between a set of numbers. In this case, the more we look the more numbers we get and the formula gets increasingly complex. If the number set is a sequence made of a formula which repeats as in fractals, then adding more numbers wouldn't increase complexity.

I am imagining what a fractal description of the universe would be like. Maybe it will be analogous to looking down a super powerful microscope and finding yourself there looking into a microscope

Mong H Tan, PhD

11th January 2007 - 07:28 PM

Hello, Consciousness/Matter Inquirers-Thinkers, Everybody, Mind, and Spirit!

QUOTE

Imagination: Dr. Tan, I wrote as 'Einstein's Ghost' above.[1]

I apologize for something I misconstrued of yours a while back.[2]

You said to me 'Savant'. I think you could be correct. Maybe 'Cosmo-Savant'.[3]

=====

1] I thought I read something quite familiar before!

2] Please, no apology necessary! I'm used to be stalked and verbally insulted worse than that in cyberspace, wherein I try not to take any comments personal; otherwise one would not be able to learn and grow, intellectually, as well as spiritually.

3] I did ask you if you're a Savant of some kind; but I didn't get a direct answer, so I presumed you're not a Savant! Now, calling yourself a "Cosmo-Savant," and that is a big stretch of imagination. Let elaborate further below.

4] This is your pure imagination again: Your assertion without substantiation—it's not scientific thinking at all!

5] This is again your assertion without any scientific understanding of the issue at hand, the Autonomous Nervous System.

6] Again, this is your big imagination; whereas neurologically, and in Psychiatry, all the 3 syndromes above have no connections whatsoever clinically—although they all may involve in our memory system, they each represent the 3 distinct specific circuitries, phenomena, and symptoms, whose characterizations are still under close clinical investigations; so your assertion of "Cosmo-Savant" is beyond yours or my professional qualification!

7] No, the biological laws include the physical laws, not the other way around; that's why we—as the Observer-Humans operating within the biological laws—are able to define the physical laws of the Universe, and not the Universe (nonliving) investigates the (living) Observer!

8] Yes, all mobile organisms have an instinct reflex for self-defense, self-preservation; and, all involuntary reactions (instincts, intuitions, gut feelings, etc) are conducted by our autonomous (involuntary) nervous system—only mobile organisms have both the voluntary and involuntary nervous systems (please see **Gods, Genes, Conscience**, Chapter 10 The Universal Composition of Mind; and Chapter 11 The Wondrous Working of Mind).

9] Yes, Freewill is created by our voluntary nervous system, one that is composed of our 5 senses of seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, tasting; and thinking, willing, etc, in our brain.

10] Thanks; as you've said: "**There are many different theories about it [a theory of everything]. Nobody knows which of them is better. You may create yours as well.**" So, I hope you will find the Theory of Consciousness in **Gods, Genes, Conscience** is the most updated, useful, and the best model out there in the literature (please see Chapter 15 The Universal Theory of Mind)!

11] This is a big jump from Physics to Psychology; I hope **Gods, Genes, Conscience** will help you bridge the gap in your search for a "theory of consciousness" soon—or Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) would say of his "theory of dream" as the royal road to the unconscious, although my research (in book) shows that he was not quite exactly right (please see Chapter 4 The Human Life, Mind, Dreams, Intelligence, and Conscience)!

I do not believe that our Observable Universe is a perfect closed and finite. We observe a Dark Energy effect and it might be an energy supplied from outside of our Observable Universe. Along with the energy is the information coming to us and our Universe is so complicated.

I think Information is not energy; however, Information is a stream of creations—characterizations of the STEM matrices (see below)—in our Consciousness, memory system; a freewill creativity system that utilizes energy, so as to function in our brain. Furthermore, our Universe is in a state of perpetual dynamic equilibrium: an active, interactive, and creative system of the STEM (space, time, energy, matter) matrices, in continuum, ad infinitum; of which our Solar System is only a very tiny part!

Thank you all for your kind attention and cooperation in this matter. Happy reading, thinking, scrutinizing, imagining, and enlightening!

Best wishes, Mong 1/11/7usct1:27p; author **Gods, Genes, Conscience** and **Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now**; a cyberspace hermit-philosopher of

Modern Mind, whose works are based on the current advances in interdisciplinary science and integrative psychology of Science and Religion worldwide; ethically, morally; metacognitively, and objectively.

StevenA

11th January 2007 - 10:41 PM

It is like a formula that defines the relation between a set of numbers. In this case, the more we look the more numbers we get and the formula gets increasingly complex. If the number set is a sequence made of a formula which repeats as in fractals, then adding more numbers wouldn't increase complexity.

I am imagining what a fractal description of the universe would be like. Maybe it will be analogous to looking down a super powerful microscope and finding yourself there looking into a microscope

Yes, that's the type of relationships you'd find with fractal structures, or for example, you might find galaxies possess the same properties atoms do but on different scales of space and time. Hopefully this could be extrapolated across intermediately sized orbital systems like stellar systems or planets and moons (it's hard to imagine how quantization apparent on small scales could be mimicked on larger scales though)

If you look at the power of the fourier transform and sinusoidal waves there was an entire branch of mathematics that resulted from recognizing periodic structures and treating them as a single static value (frequency, period or wavelength). If we could find mathematical ways of treating some types of fractal systems similarly, it could open up quite a few new fields of discovery. It might be we can bypass the need for a fast matrix multiplication algorithm for natural systems if we can find that nature never needs to use it.

vkamath

12th January 2007 - 05:00 PM

QUOTE (StevenA+)

Yes, that's the type of relationships you'd find with fractal structures, or for example, you might find galaxies possess the same properties atoms do but on different scales of space and time. Hopefully this could be extrapolated across intermediately sized orbital systems like stellar systems or planets and moons (it's hard to imagine how quantization apparent on small scales could be mimicked on larger scales though)

Also, the uncertainty principle which operates at quantum level is not present at larger scales. At larger scales everything has mass, unlike particles without mass at quantum scales. So there are plenty of differences. Correct me if I am wrong, I am an amateur at quantum mechanics.

But I get your point that if a fractal relation is found at some level, it could explain everything without adding complexity. It seems unlikely, but what do we know?
czeslaw

13th January 2007 - 02:30 PM

The natural laws are sometimes very universal and may be some of us will discover something universal just by observation only.

That you attempted to understand the Evolution of Everything in and through the outdated mentality of the early 20th-century Physics of the Universe and Life; and that cannot be “the royal road” to the Consciousness, as Freud would put it!

Maybe you missed reading my latest theory of “Memophorescencicity” that I presented here, **Infinity (Consciousness vs Observer: A Complementary to Infinity Quest)** (Physics-philosophy-metaphysicsAU; September 21), or more recently about the Evolution of God (our emotional spiritual Mind) here, **Let's begin the Dialogue and Reconciliation of Science and Religion Now!** (PhysOrgEU; December 5). For your convenience and consideration, let me quote the more updated philosophical principles below; and based on which that I arrived at my Theory of Consciousness (linked above):

Epistemologically, since the 1980s, Consciousness and theory of the human mind, have had been increasingly studied by many prominent philosophers and scientists alike, from all possible ways or perspectives, accurately or misguidedly, throughout our intellectual and spiritual history. Generally, I would characterize them, as follows; although by no means it's to be construed as an exhaustive list:

- 1) Metaphysical-cosmological—eg, Spinoza; Einstein; Carl Jung; et al; whose hunches are that consciousness or deity as something big out there in the Universe, beyond our reach physically;
- 2) Hard artificial intelligence (AI)—eg, Turing; Marvin Minsky; Ray Kurzweil; et al; who believe that computers will be conscious someday; AI dreaming, so to speak;
- 3) Neurophysics-mathematics—eg, Descartes; Roger Penrose; et al; who pinpoint the seat of consciousness in our brain, but all in the wrong places; Descartes pointed at the pineal gland, Penrose at the neuronal microtubules (1994), all inconsistent with the current knowledge of neuroscience, neurology, and neuro-endocrinology!
- 4) Soft artificial intelligence—eg, Paul Churchland; David Chalmers; Steven Pinker; et al; who believe that consciousness may be akin to digital computational software;
- 5) Neurophilosophy—eg, Francis Crick; Patricia Churchland; et al; who attempt to incorporate neuroscience into theory of mind, but they are not quite there yet, both

conceptually and empirically; all lost in the complexities of the neuropsychological forests, so to speak;

6) General philosophy—eg, John Searle; et al; who vehemently oppose all AI representation or simulation of the human mind or consciousness; whose “Chinese room” thought experiment is exemplary, as a debunker of the AI thesis, hard and soft;

7) Faulty theory of memetics (not even a philosophy!)—eg, Richard Dawkins; Daniel Dennett; Susan Blackmore; et al; whose Evolutionism in *The Selfish Gene* (1976) gives rise to the scientific, metaphysical, evolutionistic theory (or wordplay) of meme (or myth); whereby our consciousness may be likened to the viral contagion in our brain, gloriously and utterly fashionable nonsense, for 3 decades now;

8) Self-defeatist philosophy—eg, Mary Midgley; Colin McGinn; et al; who proclaim that consciousness is what our brain does, but we’ll not be able to understand it! And,

9) Interdisciplinary metacognitive philosophy—eg, **Gods, Genes, Conscience**; wherein a new theory of consciousness is presented (Chapter 15 *The Universal Theory of Mind*), whose quantum mechanics dubbed “memophorescencicity” has had been empirically defined and localized in the particle-wave function of our cortical neuronal membrane (2006)—please also see [Scientists use quantum mechanics to control a biological process](#) (PhysOrgEU; September 7)!

Thank you all for your kind attention and cooperation in this matter. Happy reading, thinking, scrutinizing, imagining, and enlightening!

Best wishes, Mong 1/13/7

author **Gods, Genes, Conscience and Gods, Genes, Conscience: Global Dialogues Now**; a cyberspace hermit-philosopher of Modern Mind, whose works are based on the current advances in interdisciplinary science and integrative psychology of Science and Religion worldwide; ethically, morally; metacognitively, and objectively.

Janus

13th January 2007 - 11:06 PM

Hi All,

We must not overlook the obvious.

The brain is in two halves, why?

My belief is that if the brain was a single unit ... it would perform as a computer and have no consciousness ... well not like ours.

It would have to be programmed by hand and have no knowledge beyond its

programming.

Simplistically explained:

The left brain inherited our instincts and the right brain processes them ... you know the good and bad devils on each of our shoulders.

But where is consciousness?

Can we prick it?

My concept is this: the brain is like an A and B Venn diagram ... the intersection of A and B is where our consciousness lies ... beyond being conscious and unconscious ... it is invisible and immeasurable.

In other words remove half the brain and consciousness disappears ... you will still function ... but more like a politician.

I think drugs like LSD give you right brain (bad trip) or left brain (wow man) trip ... and actually break up the A and B intersection of consciousness momentarily ... I don't think they actual put you in a second state of consciousness ... happy pills work in the same way by stimulating the left brain.

In the future I believe we will develop further and higher consciousness' by each brain dividing in turn so that we will have an intersection of A and B and C and D ... that I believe is why we still have plenty of unused areas in our brain.

In other word there will be a total of three states of consciousness ... beyond the one we are in at present.

Maybe ... some people have already developed beyond the A and B intersection of consciousness.

Cheers

Janus
Zephir

13th January 2007 - 11:32 PM

QUOTE (Janus+Jan 14 2007, 02:06 AM)

The brain is in two halves, why?

...for being able to put such questions? The consciousness has no specific location in brain, the human's brain the less. After all, it's quite vaguely defined term. Even animals can have often a great insight over its real situation. Try to have look at this [amazing video](#) of brave rabbit from Texas, which has beaten some snake back to the tree. This rabbit has overcome its instincts, because of perfect insight into situation. It's a typical example of conscious behavior - this rabbit was simply more

clever than the snake.

StevenA

14th January 2007 - 05:10 PM

QUOTE (Janus+)

The brain is in two halves, why?

Something I find interesting is that the two halves communicate through a limited pathway.

I believe each half performs a very similar process and that the results are compared in a limited and compressed fashion between them. If one side can predict characteristics of what the other side is seeing, then those characteristics are likely features of the real, physical world and not internal noise in the brain.

Also by requiring a compressed representation be compared a preference for extracting some of the most pertinent information is created.

For example, imagine turning your head from left to right. In this case, your right eye sees things first and then they pass on to your left field of vision.

If the objective of the communication between each side of the brain is to maximize the predictive power of events detected by the alternate side of the brain, then in order for information from your right eye to be used to predict what will be seen by the left eye, the largest and most influential features seen by the right eye must be isolated in order to be passed for expansion and comparison with the other side of the brain. This also helps assure internal noise or illusions in one side of the brain can be detected and rejected because these wouldn't occur identically in each hemisphere.

Ivars

14th January 2007 - 08:50 PM

QUOTE

The brain is in two halves, why?

Because it is a typical vortex breakdown structure. As is Earth. And electron. With MOST complex internal structure.

Zephir

14th January 2007 - 09:24 PM

QUOTE (Ivars+Jan 14 2007, 11:50 PM)

Because it is a typical vortex breakdown structure. As is Earth. And electron.

I suppose, the reason is in evolutionary biology, because the first central neural systems were paired due to treatment of signals from eyes. The eyes are paired, because it enables the spatial orientation, therefore the neural ganglia were paired too. The most information comes from eyes, therefore the neural ganglia has developed in paired brain hemispheres.

The explanation of everything by vortices is just naive homology, not analogy and such reasoning doesn't belong into science. Here's nothing paired on the Earth planet, for example.

Ivars

14th January 2007 - 09:43 PM

Nature is simple, and analogy is the most powerful tool of understanding it. Probably You know Pythagoras.

It does not add any value to involve things like evolution which just approximate vortex structure dynamics and resonances (not vortexes, but vortex breakdown structures) either.

There is no way of proving it is not so. Nothing in nature would contradict this aether and vortex breakdown structure theory. Even Your foams etc. is just the result of it . Another approximation. So it is not naive. It is, at least, the simplest, most unifying and not disproved theory of Nature there is. The details have to be worked out, but it is not so difficult as mathematicians have done most of the job already. Unfortunately, few most important pieces are still missing, like what is i? why e, pi is as they are? Why heptagon can not be inscribed in circle ? What is the closest number to 7 that can? When this will be found, the rest will be easy.

Evolution etc. is nice, but unnecessary complication of things, and degrades human ability to understand nature as specialization and knowing becomes more important than understanding.

Inside Earth, there of course are 2 semi spheres, is not that obvious? Stationary with respect to Earth surface rotation axis. Made of Aether Vortex breakdown.

Every real , natural sphere has them.

Zephir

14th January 2007 - 10:01 PM

QUOTE (Ivars+Jan 15 2007, 12:43 AM)

Nature is simple, and analogy is the most powerful tool of understanding it.

Just because of Nature symmetry, such "analogies" can be the most powerful tool for misinterpretations, too. The problem is in mixing of analogy and homology. The causal connections in homologies are just illusory and they can lead to the misunderstandings as well.

For example, the Aether hypothesis was refuted before years, just because the scientist have believed, the Aether will behave like air or other homological environments, composed from particles. Therefore I'm not very happy, if somebody applies the general connections by naive and mechanical way, while the real reasons is somewhere else.

Ivars

15th January 2007 - 07:58 AM

QUOTE

Therefore I'm not very happy, if somebody applies the general connections by naive and mechanical way, while the real reasons is somewhere else.

You may be unhappy, that is Ok. But as to other "real reasons", that sounds to me totally unproved. All real reasons we have today in physics are just approximations of reality, projections, which fit the limited scope they have been introduced for. Including Newton dynamics. There is and can be only 1 real reason why e.g. there is no EXACT analytical solution to Navier-Stokes, but there is exact numerical one once You get down to small enough quanta. If there would not be, we would not see them. Beyond today computer capabilities, but not beyond the capabilities of human mind.

Zephir

15th January 2007 - 08:49 AM

QUOTE (Ivars+Jan 15 2007, 10:58 AM)

...but as to other "real reasons", that sounds to me totally unproved....

LOL, it's just you, who is claiming, the brain has two hemispheres, because of vortex structure of Universe.

That sounds to me totally unproved. Of course, you can say, the people have a single nose, because of vortex structure of Universe as well. It's evident, such "reason" doesn't explain anything, being a pure subject of belief.

Ivars

15th January 2007 - 09:31 AM

I agree I have to supply little bit more "flesh on the bones".

At the same time, there does not exist neither theory of turbulence, nor vortex breakdown structures, so to presume that it is NOT possible to have resonance environment where shapes like brain and fractals can grow out of Aether - well it is at least to cut away a huge potential where to look for answers.

The smallest thing in Universe so far is (assumed) Planck length 10^{-35} m

The Universe itself is presumed to be of order 10^{26} m. So it is 10^{51} times in length, but as resonance is linked to rotation, and rotation quanta to h , there has to be a phase space which is dimensioned as far as to allow 10^{84-85} units of rotation.

It is enough to have Whole Universe created as a resonance structure of a complex vortex bubbles and other shapes. I guess it is totally realistic. At least as a hypothesis.

czeslaw

15th January 2007 - 09:31 AM

We have to be careful with the analogies. The Aether is a good example. We have a Pauli excluding principle in atomic scale - it is not a pressure though the effect is similar.

We may create an artificial intelligence but if it has a consciousness ? What kind of a consciousness ?

As I wrote the galaxy is more complicated than our living cell. There is so much galaxies as cells in a brain. It doesn't mean that our Observable Universe is a brain. May be the structure is similar but it means something different and we do not know what.

carnation

27th February 2007 - 05:24 AM

My paper, **Model of process storing and recalling post on Web 31th Oct 2006, have describe the timing funtion of blood cycle in brain. Today, my paper still contain useful information** welcome to SCIAM COM CN\BBS\thread.php?fid=18

Best wishes

Teonanacatl

27th February 2007 - 07:59 PM

Forgive me for the lack of flow in this post, I just copied and pasted and shuffled from my word document somewhat hurried

Matter at its most fundamental level isn't "matter" as such. It's energy. Non-local, timeless, formless pure energy. We tend to forget that we are huge beings roaming about in a multidimensional world consisting of stuff that hardly can be said to have any consistency or spatial dimension at all. This is what we are made of! I believe modern physics is about to discover the role of the observer but also the limitations of science, for ultimately we cannot observe ourselves. The observer is the observed. The Universe is like a holographic projection made possible by Awareness. The whole thing is experience. Reality cannot exist without consciousness, for it is reality itself.

It seems we have a species-specific interface with the Universe that prevents us from ever seeing its true form. This interface of ours has made our relationship with it overly emphasized with the macroscopic structures of matter and its casual relationship with itself. (Stars, planets, galaxies, space and such) It appears like a cause and effect mechanism when, at its subtlest levels, it is not. If you think about it, the whole thing is made possible by consciousness. Without it, it would just be a

formless mesh of energy. Our mind is that non-local, etheric, strange, intangible force that's just so familiar to us to recognize. The Universe exists within Consciousness. You are not only a part of it, you are it, for you're not really a Human more than you are consciousness. It is through language we separate the world. So one has to conclude that your consciousness can never die, for Consciousness isn't some epiphenomena of the brain. It's the fundamental force of the Universe. This is why near-death experiencers are constantly raving about their life-changing experiences

I believe the Universe (not the visible one) is a multidimensional, non-local conscious entity which can't be said to exist anywhere, or at any point in time. Neither can it be said to be "big" or "small" or of any size. In that way it is formless, eternal and beyond time. Time is but one of the dimensions within it somehow related to (or made possible by) consciousness, but unable to influence the entity itself. I believe that this entity is consciousness itself. We are One multidimensional conscious being growing, complicating itself, expressing itself constantly.

We are not machines, if that we're so you wouldn't be able to read or understand this. Neither are we organisms separate from our environment, as nothing in nature is separate from anything else. The flower cannot exist without the bee, neither can the bee without the flower. They are one organism. Our own existence depends on an infinitely vast range of variables, ranging from bacteria and insects to cosmic radiation and black holes thousands of light years away! You can't define one thing without defining the Whole!

The biosphere of the earth is an organism, the Universe is an organism. It grows, expands and complicates itself. It's fractal by nature.

So we grow out of the Universe, we don't "come into it", we're not created by it, we are the apples of the tree and the tree itself. We're not accidents in some clock-work mechanism set to run itself to destruction through time 14 billion years ago. Cosmos is an interconnected, self-aware, organism expanding from within. It expresses itself through you, I, the trees and the stars.

Isn't slightly weird that the parameters of the Natural forces would be so finely tuned as to create a Universe able to observe itself? That intelligent creatures would self-assemble of an unintelligent environment? We're just too preoccupied by bogging ourselves down as unimportant to remember that in fact; we are it. Consciousness is it. Consciousness is self-aware by nature. Nothing else is aware but awareness, and without awareness, nothing is.

Looking at the starry night is looking at yourself; nothing is separate. It is One undivided entity. Life and Consciousness is what it is all about. Deep inside, you know. You've always suspected it; deep down you're the only being in existence. You "unconsciously" (or rather "superconsciously") create the entire cosmos and everything in it; me, you, your dog, your neighbour, the forests, the mountains and

the galaxies, for you, the far-in you, are that non-local, conscious entity that is beyond time and matter. Imagine observing your room without consciousness...It's impossible. There would be no time or space. At the innermost deepest of yourself you are the Universe! I, You, All, One. Some people call you Brahman, some call you God. The fact is you're pure Consciousness. You've always been around and you always will be, and the reason you can't remember what's been going on for the past eternity, is that Time doesn't exist, there is only Now and Awareness itself has no memory. There is no tomorrow and yesterday is but an echo of now. To realize this is what is called enlightenment in eastern philosophies.
Peace

[A nice animation of what I've just said.](#)

[A dreamy video narrated by my favourite philosopher, Alan Watts.](#)
carnation

28th February 2007 - 05:02 AM

Model of process storing and recalling

post on Web 31th Oct 2006, have describe the timing function of blood cycle in brain, and it's the origin of time cognition.

A friend(whose ID on SCIAM COM CN BBS is emohuang) introduce me to this site, the invitation is sciam com cn /bbs/read.php?tid=4893

here, i should say thank you to him

Teonanacatl

28th February 2007 - 03:45 PM

Also I want to add; that the exploring of consciousness without the use of consciousness-altering compounds like Psilocybin, LSD, Muscimol (Soma), DMT, Salvia Divinorum and Mescaline is next to useless. It's rather like having a bunch of Astronomers studying Cosmos with the Hubble Space Telescope in the closet. The situation is absurd. Hysteric politics has made sure that these "drugs" are only available to the kids on the streets but not to scientists....woa, woa, woaaaa.....

carnation

1st March 2007 - 03:52 AM

A Evidence support Model of process storing and recalling:

A paper post on <Brain Research Bulletin>(Oct 2006, Author Prof. LuoJin PRC) report the excited or inhibited situation in different subareas of optic pallium when the brain running a chinese character distructing task. The Objective of experiment is to find more detail about chunk breaking mechanism, using imaging technology. Phenomena: when chunk breaking happens:

- (1) Primary visual is inhibited
- (2) MT area is excited

Phenomena Telling from view point of "Model of process storing and recalling"

- (I)Experiment breaking a chunk into "step by step" and display each step on image
- (II) PAY ATTENTION to position relationship among Primary visual, MT area,

and posterior cerebral artery

(III) During process of "new idea rise up" in experiment, the chunk is broken into steps and was "locked" on a special step. This tell the function of glia network when brain processing complex information

(IV) Phenomena in this experiment have common point with process storing and recalling-- timing control function of blood circulation

(V) More detail about the experiment refer to <BrainResearchBulletin>(Oct 2006) etc.

RickyTy