

Editorial Inaugural Issue

Let All Truth Seekers Be the Vessels to Carry Consciousness Research to New Heights

Huping Hu & Maoxin Wu

ABSTRACT

Journal of Consciousness Exploration & Research ("JCER") is a publication in which scientists, philosophers and other learned scholars publish their research results and express their views on the nature, origin and mechanism of consciousness. JCER is not about a particular philosophical view of consciousness nor is it focused on philosophical debates which have been done over the millenia. Rather, it is a journal mainly dedicated to the scientific studies of consciousness. JCER is published by QuantumDream, Inc. We are committed to truth and excellence at JCER.

Key Words: consciousness, science, exploration, research

1. Purpose, Mission & Policy

The main purpose and mission of JCER are to conduct scientific studies on the nature, origin and mechanism of consciousness. It is a journal in which scientists, philosophers and other learned scholars publish their research results and express their views on issues outline herein. In doing so, we hope that one day we will be able to arrive at a genuine science of consciousness.

The current policy at JCER is editorial invitation for publication and editorial selections of submitted papers for publication. All papers published by JCER are either subject to open-peer-review ("OPR") in the same issue of JCER or open to OPR in subsequent issues of JCER.

2. The State of Consciousness Research

"As a man who has devoted his whole life to the most clear headed science, to the study of matter, I can tell you as a result of my research about atoms this much: There is no matter as such. All matter originates and exists only by virtue of a force which brings the particle of an atom to vibration and holds this most minute solar system of the atom together. We must assume behind this force the existence of a conscious and intelligent mind. This mind is the

matrix of all matter." These were the words of Max Planck (1944). Planck (1931) had also stated that "I regard consciousness as fundamental. I regard matter as derivative from consciousness. We cannot get behind consciousness. Everything that we talk about, everything that we regard as existing, postulates consciousness."

However, in mainstream sciences today the study and even the mentioning of mind or consciousness are till taboo and the physicists' version of a theory of everything does not include consciousness. Indeed, physicists encountered consciousness more than eighty years ever since quantum mechanics was born (see, e.g., Rosenblum & Kuttner, 2006). Instead of embracing such encounters and exploring the mystery of consciousness, the majority of physicists have been avoiding the consciousness issue like a plague. The irony is that, if we cannot understand ourselves and refuse to do so, how can we hope to understand fundamentally the world surrounding us. Shouldn't the logic be that in order to understand the external world fundamentally we need also (or we must first) to understand how consciousness work?

On the other hand, in the current field of consciousness research some individuals treat the field not as an arena of truth-seeking but a playground for personal gratifications and gains. The goal for them is not about truth but themselves. These individuals create so much of the unhealthy atmosphere in consciousness

Corresponding author: Huping Hu, Ph.D., J.D.
Address: QuantumDream, Inc., P.O. Box 267, Stony Brook,
NY 11790, USA. E-mail: hupinghu@quantumbrain.org

research such as rivalry, arrogance, protectionism and intolerance of alternative views which lead to mediocrity and stagnancy in the field. Similarly, being the mouthpieces of the entrenched, dogmatic, and/or self-proclaimed authorities in the field, some of the journals, electronic archives and conferences covering the field reject or degrade many original works, although freedom and impartiality are their slogan.

3. The Way Out of the Crisis

So, how can we turn around the currently depressing and even shameful situations? First, all men and women of consciousness research have to rise above ourselves by putting our personal interests and gains aside and the mission of truth-seeking as the first priority. Second. All truth-seeking men and women should be granted the rights of freedom, equality and opportunity to be heard in the pursuit of truth. Third, all men and women of consciousness research should be humble, open-minded and tolerant of alternative and opposing views.

Over the last 450 years since Copernicus, we have reached the golden age of science. It is up to us, the modern scientists and all truth-seeking men and women, to study the nature of consciousness scientifically so as to usher mankind into a new era of unprecedented enlightenment and knowledge.

4. Authors' View on Consciousness

The authors are of the view that the reality is an interactive quantum reality centered on consciousness and the interaction between consciousness and reality seems to be a "chicken-egg" puzzle. The perplexing questions are: (1) Is quantum reality (the "chicken") produced and influence by consciousness (the "egg"); or (2) is consciousness produced and influenced by quantum reality?

Quite a few consciousness researchers have tried to answer parts of these two questions. For example, on the first question, Henry Stapp (1993) has made heroic efforts in the face of various criticisms. On the second question, Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff (1996), for example, have made tremendous efforts in producing and advocating the Penrose-Hameroff

model. Philosophically, David Chalmers (1996) in the 90's shook up the field of consciousness research with his classification of the problems of consciousness into "easy problems" and "hard problems". However, the answers to all these fundamental questions are far from settled and they must be answered to arrive at a genuine science of consciousness.

Borrowing from certain philosophy of Hinduism, the herein authors are inclined to believe that: (1) consciousness is both transcendent and immanent, that is, the transcendental aspect of consciousness produces and influences reality as the interactive output of consciousness and, in turn, reality produces and influences immanent aspect of consciousness as the interactive input to consciousness; and (2) Human consciousness is a limited or individualized version of this dual-aspect consciousness such that we have limited free will and limited observation/experience which is mostly classical at macroscopic levels but quantum at microscopic levels.

As a limited transcendental consciousness, we have through free will the choice of what measurement to do in a quantum experiment but not the ability to control the result of measurement. That is, the result appears to us as random. On the other hand, at the macroscopic level, we also have the choice through free will of what to do but the outcome, depending on context, is sometimes certain and at other times uncertain. Further, as a limited immanent consciousness, we can only observe the measurement result in a quantum experiment which we conduct and experiences the macroscopic environment surrounding us as the classical world.

5. Milestones Leading to the Launch of JCER

The herein authors have been conducting scientific studies of consciousness over last ten years since 2000 (See, e.g., Hu & Wu, 2001-2007) thus making the launch of JCER feasible and practical.

In a series of publications, the herein authors proposed a novel mechanism of anesthetic action, a spin-mediated consciousness theory, and a theory in which spin is the primordial self-referential process driving

[immanent] consciousness (See, e.g., Hu & Wu, 2001-2004).

Then, the authors found ways to test experimentally the spin-mediated consciousness theory and biological (& macroscopic) quantum entanglement (Hu & Wu, 2006-2007). It was discovered that applying magnetic pulses to the brain when an anesthetic was placed in between caused the brain to feel the effect of said anesthetic as if the test subject had actually inhaled the same (Hu & Wu, 2006a&b). Through additional experiments, the authors verified that the said brain effect was indeed the consequence of quantum entanglement (*Id.*). These results support the possibility of a quantum brain. Experimenting with simple physical systems such as water quantum-entangled with water being manipulated, the authors also found non-local chemical, thermal and gravitational effects (Hu & Wu, 2006c, 2007). These non-local effects also support a quantum brain theory such as the spin mediated consciousness theory (*Id.*). In short, the above experiments call for drastic changes in the authors own under-standings of nature, consciousness and life.

On December 21, 2009, the herein authors made public their work entitled "The Principle of Existence: Toward a Scientific Theory of Everything." The work was also submitted for publication on the same day to a journal which provisionally accepted it for publication pending review of the mathematics. The feedback from the two reviewers as relayed by the chief editor of that journal under submission was that there is too much theology in the work (which is not true as any reader of the preprint of the work can tell) thus unsuitable for publication.

To accommodate and/or conform to the current circumstances in science and consciousness research, the herein authors have decided to modify their work by leaving the word GOD, ALLAH and Creator out and publish the modified work in this journal. However, the herein authors strongly feel that this yielding to the present circumstances of scientific journalism hardly do justice to the work or to the scientific GOD which the work proposes. So, the original version has been published separately.

In short, time is ripe to launch JCER at this critical moment – the first month and year of a

brand-new decade in the New Millennium and the fast approaching December 2012 during which the supposed transformation of mankind shall occur. The herein authors believe that the state of consciousness of mankind is the missing link for the supposed transformation to take place.

6. The Contents of the Inaugural Issue

Besides the work of the herein authors, this inaugural issue also contains original works of several authors by editorial invitations. The papers appear in reverse alphabetic order by the last name of the first author.

The work of Dainis Zeps illustrates *cognitum* hypothesis and *cognitum* consciousness through which Zeps offers a route to the unification of mind and matter. Zeps passionately ask the question: "May we imagine that materialistic and idealistic thinkers were both right in all point concerning mind and matter they have quarreled for centuries?"

The work of Stephen P. Smith investigates the conflict between formality and intuition and discusses the importance of sentience (or feeling). Among other things, Smith argues that "sentience is covertly connected to space-time geometry when axioms of congruency are stipulated, essentially hiding in the formality what is sense-certain."

The work of Dick Richardson illustrates from the mystical point of view "consciousness, time and prespacetime as consciousness finds it to be." Richardson argues that "only things in time and space which were not made in time and space can go back beyond time and space where they come from." The best way to understand Richardson's work fully is to read his online book given in the reference section of his paper.

The work of Joseph Polanik questions whether "there is an I_3 ", and recommends that this question be the focusing question of JCER. To this end, Polanik describes his notation for subscribing pronouns by reality type and then these are used to diagnose the situation in which contemporary consciousness research finds itself and to pose the search-focusing question for JCER as a means for moving on from here.

Then the work of Alan Oliver addresses the "Hard Problem" from the perspective of the ancient teaching in Yoga Sutras of Patanjali.

Oliver finds ontological similarity between the herein authors' work to appear as the last paper in this issue and the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali. The reason for this similarity, according to Oliver, is that "both seemed to progress through the same or similar steps in a journey from prespacetime to the everyday reality in which we and the Hard Problem exist."

Indeed, the graphics in the cover page of this Inaugural Issue tries to capture Oliver's view.

Finally, the work of the herein authors attempts to lay out an ontological and mathematical foundation toward a scientific theory of everything: "In the beginning there was Consciousness by itself $e^0 = 1$ materially

empty and spiritually restless. And it began to imagine through primordial self-referential spin:

$$1=e^0=e^{iM-iM}=e^{iM}e^{-iM}=e^{iM}/e^{-iM}=e^{iM}/e^{iM}...$$

such that it created the external object to be observed and internal object as observed, separated them into external world and internal world, caused them to interact through self-referential Matrix Law and thus gave birth to the Universe which it has since passionately loved, sustained and made to evolve."

In closing let us remind ourselves that consciousness study is a sacred enterprise of truth. So, let freedom and knowledge to ring and let all truth seekers be the vessels to carry consciousness study to new heights.

References

- Chalmers, D. *The Conscious Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Hameroff, S. & Penrose, R. Conscious events as orchestrated spacetime selections. *J. Conscious Stud.*, 1996; 3: 36-53.
- Hu, H. & Wu, M. Mechanism of anesthetic action: oxygen pathway perturbation hypothesis. *Med. Hypotheses* 2001a: 57: 619-627. Also see arXiv 2001b; physics/0101083.
- Hu, H. & Wu, M. Spin-mediated consciousness theory. arXiv 2002; quant-ph/0208068. Also see *Med. Hypotheses* 2004a: 63: 633-646.
- Hu, H. & Wu, M. Spin as primordial self-referential process driving quantum mechanics, spacetime dynamics and consciousness. *NeuroQuantology* 2004b; 2:41-49. Also see *Cogprints*: ID2827 2003.
- Hu, H. & Wu, M. Photon induced non-local effect of general anesthetics on the brain. *NeuroQuantology* 2006a 4: 17-31. Also see *Progress in Physics* 2006b; v3: 20-26.
- Hu, H. & Wu, M. Evidence of non-local physical, chemical and biological effects supports quantum brain. *NeuroQuantology* 2006c; 4: 291-306. Also see *Progress in Physics* 2007; v2: 17-24.
- Planck, M. Interview with *The Observer*, London, Jan. 25, 1931.
- Planck, M. Speech at Florence, Italy, 1944.
- Rosenblum, B. & Kuttner, F. *Quantum Enigma* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Stapp, H. P. *Mind, Matter and Quantum Mechanics* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1993).