

Essay

Rationalization of Creation: A Theory of Mind

Nadeem Lal*

Abstract

In this work, we aim to show that the metaphysical causes the form of the physical, hence creation as true. In particular, it is shown that the Mind causes the brain. We do this by firstly examining a proposition which is the identity function, looking at its form to divulge a truth of consciousness and of mind. We will find that the form the physical takes is in line with this logical truth, thereby offering a new lens by which to inspect the mind and her functions.

Keyword: Metaphysics, physical, rationalization, creation, mind.

Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence - Carl Sagan

The purpose of this work is to show that design is at work in creation, that an immaterial metaphysical truth gives form to the physical, hence life and how she is found as no accident. What is required is some sort of blueprint which would ensure the process, and my contention is that in relation to life there are two fundamental truths of this blueprint.

Firstly, we will uncover the primary of those truths; that truth being the seal of consciousness which opens us up to ourselves and others; and find the form of that metaphysical truth 1:1 correlated with the physical. Now as the metaphysical is prior to and outside the scope of evolutionary processes, this particular a necessary truth of identity, it will therefore have been shown, given the investigation having been concluded, that it is the metaphysical which causes the physical. What we are going to find is a proposition which acts as identity function. The proposition gives the possibility of one identity being shared by two persons, but as identity ranges over Being the proposition, its form, will show a truth of consciousness. What propositions have in common with reality is form and that is just what we will find. Examining this proposition will spell out a unique picture of consciousness, of the form of consciousness. Now if the metaphysical causes the physical then we can expect to find that form 1:1 correlated with the physical; it will have to be shown that the brain is defined by exactly this form. This exactly will be shown but furthermore, as Mind and brain are correlated we will be able to make certain predictions and see if they play out.

Secondly, we will conclude another truth of Being, of life, and as it is a truth of Being we can again expect there to be a correlation in the brain. This truth is different as it is not linked to a proposition but to the laws of thought, the law of non-contradiction in particular, but again, having given careful consideration to just how it is functioning, we shall be able to make predictions, and again these predictions will be shown to play out just as expected.

* Correspondence: Nadeem Lal, Independent Researcher, UK. Email: nadeem.lal.1981@gmail.com

Firstly, we start with a passage from the Bible, from the Book of Genesis, as it is here that our first truth, the truth of consciousness and of Mind, can be found. Let us begin.

Here we read from a passage from Genesis which features the Adam and Eve beginnings narrative and in which we shall first meet our truth. Let us give the passage for examination:

And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.
(Genesis 1:20-24)

Now it is with verse 24 beginning with "therefore", a logical operator, that we find that there is an argument to be concluded. The verses prior to verse 24 hold a premise; these verses being the antecedent of the argument, with a conclusion from this premise marked as the consequent in verse 24. Note that what is concluded, or rather what is being explained, is the universal phenomenon which has men and women pair. A particular is being given as reasoning for a universal feature of human relations.

The conclusion is a one identity being formed. What we have is a picture of identity and this requires careful consideration: an overview of the antecedent verses shows that the way by which the divine created woman result in a metaphysical operator working over, in and between couples, working to bring them together as one. The metaphysical operator is that very force of attraction which works to sustain this original ordering which is the necessity for a humanity to speak of, that force most commonly known as Love. So we have a picture of identity being shown and of course we know the formula of identity as $A=A$.

Now, of interest is that in Hebrew the two words that "help meet" are derived from are the words "ezer" and the word "k'negdo". Diana Webb, in her book "Forgotten Women of God", writes on "k'negdo": "Neged, a related word which means against was one of the first words I learned in Hebrew. I thought it was very strange that God would create a companion for Adam that was against him! Later, I learned that kenegdo could also mean in front of or opposite. This still didn't help much.

Finally, I heard it explained as being exactly corresponding to, like when you look at yourself in a mirror."(Webb, 2010) We have a picture showing two Beings facing each other in such a way that by this relation they become identical and represent the one value. Our passage shows an accurate picture of a metaphysical truth. The interest is with asking what one proposition could they both share?

If we ask as to what proposition could possibly be shared by both parties then we find that the proposition is "I Love You", and this is a very special proposition indeed. We find that we have one metaphysical necessity, the I, one possibility, the You, and a metaphysical relation.

Now the “You” does not require loving back and if not then the values are: T/F. However, if love is shown back then the values are: T/T. This latter is what is important, for you see that by the relation is a domain of meaning opened up and in and by which both parties now represent the *one* value. By this prop is identity a possibility, our prop acting as identity function. Here we have identity shared by two people, but in fact the prop shows the possibility of universal identity and relating for the “You” need not be singular. Our prop shows the *possibility* for meaningful relation and identity.

Let us think of the I as a point in space: I cannot think a point without thinking the possibility of another. The fact is that the possibility of connecting is a possibility of the I, and as Ludwig Wittgenstein writes in his Tractatus work: "2.0121: (...)If things can occur in states of affairs, this possibility must be in them from the beginning(..)" (Wittgenstein, 2014). The form of this proposition is a form essential for the I to be in the world, essential to Being, and is in fact a stripped down self-reference structure. We found that the form is one of identity, but identity ranges firstly over the singular. As identity is secured by the laws of thought the form of our prop is spelling out a truth of consciousness, but what is this truth? Well we find that the I is not quite as singular as we think.

We must think the I as two particles so intricately entangled that they act as a one entity, and how they are entangled is by way of a definite relation. It is this two place relation which is the metaphysical real of Being. We find that by this form there are two aspects to Being: I stand facing the world with the value as T/F, myself othered to myself, and then with the values as T/T, where I am in line with my representation. I am at both positions at once and this is the conscious experience. This is the truth of identity, our metaphysical reality. Now it is clear that in this reality Mind and brain are interdependent, but which has primacy? The materialist conception of reality is the dominant worldview of the sciences and yet there have been studies that show that the Mind can cause changes in the brain, which should indicate that the Mind is distinct and has primacy.

For example, Sara Lazar, a neuroscientist at Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, in an interview with The Washington Post recalls how “they [long term meditators] had more gray matter in the frontal cortex, which is associated with working memory and executive decision making” (Schulte, 2015). The main obstacle to such a view has been studies that have found that damage to the brain can cause consciousness to appear split, dual consciousness. We will come onto this but it should now be apparent that seeming dual consciousness cannot be thought to show that the brain has primacy as consciousness just is bipolar by its very design! Now I have used the ‘d’ word, design, and I have done so intentionally.

We have a metaphysical form of consciousness which our proposition spells out. If it can be shown that this form defines the brain then it will be clear, our necessary truth of Being prior to, and therefore out with the scope of, evolution, that the brain is formed in line with metaphysics. It will be the Mind which causes the brain, so what can we expect to find? Well our form shows that consciousness is split into two distinct centres which are joined by a relation. We should expect to find exactly this form defining the brain. Now as it is the

relation by which communication is possible we should find that when the neural correlate of this relation is damaged then there should be the appearance of dual consciousness.

I use the word ‘‘appearance’’ as in fact the particles are so entangled that they remain one consciousness, and this should also be reflected. Now the relation is by which communication is a possibility, so when this area is damaged we can expect to find that the Being will show problems with interpersonal relations and language in general. In fact as the relation is a meta principle we can expect this group of people to have difficulty with the conceptual and abstraction.

So our first prediction was with regard the form of our truth of Mind, is this form found as defining the brain? Yes, it is. The brain is split into two hemispheres and connected by a relation, the corpus callosum. Our second and related prediction was with regards what should happen when this relation is cut – there should be the appearance of two consciousnesses and this is exactly what we find. The process of severing is known as a corpus callosotomy, is performed as a last resort to treat refractory epilepsy, and it is what is recorded with these patients that is of interest.

It was back in the 1960s that Roger Sperry conducted a number of experiments which would later be known as the ‘‘split-brain experiments’’. In one of these experiments subjects were presented with a row of horizontal lights that could flash across the visual field. ‘‘ Sperry found that subjects were only capable of vocally reporting when the lights flashed on the right side (thus corresponding to the left brain hemisphere). But when the subjects were asked to instead point at the lights when they flashed, rather than make a vocal report, the subjects were able to accurately identify all the lights.’’(MNN, What were the split brain experiments?, 2015) There have also been behavioural differences noted, as was found with one particular subject who, when he dressed himself, sometimes pulled his trousers up with one hand (that side of his brain wanting to get dressed) and down with the other (this side not). Also, the same subject was reported as once grabbing his wife with his left hand and shaking her violently, with then his right hand coming to her aid and grabbing the aggressive left hand. (2) Many have taken this as evidence of split consciousness and have conjectured that therefore it is the brain which causes the Mind.

We know that this is not evidence of the brain causing the Mind as the Mind is necessarily bipolar, but it was also stated that split consciousness will only be seeming as always consciousness remains unified. On this Thomas Nagel in ‘‘Brain Bisection and the Unity of Consciousness’’, writes ‘‘The split-brain procedure has surprisingly little impact on cognitive function in everyday life. Split-brain patients can drive, hold down jobs, and carry out routine day to day tasks.’’(Nagel, 1971) And it has been shown that attention, the mark of consciousness, does not seem to be affected, a Dr. Michael Gazzaniga writing ‘‘The data indicate that even though both simple and complex perceptual information associated with the cognitive activities of each disconnected half brain show virtually no interactions, the attentional system remains largely integrated in the split-brain patient.’’(Gazzaniga, 1987) Our last prediction was: ‘‘when this area is damaged we can expect to find that the Being will show problems with interpersonal relations and language in general. In fact as the relation is a

meta principle we can expect this group of people to have difficult with the conceptual and abstraction.” Well it has been established that there is a link between autism and Agenesis of the Corpus Callosum (AgCC). The establishing was done by a Ralph Adolphs of Caltech, a paper published in the journal “Brain”.(3) Now autism has sufferers characterized by a great difficulty in communicating and forming relationships with other people, and in using language and abstract concepts.

So, we found that identity consequences a fundamental truth which is the basic form of a self-reference structure. This truth is a necessary one and is prior to, and therefore outside the scope of, evolutionary processes. As this is the case it was predicted that as there is a correlation between mind and brain, if Mind causes brain then the brain should be defined by just this form. We found that the brain exactly is defined by this form and other predictions we made were shown to play out. We must therefore conclude that there is a metaphysical and it causes the form of the physical. Our conception of reality, of our place in the cosmos, must now radically change.

However, there is a second truth which we shall momentarily move onto but first I wish to anticipate counter arguments. To the one I can think of which would be a direct counter to our findings would be one which points to the fact that not all living organisms have a brain which is defined by a form which has two hemispheres connected by a relation. Well we clearly found a necessary truth for life to be and this gave a form. That all life does not share this form merely indicates that not all life has progressed to the same point. What our finding gives is a standard by which to judge evolutionary progress. The other possible counters are ones not directly related to our findings, but which point to seeming evidence that it is the brain which causes Mind.

For example, it may be pointed out that brain damage may affect personality and conscious reception. Well it is clear that Mind and brain are certainly correlated and so it should be no surprise that damage to the brain can cause profound changes to the likes of personality. What I will point out is this: what is being pointed to is the Mind being something which the physical realizes, just as the correct arrangement of physical components can realize a broadcast. If the components become damaged then reception of that broadcast may well be affected, however the broadcast remains untouched. Let us now move on to the second of our truths.

The question which we wish an answer on is one of morality. How do we come to have the conceptual distinctions, the binary set, right/wrong, good/evil ? It is clear that we ascribe these distinctions to the phenomena and so how can it be thought that we could have possibly derived them from the phenomena, which is the only possible alternative? If one turns to the liar paradox, *This Sentence is False*, then we find that given the possibility of a lie that we judge truth by honesty. Considerations on honesty is something we bring to the table, knowledge of a rule implied. I want to show that such a rule is what grounds Beings in their existence, therefore, conceptual distinctions of morality entailing, morality is found as innate to life itself; and for this we turn once more to the laws of thought, the law of non-

contradiction in particular. This law basically states that contradictory statements cannot both be true in the same sense at the same time: I cannot both be and not be.

Aristotle stated that those who could truly doubt this law would be no more than a vegetable, and this is true for by the law is the very first distinction, that of self, secured; and in doing so difference between self and world is concluded. Our law secures the forms of Self and World, of Self and Other. I simply cannot doubt my existence, any such doubt being no more than hyperbolic. It is also the case that attempts to deny the law invoke that very law in the denial! I must assume the honesty of what is presented, failure to do so entailing severe dissociated schizophrenia at very best. And the possibility for language rests with this law.

It is simply the case that if I am to say that it is both raining and not raining that I have given no information as to the world. This is the rule which grounds us in our existence and allows communication, and it is in its being a grounded rule - a rule entailing the primary distinctions right/wrong -, that we find that morality, its possibility, is something innate to life. Now, Mind being correlated to brain, we can make certain predictions in order to test this hypothesis. Unlike our previous truth, this truth has no obvious form and so we should not expect the brain be formed in a certain manner; however we can locate the moral centre in the brain and see if (i.) this area is linked to self/other distinction (ii.) this area is linked to out of body experiences. Note that these are very specific predictions, so let us find if we are correct.

It was in work carried out by a Dr Liane Young that the right temporoparietal junction was found as crucial for moral judgements (4). The temporoparietal junction is where the temporal and parietal lobes meet, incorporating information from the thalamus and limbic system. Damage to this part of the brain, or even electromagnetic stimulation of this part, affects a person's ability to make moral judgement. Most importantly, when damaged, it can produce out of body experiences, subjects recording to feel out-with their physical bodies (5).

This area has been found as a *crucial* structure for self-processing, neuro-imaging studies showing activation in the temporoparietal junction during different aspects of self-processing such as visuo-spatial perspective, self-other distinction, mental own body imagery, and vestibular and multi-sensory integration (6). So, we certainly have the strong evidence that one would expect if the form of the brain is informed by metaphysical truths. The form which the brain takes is dictated by these truths, but this has been a mere introduction. If correct then one may expect the whole brain to be aligned to laws of logic and their consequences. This is certainly one point I hope that this work engenders discussion on.

Notes

1. The common objection to this argument is this: rabbits are also a possibility of the universe, so did the universe form with rabbits in mind? It is a reasonable objection but one that can be dismissed. There are but two types of thing in the universe: life and non-life. These are the possibilities I speak of.
2. *Introduction to Psychology Gateways to Mind and Behavior*,(2000) p. 65.
3. *Agenesis of the corpus callosum and autism: a comprehensive comparison*, *Brain*, (2014), 137 (6): p. 1813-1829.
4. Liane Young et al, *Disruption of the right temporoparietal junction with transcranial magnetic stimulation reduces the role of beliefs in moral judgments*, *PNAS*, (2010), 107(15), p. 6753 – 6758
5. O.Blanke and S.Arzy, *The Out-of-Body Experience: Disturbed Self-Processing at the Temporo-Parietal Junction*, *The Neuroscientist*,(2005) 11 (1), p. 16–24
6. O.Blanke, (2012), *Multisensory brain mechanisms of bodily self-consciousness*, *Nature reviews, Neuroscience*, 13 (8), p. 556–71.

References

- Webb, D.,(2010), *Forgotten Women of God*, Bonneville Books(Kindle Edition),
- Wittgenstein,L, (2014), *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Trans: Pears,D.F., McGuinness,B.F., Routledge,
- Schulte.B, (26/05/15), *Harvard neuroscientist: Meditation not only reduces stress, here's how it changes your brain*, *The Washington Post*, , https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/inspired-life/wp/2015/05/26/harvard-neuroscientist-meditation-not-only-reduces-stress-it-literally-changes-your-brain/?utm_term=.c9380d4a8952, Date Accessed: 23/03/2017
- B.Nelson,(31/01/2015), *What Were the Split-Brain Experiments?*, *MotherNatureNetwork*, <http://www.mnn.com/health/fitness-well-being/stories/what-were-the-split-brain-experiments>, Date Accessed: 23/03/17
- T. Nagel, (1971),*Brain Bisection and the Unity of Consciousness*, *Synthese*, 22, pg396-413
- M. Gazzaniga,(1987) *Perceptual and Attentional Processes Following Callosal Section in Humans*, *Neuropsychologia*, 25(1A), pg 119-33,

Much thanks to YouTube's 'Inspiring Philosophy' channel for their 'A Case for the Soul' series of videos.