

Science of Consciousness – firstly, the Matter of Definitions

by Peter Jakubowski (June 2018)

In the "HuffPost" from 05/01/2017 ("[Can There Be a Science of Consciousness?](#)"), authors Deepak Chopra and Pankaj S. Joshi correctly note the actual circumstances related to Consciousness Research: "The possibility of a science of consciousness, which would involve a thorough explanation of mind and how it relates to matter, can't begin until the obstacles in its path are removed and old accepted assumptions are overturned."

Nevertheless, the authors themselves still employ said "old accepted assumptions" in their argumentation. They begin the article as follows: "Although it takes place outside the headlines, even those that deal with science, a heated debate is occurring about mind and matter. On one side is a camp of so-called physicalists, formerly known as materialists, who hold fast to the assumption that any and all phenomena in nature can be reduced to physical processes, namely the forces and the interaction between objects (atoms, subatomic or elementary particles, etc.) — these are the building blocks of the universe. On the other side is no single camp but a mixed assortment of skeptics who hold that at least one natural phenomenon—the human mind—cannot be explained physically through such methods."

There are numerous "old accepted assumptions" even in their short passage. Two most evident are the following:

1. **"... physicalists, formerly known as materialists, ..."**
Indeed, traditional physics (including "so-called modern" physics of the 20th century) was a materialistic description of natural phenomena (accordingly restricted domain; excluding soul, mind, and consciousness etc.)
2. **"... the assumption that any and all phenomena in nature can be reduced to physical processes, ..."**
Only the traditional scientific description of any and all phenomena in nature can be reduced to physical processes. The true natural phenomena can in no way be influenced by our scientific description of Nature - neither by the traditional description, nor even by any new one.

But the heaviest "obstacle in the path" that I see is in their following "old accepted assumption": "Finally, in neuroscience and biochemistry, there is zero connection between nerve cells, and their chemical components, and mind. Unless someone can locate the point in time when molecules learned to think, the current assumption that the brain is doing the thinking has no solid footing."

Unified Physics explains to us why the assumption that a "connection between nerve cells, and their chemical components, and mind" is unrealistic. Certain chemical components of nerve cells are merely an illusion. Chemical molecules in our body with a diameter smaller than 5 nanometers can not exist at room temperature. Therefore, to expect that molecules could "learn to think" at some point in the past is not only naïve but is misleading Consciousness Research in a completely false direction.

Nevertheless, my commentary on this important article is intended as a constructive offering. My aim is to wholeheartedly support the authors' principle tenets: "Instead of conceiving reality from the bottom up, moving from tiny building blocks to larger and larger structures, one could do the reverse and create a top-down model. In other words, the starting point would be the whole, not the parts."

The above is precisely what Unified Physics exemplifies by having created a new universal description of Nature's entirety which includes unified definitions of Universal Quantum Creativeness (with its inseparable partners of matter & spirit – relating to the global sense) and Individual Soul (with its inseparable partners of body & mind – relating to individual natural "objects"). In this regard the authors come to very similar conclusions when they write: "In a word, the notion that everything is a mental construct is just as valid as the notion that everything is a physical construct. The two are merely different perspectives."

It's a question of terminology: we need only replace their "mental construct" with Unified Physics' "mind" ... and "physical construct" with "body". However we have to understand that these are not "merely different perspectives" but an actual and indivisible partnership between body and mind (and in a global sense, between matter and spirit being a direct creation of the Universal Quantum Creativeness). In the case of our human being, one's soul gives birth to one's body and mind, and not the reverse way around (as assumed by traditional philosophy for millennia and which traditional physics probably therefore was unable to confirm).

In conclusion, we are at a compelling crossroads, about to take a wrong turn by continuing Consciousness Research along its current path suggested by the authors: "Where physicalists are stymied by how atoms and molecules think, non-physicalists are stymied by how mind creates matter."

Our body and our mind are two inseparable creations of our soul (aka individual consciousness). And matter and spirit are two creations of the Universal Quantum Creativeness (aka global consciousness). This same must also be assumed for every natural object and the entire observable Universe respectively. What a stunning composite of Existence, indeed.

(More about these definitions in Peter Jakubowski's book, "<http://naturics.info/uncategorized/einstein-would-be-happy/>").