

Abstract Consciousness 7a

Kurt Forrer

Retired school principle, Australia

Article Info

Received: August 27, 2021

Accepted: September 17, 2021

Published: September 21, 2021

***Corresponding author:** Kurt Forrer, Retired school principle, 26 Parkins Reef Road Maldon 3563 Vic, Australia.

Citation: Kurt Forrer. "Abstract Consciousness 7a". *Clinical Psychology and Mental Health Care*, 3(3); DOI: <http://doi.org/03.2021/1.10052>.

Copyright: © 2021 Kurt Forrer. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly Cited.

Abstract

Generally, my insistence that the work of current science is not an objective undertaking is regularly misunderstood. It seems to be forgotten by the scientific fraternity that they, as observers, are not objects, but subjects. This inevitably leads one to infer that the observations made by them are naturally subjective results. In order to ascertain this point of view a simple question will settle the quest: Who is observing? The answer to which is: A subject. It is of interest to note that scientists in general were so utterly convinced of their mistaken view that they refrained for years from exploring the mysteries of consciousness because it was, in their eyes, burdened by subjectivity. This means, of course, that science will be forced to revise its entire outlook. It will be forced to admit, for one thing, that the waking state is in principle no different from a dream. This becomes at once clear when it is realised that both states are intermittent, a characteristic of illusory substance.

Key words: objectivity; subjectivity; dreams; waking; reality; consciousness; illusion; intermittent; point of view; double premise; sine qua non; sanskrit; cingulate cortices

Consciousness 7a

The most misunderstood assertion of mine with respect to *objective* versus *subjective* activity is habitually my insistence that science is not an objective occupation, but a subjective one instead. For one reason or another, both the scientist and the layperson were under the false impression that engagements in the waking state are of an *objective* nature, no matter what. This misapprehension could well be due to the fact that the waking state conjures up an impression that its contents are 'more realistic' than the contents of a dream. And what evokes this sort of illusion, so it is erroneously thought, must be firmly within the ambit of 'reality'.

It is opportune here, to perform the testing method that decides whether we are dealing with an *objective* occupation or a *subjective* one. This is very simple and practical. All we need to do is to ask the straightforward question, "Who or what is doing the testing? Is it a subject or an object?" Which amounts, in our particular case, to asking, "is the scientist an object or a subject?" He or she is clearly a subject who observes or investigates, which makes the scientific enquiry to a *subjective* preoccupation, whether it is done in a dream or in the waking state. In this way there can be neither doubt nor mistake about the final designation.

Scientists in general, were so convinced that their *erroneous* view was right and legitimate that they refrained from inquiring into the mystery of consciousness for years, an undertaking *too subjective* to achieve a result that would be capable of satisfying the *objective* standards of the usual 'scientific' order. Judging by this, it seems it will be a long time till we can expect a serious enquiry into consciousness that will meet the requirements of the proper scientific standard.

It might require a careful study of the waking state, before such an enquiry will be undertaken. What I mean by this is that without a carefully considered study of the well-integrated deception of the waking state, a serious look at its true status won't be considered a worthwhile enterprise. Indeed, it seems to have sneaked passed the watchful eye of the usually critical student of science that *the waking state suffers from the same crucial disposition that it shares with the dream*, which will, once uncovered, easily equate it in one particular aspect with its nocturnal counterpart.

This well-hidden deception of the waking state is, of course, its ability to pose as something more authoritative than what it really is. To put it quite plainly, the waking state, despite its alluring presence, is no more *objective* than the blatantly recognisable



subjectivity of the dream state, its nocturnal counterpart. Indeed, the waking state is as intermittent, as is the world of dreams. *Both states share a regular interruption, a decisive break in the flow of the narrative or the plot of the story.* It is this very intermittent rupture in the course of the unravelling of the plot that puts the two stories on the same *subjective* footing. *Indeed, ultimately, the waking state is nothing more than a somewhat enhancing clarification of the more mysterious, and largely puzzling dream state.*

From this is easy to see that science has much work to do in revising many of its conclusions, which is a serious necessity if it aims at being scientifically authoritative. As well as that, there is also a need for it to elaborate on the maxim of “*objects have no point of view*”. In the first instance this statement is a reminder that there is no genuine *objectivity*, for the simple reason that objects have no capacity to assess, or indeed to express their state of being or their position in any shape or form. Secondly, it emphasises that one’s point of view determines the actuality of one’s reality; the kind of worldview one is entertaining.

In this context it is worthwhile to mention the *double premise*, which rears its ugly head whenever the question of one’s point of view steals the lime light of the discourse. Many people, Einstein included, have (had) great difficulty in embracing the reality of one’s point of view under certain circumstances, particularly the one that is forced on the sleeper. It would not gel with them that for the sleeper *there is no moon in the sky* while for the individual awake it is undoubtedly up there. As alluded to, for many people this is difficult to grapple with, mainly because they imagine that their specific point of view applies to everyone else regardless of their circumstances. This is patently misguided, for one particular point of view need not coincide with another.

One of the strangest, yet decidedly false justifications of the ‘uniform’ point of view is that the person still awake could verify the moon’s location for the sleeper, forgetting that the latter could not be contacted since at that critical time he would not be in the world of the one who is gazing at the moon, that in fact the sleeper himself would not have any sense of existence at all. All this demonstrates loud and clear that the world we live in depends entirely on one’s point of view.

There is one more point to be explored. *It is the question of what is reality.* I have broached this vital subject in conjunction with the waking state of which I have said that it is inclined to project an impression that is more ‘weighty’, and with it more ‘real’, than that of the dream, for instance, which is automatically perceived as illusory or lacking presence, as compared with the general impression the waking state is able to leave on our mind. But the crucial question is not the kind of imprint it leaves, but whether it has all the qualities and conditions that add up to what are *the scientific conditions of REALITY.* The most basic requirements that will add up to a *true definition of reality* is that the real ‘object’ is perfectly stable, that in essence (!) it doesn’t ever change in any way.

Consciousness fits these requirements perfectly, even though it may appear to undergo at certain times particular changes, which however look deceptive. To give an example, it may occur that a person gets knocked out completely unconscious. We then are inclined to classify this situation as a loss of consciousness, and indeed, we are in the habit of declaring the affected individual to

be ‘*unconscious*’ - devoid of ‘consciousness’. But this is an imprecise assessment of the true situation, for the person so affected is *not really unconscious*, but merely *unaware* of his immediate surroundings. If he were truly unconscious, he would be waking up as someone else if he regained consciousness in some miraculous manner or other.

This is the perfect illustration depicting the one and only REALITY in this life: CONSCIOUSNESS. Anything else belongs to the realm of illusions.

Consciousness is in fact the *sine qua non of existence.* Without it there is absolutely nothing. Without it there would be no creation, no development, no life. From this it is not difficult to infer that consciousness is the ground of existence, that it is in fact life itself. In contrast to the view of science, consciousness is available to everything on this planet. This means that everything is conscious to one degree or the other. The quality and quantity of consciousness of an object depends on the equipment for perception it is fitted with. According to the authors’ of the book, “The Secret Life of Plants”, plants have a very well developed system of perception. They are able to sense a person’s feeling accurately, which means they can detect a human’s thoughts and detect someone’s honesty. According to these researchers, even metals share in this life of consciousness.

According to Hindu tradition –and let’s not forget here that Hinduism is the foundation of quantum mechanics- consciousness finds its way into the human body via the Hrit (Sanskrit) or heart on the right side of the chest, from where it filters along invisible nadis (or nerves) to the brain and subsequently from there throughout the remainder of the body.

Again, according to Hinduism, consciousness has no beginning and therefore cannot die. It is eternal. It is in fact that which various religions regard as the soul in the body, which will reincarnate various times until it has fulfilled its destiny. Many NDE stories confirm that we are conscious as we move from our dead body to a transitional realm where we will remain for a time. Ann Frank’s story illustrates this part of the mystery after the death of the body. According to a reincarnated Ann Frank as the Swedish Barbro Karlen, we will have to live a life of rectification of our failures and shortcomings of the life before.

Present science still believes that consciousness is manufactured in the brain. This has now been proven false with the help of the Journal entitled “Nature”. In the issue from the 23rd of January 2012, a report demonstrates that psychedelics like psilocybin have a mind-expanding effect, which will lead us to surmise that the brain is the cause of this expansion. But to the experimenters’ surprise, psilocybin actually caused the cerebral activity to diminish in areas that have the densest connection with other areas. The largest decreases were found in the anterior and posterior cingulate cortices. The scans also showed a reduction in functional connectivity.

This, like nothing else makes plain that the brain does not generate consciousness. In fact consciousness is not generated at all. Instead it is self-existing, always has been and always will be, for it is a manifestation, if you will, of eternity. This, no doubt, is the main reason for the reluctance of science to capture it and put it in a box.



Consciousness is not just a figment of our imagination. It is in fact the breath of life. It pervades the entire cosmos and thus touches everything as does the air that embraces the earth and its inhabitants.