

Commentary

Commentary on Tony Bermanseder's "Physical Consciousness in a Self-conscious Quantum Universe"

Michael Cecil*

ABSTRACT

This is my brief Commentary on Mr. Bermanseder's "Physical Consciousness in a Self-conscious Quantum Universe" in this issue of JCER. My point is that any attempt to explain human consciousness which focuses exclusively upon the scientific method for the understanding of consciousness—simply ignoring both the consciousness of the "self" and the origin of the consciousness of the "self" in the 'movement' of self-reflection—simply does not fulfill the requirements set out by Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

Key Words: thinker, thought, self, consciousness, movement, self-reflection.

Mr. Bermanseder's essay "Physical Consciousness in a Self-conscious Quantum Universe" in this issue of JCER is, in my view, another valiant but futile attempt to establish the consciousness of the 'thinker' as the 'inertial frame of reference' for the understanding and description of all of human consciousness and experience; when, in fact, the consciousness of the 'thinker' constitutes only one (and a very narrow one, at that) of the three dimensions of consciousness and experience (those other dimensions being the consciousness of the "self" and another dimension of consciousness existing prior to both the origin of the "self", in the 'movement' of self-reflection, and the consciousness of the 'thinker' itself). And, in this, the approach taken by Mr. Bermanseder bears resemblance to the approach taken by Leon Maurer with his *ABC Theory of Consciousness* (see, Maurer, 2010); although it is far beyond my poor powers of cognition either to understand theoretical physics, or to determine with any degree of certainty which of these theories of consciousness more clearly demonstrates the utter futility of attempting to understand consciousness from exclusively the frame of reference of the scientific method; that is, the consciousness of the 'thinker'.

The critical issue about the subject of consciousness—and what makes it so intensely and frustratingly difficult to understand in its totality—is that, while the question "What is consciousness?" can only be posed by the consciousness of the 'thinker' itself; any attempt whatsoever by the consciousness of the 'thinker' to answer that question is, necessarily, based upon the assumption that the consciousness of the 'thinker' is not only the only dimension of consciousness; but, also, the only source of any legitimate explanation or description of the experiences of the physical/conscious reality; thus, necessarily, ignoring both the entire subject of psychosis, as well as the findings of both the Reichian and Jungian psychologists with regards to the consciousness of the "self"; to say nothing of the findings of the parapsychologists with regards to presentiment or pre-cognition; or, for that matter, the evidence from, primarily, the Eastern traditions with regards to memories of previous lives; memories which are necessarily beyond the frame of reference of both the consciousness of the 'thinker' and the consciousness of the "self" as well.

Correspondence: Michael Cecil, <http://science-of-consciousness.blogspot.com> E-mail: mececil@sbcglobal.net

In other words, unlike any other subject to be investigated by the scientific method, any all-inclusive understanding of human consciousness must necessarily strike at the very foundation of the scientific method itself; that foundation being the assumption that the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ is, for all practical purposes, ‘omniscient’ in its description of the physical/conscious reality. That is, while the ultimate goal of classical physics was to establish an all-inclusive physical theory rather than merely to preserve classical physics itself as that all-inclusive theory; so, too, the ultimate goal of even the scientific method must be to transcend the fundamental assumptions of the scientific method itself (rather than merely to preserve the scientific method itself as the reigning paradigm for the understanding of reality)—and the purported ‘omniscience’ of the consciousness of the ‘thinker’—for the purpose of attaining an even more inclusive understanding of the physical/conscious reality.

Briefly, then, the entire paper consists of thoughts originating in the consciousness of the ‘thinker’. But, for the totality of consciousness to be understood at all, it must be understood that what Mr. Bermanseder refers to as “first principles and causes” are “first principles and causes” only for the consciousness of the ‘thinker’; and that, prior to all such “first principles and causes”, there occurred a ‘movement’ of self-reflection, which was the origin of the ‘spatiality’ of the “self”, as well as a postulation of the thought of the ‘thinker’, or the “self” or the “I”, which established and maintains the continuity of the ‘spatiality’ of the “self” (and the arrow of time in, exclusively, a forward direction) from one moment to the next; all of which, however, are direct observations of the reality of consciousness rather than “first principles or causes” to be believed by a ‘thinker’.

That is, any attempt to explain human consciousness which focuses exclusively upon the scientific method for the understanding of consciousness—simply ignoring both the consciousness of the “self” and the origin of the consciousness of the “self” in the ‘movement’ of self-reflection—simply does not fulfill the requirements set out by Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

Reference

Maurer, L. H. (2010), How Unconditioned Consciousness, Infinite Information, Potential Energy, and Time Created Our Universe. JCER 1(5): pp. 610-624.