Mind Over Matter: A Quantum Approach to Indian Philosophical Views on Consciousness

Dr. Bhupendra Debbarma

Associate Professor,

Government Degree College, Khumulwng, Tripura,

Department of Philosophy.

Email: bhupendradebbarma.143@gmail.com

Abstract

A complete investigation of consciousness and its relationship to the physical body was given by the ancient Indian philosophical system. Researchers working in the area of modern consciousness and brain science are interested in a variety of issues, and the many theories that are contained under this philosophy have the potential to provide scientific answers to a number of these issues. It is common practice in Indian philosophical literature to describe the process of cognition as being very quick and as one that never comes to a complete stop. When compared to the attributes of objects that move faster than the speed of light, which are referred to as tachyons in modern physics, the characteristics of thinking that are described in this literature are strikingly similar to those of tachyons. In the realms of mathematics and physics, and quantum mechanics in particular, it will be possible to explain mental processes and the interaction of mind with conventional matter by means of a theory that is predicated on the assumption that mind is constituted of superluminal objects. This will be possible because quantum mechanics is a theory that involves the interaction of mind with conventional matter. When applied to this description, this theory will be able to be of assistance.

Key Words:

Physical Body, Cognition, Rapid Thinking, Brain Science.

1. Introduction

A complete investigation of consciousness and its relationship to the physical body was given by ancient Indian philosophy. This investigation was conducted from a philosophical point of view. "The answers to some of the questions that researchers in the area of modern consciousness and brain science are concerned with may be found in this philosophy. This philosophy contains a number of concepts that have the potential to lead to scientific solutions with regard to these questions. In particular, we will talk about the proposition offered by this philosophy, which states that the mind is faster than matter (and therefore faster than energy and light), and how this proposition sheds light on questions such as "is monism or dualism, which theory

can better explain consciousness scientifically?", "is dualism necessarily unscientific?", "How does a living brain create subjective experience?", and "is quantum mechanics necessary to explain consciousness in a brain?" The mind is often described as being very quick and as being one that never stops moving (it is important to note that according to contemporary physics, a tachyon, which is a particle that travels faster than light, cannot be brought to a halt). This is a common theme in Indian philosophical literature. The language of mathematics and physics, and quantum mechanics in particular, may be used to explain the features and activities of the mind, as well as its interaction with conventional matter, if it is true that the mind is composed of superluminal objects. This is a possibility if the mind is really composed of superluminal objects.

The transmission of a number of ideas from ancient Indian philosophy will be accomplished via the use of a comparison between the brain and a computer. In their pursuit for scientific explanations of how the physical brain and the mind interact with one another, as well as how subjective experience is created inside the brain, researchers doing their work today may benefit from these principles. Probably owing to the fact that it was all written a very long time ago and in Sanskrit, a language that is not used today, and also due to the fact that awareness is discussed here in the context of spiritual progress, Indian Philosophy is frequently regarded to be a mystery and inexplicable. Instead than focusing on faith and the things that one ought to believe in, the analyses that are offered in this literature are objective and focused on grasping truth and the sense of reality. This is in contrast to the myths as described above." The findings of recent discoveries in the area of quantum physics have brought a number of quantum physicists to the realization that this ancient body of knowledge includes principles that are in agreement with the findings of quantum physics.

2. Indian Philosophy on Consciousness, Free Will, Mind, and Matter

There is a distinction that can be made between free will and all of the other components of what we now refer to as consciousness. This notion encompasses not just humans but also other living species. The philosophical standpoint in question is responsible for this distinction. It is generally accepted that a specific memory encompasses all of the features that do not fall under the category of free will. These characteristics include desires, rational cognition, remembering, emotions, experiences, imagination, and so on. There is a possibility that science can explain these characteristics, but it is not possible for science to explain free will. Taking into consideration the following, in a nutshell, is the viewpoint that this philosophy represents about consciousness:

To the same extent that a piece of equipment may be compared to the physical body of a living human. It is made up of a great deal of different kinds of materials. A human person, an animal, or any other living creature, with the possible exception of extremely primitive forms of life, has an accumulation of

experiences and, therefore, an accumulation of knowledge. This is true regardless of whether the living thing in question is a human being, an animal, or any other living organism. A memory, which is referred to as Manas in this literature, is composed of what we will refer to as mind in this work. In other words, a memory is composed of mind. According to this comparison, the mind is comparable to the memory of a computer, which is responsible for storing information and programs. "In the same way that the hardware and software of a computer do not know what they are doing, their own existence, or the significance of the contents of their memory, the body and mind of a living creature do not truly know anything. This is because they are not experiencing the same things that they are experiencing. Having said that, in addition to the mind that was discussed previously, there is a certain Consciousness that "knows." It is possible to draw parallels between the notion of consciousness and that of a computer operator. This is due to the fact that awareness is the entity that "really knows" everything that is connected to the actions of a living organism. A computer is able to be able to display or imitate numerous "intelligent" behaviours such as learning, planning, and pattern recognition if it is equipped with stored information (both data and programs) and mechanisms to store, retrieve, and process information. These mechanisms allow the computer to store, retrieve, and process information. The fact that a computer does not genuinely know or comprehend anything that it performs does not change the reality that this is the case. The type of "intelligent" behaviour that is being described here is not something that can be shown by machines that do not have these memory operations to begin with. Since memory mechanisms are the basis of machine intelligence, one may argue that an artificially intelligent machine is "intelligent" but not "conscious." This is because memory mechanisms are its foundation. In the context of this discussion, the term "intelligent" machines refers to those that are able to store, retrieve, and process information among other capabilities. On the other hand, human beings (and probably other living beings) are not only "intelligent" in the same way that "intelligent machines" are, in the sense that they are able to carry out a variety of functions in life by utilizing the physical brain (which is analogous to hardware) and the information that is stored in the brain (which is analogous to software), but they are also "conscious" in the sense that they are aware of what they are doing, at least when they are awake. Both the idea of "Free Will" and the concept of "Consciousness" are stressed in Indian philosophy. Consciousness is identical with these two concepts. Unlike the memory of any living creature, as well as its contents and operations, this idea is different from and independent of the memory of any living organism. As an additional point of interest, in contrast to computers, intelligence in living beings is not only a material activity; rather, it is a process of interaction between the ordinary matter of the physical body and some stored information that is composed of matter that moves faster than the speed of light. This faster-than-light software is responsible for the feelings and emotions that are experienced by a living body. It does this by reacting to the sensory inputs that are received. The living thing has the knowledge that is necessary to develop experience at a pace that is faster

than the speed of light, however neither the stone nor the computer have this information. This is the factor that differentiates a living creature from a stone that does not possess any life. In light of the fact that the stone is incapable of producing experience, we interpret this as a lack of self-awareness on the part of its personality. "Information" and "consciousness" are two concepts that are distinguished from one another in the philosophical discourse. The former is similar to the software on a computer in that it creates experience in response to external stimuli, but the term "consciousness" alludes to the ability to "really know" and "choose."

In current language, the idea that we refer to as awareness is made of two unique aspects: the first is free will, and the second is the mind, which is the root of "intelligence" as mentioned before. Both of these elements are distinct from one another. Free will is defined as the capacity to make choices consciously and independently of any cause from the past or the present, and without anticipating anything to happen in the future. This is what we mean when we speak about the ability to make decisions. All causes are irrelevant to the exercise of free will. The manifestation of free will is not an unconscious, nondeterministic, or random occurrence; rather, it is free will that is the source of manifestation. It is not dependent on any memory, nor is it restricted by any rules or logic, and the existence of free will is not depending on any memory. Free will is not dependent on geography or time in any way. It is believed that it is nishkarana, which indicates that it is not the product of any specific cause. This idea is based on common sense. When all is said and done, it is free; it would not be free if it were reliant on anything else for one thing or another! Due to the fact that this is the case, its presence cannot be defined, nor can its occurrence be expected, by means of a formula that is stated in terms of space and time using any language, including but not limited to physics, mathematics, quantum mechanics, computer science, or any other scientific discipline! ()The fact that every language has its own distinct set of symbols and rules for manipulating those symbols on its own is something that must be kept in mind at all times. In any theory that seeks to explain subjective experience, the presence of such free will must obviously be taken into account as a postulate. This is a must.

In light of the fact that it totally sidesteps the "hard problem" by supposing that free will is not within the scope of scientific research, one may argue that the approach to consciousness that was described above is analogous to the first sort of approach that Chalmers rejects. When we insist that everything we perceive must have a scientific explanation, on the other hand, we are making the opposite assumption, which is that there is nothing that exists beyond space and time. This is because we are assuming that there is nothing that exists beyond these two dimensions. Both the assumption that something does exist irrespective of space and time and the assumption that the opposing assumption is true or invalid are, in my view, equally valid or flawed. Despite the fact that Indian philosophy maintains that free will is not bound by logic and is not dependent on space and time, it was discovered that Indian philosophy may offer a contribution to

the scientific knowledge of how experience occurs in our brains. This was discovered despite the fact that Indian philosophy says that free will is not confined by logic. Attempts will be made in the following to provide an explanation for this contribution. Due to the fact that "Manas" relates to the intellect, the idea of free will is rendered obsolete. An ever-increasing quantity of contents is something that Manas continues to accumulate during the course of his existence. Manas is a sense that integrates memory and logic in the same manner that other senses, such as sight, touch, hearing, smell, and taste, are considered to be senses. Manas is said to be sukshma, which meaning subtle (akin to the adjective "soft" in the word software). These are the beliefs that people have. This is in contrast to the physical body, which is referred to as sthula, which means hardware. This means that it may be sensed instantly via the physical processes of seeing, touching, hearing, smelling, and tasting, either directly or indirectly through those physical modalities. In the sense that neither the body nor the manas can be transformed into the other, manas is different from the body. This is in contrast to other things, such as matter and energy, which, depending on the conditions, are capable of transforming into one another. It is believed that the mind never stops moving, and according to Isavasyopanishad, the mind is often characterized as being faster than matter (and hence faster than energy, which is light). Additionally, it is said that the mind is always moving. On the basis of the theory of relativity, one might reach the conclusion that the argument that the mind and the body cannot be transformed into each other is accurate. On the other hand, it is not inconceivable that the mind and the body may interact with one another, which could lead to further changes in the mind in addition to changes in the body. It is noteworthy to note that when studies carried out in bubble chambers failed to generate tachyons, Feinberg postulated that tachyons probably cannot be formed from matter, but that it is plausible that tachyons do interact with matter. This is something that should be taken into consideration. Consequently, his viewpoint is in agreement with the idea of mind and matter that was provided before, despite the fact that he never connected tachyons with the concept of mind.

In the event that it is in fact the case that the mind is made up of objects that move at a speed that is greater than the speed of light, then it is possible to describe the characteristics and activities of the mind by using the language of mathematics and physics, and quantum mechanics in particular. There is a possibility that in the not too distant future, it may be possible to successfully verify the idea via the use of biological testing. A zero energy tachyon is able to do what an Eccles's psychon would do, which is to say, trigger exocytosis simultaneously across an entire dendritic tree. This is demonstrated in an earlier paper by demonstrating that a zero energy tachyon can do this by interacting with vesicles in multiple boutons and "collapsing" their two-state quantum wave functions into the state that promotes exocytosis." Through the use of Bohmian mechanics, this objective is successfully realized.

The fact that Fred Alan Wolf has proposed some ideas in quantum field theory that link tachyons to the mind is a fascinating development. This is in spite of the fact that the majority of scientists, with the

exception of a small number of adherents to the tachyon theory, make every effort to steer clear of using tachyons in their work. At least one theoretical physicist has proposed in the past that the mind is a field of tachyonic or superluminal matter. This idea was offered in the past. This person was the late Regis Dutheil, who was a quantum physicist and a researcher on consciousness. He passed away recently.

3. A Justification of Dualism

3.1 Information itself is not the same as its representation

Chalmers makes the observation that there is no consensus among academics over the appropriate way to use the term "consciousness," and that "as things stand, those who talk about consciousness are frequently talking past each other." The same assertion is true for the term "information," which is often used without a definite explanation, with the assumption that the reader ought to be aware of its meaning due to the fact that it is such a simple word to understand. A variety of terminologies are now in circulation, including "physical information," "classical information," and "quantum information." Each of these expressions refers to a physical property, such as energy, and they are all used interchangeably. In the framework of the "hard problem" or "explaining consciousness," it is necessary to have an understanding of "information," as Searle defines it: the live brain and mind are responsible for dealing with meanings. Within the parameters of this discussion, Shannon's notion of information does not have any relevance since it is not connected to either meaning or experience.

According to what was discussed in the part that came before this one, a dead stone does not possess any memory processes that enable it to receive inputs and produce responses. "This idea of a lack of self-awareness is based on the fact that a stone does not have the ability to react to its surroundings. This is the basis for this misunderstanding. As a consequence of this, one would be perplexed as to why a computer that is equipped with memory systems and that is capable of producing responses that seem to be intelligent does not have the capacity to make its own choices. Because the computer only carries a REPRESENTATION of information, it does not carry any "real information" or "phenomenal information" that is only present in the mind of the programmer. This is the reason why this is the case. It is astonishing that once a representation of a piece of information is loaded into the computer, it is able to execute practically any action that a human is capable of completing with that piece of information. This is despite the fact that this is the case. It is able to do operations such as adding, subtracting, drawing an image of itself, and so on. It gives the impression that it is aware of the knowledge, but in reality, it does not "really know" it. It is for this reason that there is a certain "real information" that is present in human people, and it is possible that this information is also present in all living species. For the time being, this information has not been found in a computer, regardless of whether it is digital or quantum.

There are separate words in different languages that can transmit the same notion, but they may do so in a variety of different ways. In light of this, the meaning is not the same as any of the phrases that are used in order to describe the meaning. The mind is the only place where meaning can be discovered; it is not present in the words themselves or in the paper that the words are written on. Meaning is something that can only be found in the mind. There are also instances in which language is not even used throughout the process of information transfer. For example, when a car flashes its right signal, it is a signal to other vehicles that the vehicle is going to make a course adjustment to the right. This allows other vehicles to avoid collisions with the vehicle. Due to the fact that the various modes of communication always make use of a representation, it is thus feasible to communicate the same piece of information in a number of different ways. There are a variety of ways that the representation might be constructed, including the use of words, sounds, electrical impulses, and other types of communication. The process of mapping information into words, which are symbols, is what constitutes a language. For example, when words are spoken, they transform into sound energy, and when they are written down on paper, they transform into particles of substance. On the other hand, they transform into electrical energy when they are sent across a telephone line. Nevertheless, information is only found in the brain, and it is not the same as the language or signals that are utilized for the transmission of information. Similar to the manner that water is separate from its container, in the sense that it cannot be carried from one area to another without the container, this is also the case with water. Because we are unable to stop ourselves from storing or transmitting our thoughts via the use of material representations, we have grown so used to doing so that we do not even know that information and its mapping are distinct from one another. This is because we have become so accustomed to doing so.

That the meaning is not formed inside the computer itself is something that we are aware of, regardless of whether the computer in question is a digital computer or even a quantum computer. The meaning is instead supplied by the programmer to qubits, which are strings of bits and bytes. Qubits are sometimes referred to as computer bits. In turn, the states of certain hardware components inside the computer are mapped to these qubits, which are used by the computer. It is for this reason that the computer just stores a mapping of the information that is housed inside the brain of the programmer; it does not really retain the meaning of the information. Consequently, when we talk about the information (data and algorithms) that is stored in a computer, we are referring to the mapping that is included inside the computer of a certain phenomenal information that is really situated outside of the computer. This mapping corresponds to the information that is stored in the computer. Providing that we have a copy of the software stored on a storage medium such as a compact disc (CD), it is feasible for us to continue using the program on another computer in the event that the first machine becomes dysfunctional." This is granted that we have a copy of the software stored on the CD. Despite the fact that the existence of software and its characteristics can only be identified

when it is run on a piece of hardware by receiving some inputs and generating some outputs, it is essential to keep in mind that software exists independently of any computer hardware. This is something that should be kept in mind.

It is not that reductionists, who are individuals who assert that consciousness is a condition of matter, believe that a computer is aware of the meaning of the contents of its memory; rather, they believe that the biological matter in a living brain is the one that generates the meaning, whereas any matter that is not found in the brain lacks the ability to generate meaning. With that being said, they have not yet shown any proof to back up their assertions.

a native person To be more specific, philosophy is dualistic in the sense that it says that the software in the live brain is also "real information," much like the program one would find in a computer. To add insult to injury, the mind is neither a kind of matter or a material energy field; rather, it is made up of tachyonic matter, and it is not possible to make it from regular matter on its own. (However, the interaction of the mind with matter may result in the generation of more mind; for further details, please refer to the next section.) It is the contention of this philosophical school that the mind and the physical body of a living organism are two separate components, in the sense that one cannot be transformed into the other. This is in contrast to the reality that matter and energy are capable of transforming into one another under certain conditions for a variety of reasons. Nevertheless, there is a connection between the mind and the body. Life is the process of interaction between the mind and the body (to borrow an analogy from the world of computers, this interaction is equivalent to the execution of various software programs). Life is the process of living. Life starts when the mind begins to interact with the body, and it continues for as long as the interaction has lasted. This is the beginning of life. In the same way that a computer with broken hardware is unable to support the execution of software, the body is no longer capable of sustaining the interaction from the time of death to the moment of death. According to the reincarnation theory, which is widespread in eastern faiths such as Buddhism and Hinduism, the mind of a living being does not cease to exist when the being dies but rather continues to live after the being has passed away. Additionally, the mind that is able to survive has the potential to begin interacting with another body once a suitable body is discovered; to put it another way, it has the ability to take on a new existence. This is now something that may be seen as nothing more than an assumption that is taken from the example of computers: a computer that has hardware that is faulty is unable to run a piece of software that, if stored on a CD, can be placed into another machine and made to function again! It should go without saying that this is only an analogy; nonetheless, the notion itself has not yet been proved by research that is now being conducted in the scientific community.

As a result of its meticulous explanation that awareness, which is the same thing as free will, is the sole thing that appears as the numerous forms in the universe, mind, matter, and everything else linked to it, the

majority of people refer to Indian philosophy as monism. This is because monism is the most common term for Indian philosophy. One of the most well-known instances that has been supplied is that awareness is equivalent to gold, and that every thing in the universe is comparable to a jewel made of gold. This is one of the examples that has been presented. Because the philosophy also states that this reality can only be experienced by spiritual techniques that transcend beyond the mind and beyond any outward means, the monistic component does not clash with the dualistic portion that was discussed before. Additionally, the monistic element is not in conflict with the dualistic portion.

3.2 Desire, Purpose, Aristotle's Final Cause and Free Will

3.2.1 Problem Solving and Inductive Reasoning

Through the use of inductive reasoning, it is possible to recognize a shared quality, a pattern, or a connection within the data that is already available. When this line of reasoning is used, the answer is then generalized by making the assumption that it is applicable to other situations. Induction may be defined as the anticipation that arises as a result of previous experience. As a consequence of this, the conclusions that are arrived at via the use of inductive reasoning are accompanied by a certain amount of uncertainty. "On the other hand, deduction is an inference process that generates conclusions from universal laws and facts; hence one may be certain that a deductive conclusion is legitimate provided the premises from which it is formed are true. The concept of inductive reasoning refers to the line of reasoning that a scientist use in order to formulate a theory in order to provide an explanation for the facts that have been seen. It is for this reason that a scientific theory is often not accepted until after it has been thoroughly tested via the administration of experiments. Deductive reasoning is the method that a mathematician does in order to demonstrate the correctness of a theorem by making use of axioms and theorems that have been shown beforehand. There is no exception to the rule that theorems are accepted unless there is an error in the reasoning that was employed to construct them. To demonstrate the capacity to argue inductively or deductively, it is not required to be a scientist or a mathematician. This talent may be shown just as easily. Each of these ways of thinking is used rather often in the course of our day-to-day lives. An umbrella is something that we carry with us in the case that we are forced to go outdoors at a time when there is a risk of rain, for example. In the event that I were to choose the umbrella, the following is the train of thought that would be running through my head: The fact that people do not get wet in the rain if they are using an umbrella is something that I recall from my memories. This is an observation that I have made on several occasions. I then proceed to make the assumption (A) that the observation will continue to be the same in the future and for all persons, despite the fact that the majority of people are fully unconscious that they are making this assumption. Following that, my brain arrives to the inductive conclusion, which might be

stated as follows: "If I use the umbrella, I will not get wet in the rain." The observation O and the assumption A are the foundations upon which this conclusion is built. Following that, I come at the conclusion that was offered by DC, which is that "I ought to have the umbrella with me." This conclusion is based on the information that was provided by IC as well as my desire D, which is "I do not want to get wet when I am out in the rain." Philosophers debate what is known as the "Problem of Induction," which is about the advantages and disadvantages of anticipating something about to happen. This is because IC is not a certainty but rather an anticipation. This is the reason why this is the case. For example, if the wind speed is too strong, the umbrella may not be able to function properly. We are not concerned with defending or finding fault with the assumption A at this time; rather, we will be concerned with another component of our thinking that is similarly tied to the future and that occurs much too often. This is something that requires our attention. When it comes to the example that was shown earlier, one of the premises that was employed to arrive at the conclusion DC was the desire D that I WANT to be dry when it rains in the future. This desire represents knowledge about a future condition that I will be in. It is essential to include the letter D in the conclusion DC because, for example, a child who takes pleasure in being wet would go out to play in the rain without an umbrella if the letter D is not there. When deciding whether or not to carry the umbrella, the person must consider whether or not they expect to stay dry in the future or whether or not they anticipate being wet in the future. All living species, and human beings in particular, almost always have a motive, a desire, or a goal (what Aristotle refers to as the final cause) that motivates them to behave in a given manner in order to attain a certain target. This is the case for all living things. As an example, a person could decide to board a train or an airplane because they have the desire to go to a place that is different from where they are now situated. In order to eliminate a mouse, a cat will jump on it and kill it with its paws. It is essential to take notice that jumping takes place at this same instant, and that killing the mouse takes place at a later time; despite this, the cat has figured out that it should jump on the mouse first, and it is able to do so effectively. The fact that a goal or target is connected to a state of affairs that has not yet been achieved is an essential point to keep in mind. However, the desire to achieve a goal is what initiates the process of deciding a means and putting those means into action for the purpose of the objective, which is a future state at the time that this process starts. This desire is what kicks off the process. It goes without saying that the most important part in initiating an action is the exercise of free will, which entails choosing the cause for the action. This is the most critical position in the process. For example, one's free will may determine whether or not they go on vacation, as well as whether or not they go to New York or London after their holiday. One may also use their free will to decide whether or not to go on vacation. As soon as a choice is made, for instance, to go to London, that decision immediately converts into the desire to travel to London (and becomes a content of the memory of the brain). In order to take the appropriate course of action, which is dependant on the knowledge on the future state of being in

London, the first step is to purchase a plane ticket to London. In terms of the concept of free will, Within the realm of Indian philosophy, the distinction between free will and desires or aims is made in the following manner: It is important to keep in mind that we said before that free will "may choose" the want or goal, and not "chooses" the want or purpose. This is because the want or purpose of a particular action may be the result of other desires or purposes, and it is not necessarily the result of free will. This is the reason why this is the case. For example, let's consider the situation in which a person makes the decision to go on vacation (we will refer to this desire as W) because they want to have fun while they are away from their home. Therefore, W is the consequence of the cause, which is composed of two wishes: W1 corresponds to the desire to have fun, and W2 relates to the desire to be away from home together. Both of these desires are referred to as the root cause. Because both wants W1 and W2 are already recorded in memory, the desire W is the result of a past state of the brain and is not brought about by free will in any manner, shape, or form. This is because the brain already stored both wishes W1 and W2. A person may now realize that it is difficult to establish whether an action is launched by free will or specific aims or intents that already exist in the memory. This is probably something that they have come to realize." It makes no difference what kind of action is being contemplated; this is always the case. There is a distinction between free will and wants or intentions, which is that the former are things that are kept in a specific memory (the mind), but the latter are not. This distinction is the fundamental difference between the two. There is a distinction between desire and both free will and dead matter, just as there is between any other content of the mind. With regard to the process of bringing into existence and sustaining life in our cosmos, the Indian philosophical tradition holds that desire is an essential component.

In each given situation, one must first evaluate what it is that they desire (also known as volition, passion, want, etc.), and then they must ponder over the ways by which they could attain their objectives (reasoning). Only then can they take action. Problem solving is a term that is used in the area of computer science to describe the process of determining how to get something. Those who are knowledgeable in the field of artificial intelligence (AI) regard a variety of actions to be instances of "intelligent" behaviour. These activities include problem solving and planning, respectively. AI programs of today are able to handle a broad range of challenging problems and come up with solutions that are more effective and complex than those that would have been reached by human experts if they had not utilized AI programs. This is because AI programs are able to solve problems that would have been impossible for human specialists to solve. To bear in mind that these programs are just assisting the experts with the component of the thinking that relates to how to gain it before taking action in order to achieve whatever it is that the experts want to perform, it is essential to maintain this fact in mind. It is almost as if the programs are executing the thinking for the experts, rather than the experts themselves conducting the essential reasoning in their thoughts by themselves. The execution of the program, on the other hand, must be caused by an external input, which

then supplies the program with instructions for what it should get. As an example, a piece of software that plays chess is capable of playing the game with an extraordinary level of skill and outperforming the vast majority of chess players. In addition, when the go button is hit and the opponent's move is entered, it acts as a trigger for the execution of certain instructions that have been stored in the memory of the computer. The program then constructs a strategy for winning the game. The program would not have been able to function properly if it had not been for the go-hit; the chess playing software does not make any moves on its own since it does not have any drive to win! It would seem as if the go-hit has conveyed to the computer that its purpose is to win, and that it should take action in line with and shortly after the go-hit happens. The knowledge that the program receives from input is about the state that it ought to be in in the future, more precisely, that it ought to be the win state. Immediately after the use of a go-hit for the purpose of entering this information into the memory, it will be included into the information of the very first state throughout the subsequent execution phase. Each and every state that happens during this process is the result of a prior state or earlier states. This is because the digital computer follows to the causality principle of classical physics, which stipulates that every state that occurs is the result of other ones. In spite of the fact that the computer enters a state as a consequence of the experiences it has had, it does not do so because it has the intention of entering a state in the subsequent time period. A quantum computer would be able to play the game of chess considerably more rapidly and with more inventive strategies than a traditional computer would be able to do. This is due to the fact that it has a far better capacity for storing information and parallelistic processing capabilities. Despite this, the algorithmic capability of a quantum computer does not enlarge the class of functions that can be computed by a traditional Turing machine. This is because quantum computers are not purely computational in nature. with addition, much as with a digital computer, the execution of a program can only be started by an external agent. This external agent may be a person, a living entity, another computer program, or any other physical device—it could be anything.

On the other hand, human beings almost usually behave in a certain way simply because they have a desire to go somewhere, gain something, be someone, or do something else. To put it simply, the "want" or want is all about a future state that will occur in the future. It is necessary for this desire (or motivation, purpose, objective, etc.) to be entered into the computer from the outside in order for the computer to start the search for a problem-solving method and then proceed to carry out the plan. When compared to the scenario in which a living organism generates the desire on their own, there is a significant difference.

3.2.2 Causality

It was shown in the part that came before this one that "the actions of living beings are often inspired by desires and goals that are associated with the future states of the living being. At the same time as the search for an appropriate course of action is reliant on particular information about a future state, the action

itself is also dependent on this knowledge. To give you an example, if I want to go to New York, I will take a bus to New York, but I will not take a bus to Philadelphia. These are just two examples. In light of the fact that this is the case, the information that I possess about a future state causes the necessary action to be done, which in turn causes the state that it is in right now to undergo a change. This particular condition of affairs seems to be in violation of the causality principle of classical physics, which argues that a cause should always arrive before its consequence. This principle stipulates that a cause should always come before its consequence. Furthermore, it appears to be in violation of the causality principle in relativity theory. This principle states that causes can only be described by referring to the past light cone of the event that is being explained (the "effect"), on the basis of the premise that causal effects cannot move faster than the speed of light. In other words, it seems to be a violation of the principle. Therefore, if the actions of living beings are triggered by information about some future states, as was mentioned earlier, then an intriguing question that has not yet been answered is, "Are such actions consistent with the principle of causality of either classical or relativistic physics, and if they are not, how does one justify them?" This is a question that has not yet been answered.

Taking into mind the present conditions, the study titled "Causality and Tachyons in Relativity" that was published by Caldirola and Recami is pretty fascinating. There is a section of this paper that is titled "Can a Tachyonic Observer Inform Us about Our Future?" and it is in this section that the conclusion is reached that a tachyonic observer is able to convey to an ordinary observer the effects on a future event E of the anti-signals (negative-energy signals) that he sends to E in order to physically influence E. Taking into consideration the circumstances of this study, the writers of this paper arrive at this conclusion. As a consequence of this, it would seem that the tachyonic observer is carrying out the responsibilities of the how-to-get-it reasoning that is stated in section 3.2.1. To the far as Hume is concerned, the reason of an individual serves the same purpose, which is to inform that individual of the consequences that come from the acts that they have taken.

During the years that followed the advent of quantum mechanics (QM), scientists have maintained the idea that consciousness is engaged in certain quantum occurrences. One of these phenomena is the collapse of the wave function. Some scientists even think that quantum physics will be able to explain how free will originates in the brain. This is due to the fact that quantum mechanics is nondeterministic, which means that it predicts the likelihood of outcomes of measurements but not the actual results when those measurements are taken. Due to the fact that quantum mechanics is a nondeterministic theory, this is the case. It was argued by Beck and Eccles, with the assistance of quantum physics, that while consciousness may not be material, it nevertheless had the potential to regulate matter. Exocytosis is a key unitary activity that takes place in the cerebral cortex, and they suggested that consciousness has a direct role in one of the biological processes that take place in the brain. This process is known as exocytosis. In an effort to provide

an explanation for the way in which the brain operates, the scientific community is increasingly focusing its attention on quantum theories. The literature on quantum mechanics (QM) has a significant amount of debate on the compatibility of QM with the causality component of relativity physics." This discussion may be found in the relevant books and articles. According to the majority of physicists, quantum mechanics (QM) is consistent with what some of them refer to as the weak causality principle. This is the consensus among the majority of scientists. According to this principle, which asserts that this is not feasible, a controlled message cannot be sent in reverse time in any reference frame. This is the case across the whole universe. Finding an explanation for the apparent retro-causality of wishes and intents is something that may be done with the help of quantum mechanics (QM). The occurrence of this is not out of the question.

4. The Physical Brain Creates More Mind With an Existing Mind

We are aware that programs have the power to learn; they may even discover new equations and theories depending on the data that is supplied to them about a computer that does not have any life. This is something that we are aware of when it comes to a computer that. A computer program really creates new information in its memory in the form of patterns of states of its memory cells as it is learning. This information is stored in the memory of the computer itself. "The only way for the programmer to recover the new information that the program is thought to have discovered is for them to provide meaning to the output of the computer. The output of the computer is made up of numbers and characters (a specific language) that correspond to the newly formed contents of memory. Again, the meaning of any language is not found in the symbols of the language itself; rather, it is located in the thoughts of the programmers who use that language. This is true for all languages. The only person who is aware of the meaning of the new equations that the computer has produced is the person who is programming the computer or the person who is using the computer. This is because the computer does not grasp the meaning of the equations that it has developed. In the context of artificial intelligence, a computer that does not possess any software or that is unable to run software is unable to learn; in other words, such a machine cannot display "intelligence." Another thing to take into mind is that in order to produce even such novel patterns of memory cells, even if the information itself is not new, a certain piece of software must be present and completely performed in the computer. This is something that must be taken into consideration.

When it comes to the brain that is still alive, as soon as it is born, it starts to learn new things. It is constantly interacting with its environment, and as a consequence of this engagement, it is able to remember the experience and create new memories. In spite of the fact that it does not constantly learn new methods to respond to events, it nonetheless does so. It is well knowledge among neuroscientists that the construction of new memories is accompanied by the production of neuron patterns that are indicative of the process.

In the same way that a computer is able to create new patterns of physical memory, the brain ought to already have some mind (the software that represents the brain) before it interacts with its surroundings. The present level of study on the brain suggests that the brain does, in fact, possess some degree of mind. As a consequence of this, reductionists and dualists would be in agreement that the living brain, which is a physical brain that also includes the mind, creates additional mind via its interaction with the environment that it is surrounded by. Individuals from the outside world, on the other hand, are unable to offer or assign value to newly formed neuron patterns. This is in contrast to the computer, which provides this capability. Instead, it is the responsibility of the living brain to carry out this task on its own. Reductionists argue that meaning is a characteristic of biological matter, in contrast to the electrical circuits that are present in computers; nevertheless, they have not yet shown any scientific evidence to support this assumption. yet, dualists are of the view that mind is not a characteristic of biological matter; yet, they have not yet attempted to present a scientific explanation for how such a mind is created. Dualists are of the belief that mind is not a feature of biological matter.

Indian Philosophy proposes a potential method for a scientific explanation of why meaning, experience, and "real information" are only found in a live brain and not in a computer or any other physical means of storage or transmission. This is a viable approach to the scientific explanation of the phenomenon. This concept proposes that the mind is made up of tachyonic matter, and that the interaction of the mind with the matter of the brain may result in the formation of more mind.

5. Subjectivity

The term "subjective" refers to the fact that one's perspective of reality is highly individualistic, that perception is not independent of the individual who is experiencing it but rather is conditioned by the individual's mental traits or moods, and that perception is affected or impacted by one's own ideas, previous experiences, or background. The concept of subjectivity refers to the fact that perception is not independent of the person who is experiencing it. Consider for a moment the possibility of a single robot, and this is without taking into account the human population. Because they are bassed on the knowledge that the robot already has in its memory, the inferences and conclusions that a robot draws are going to be subjective in every single instance." This knowledge encompasses not just the heuristics that were entered by the programmer of the robot, but also all of the external inputs that the robot has stored up to this point (vision, sound, motor, and so on). For instance, if two robots read the same answer sheet of a student from an examination, one robot would give the student a "pass" score, while the other robot might give the student a "fail" rating. A "pass" score would indicate that the student has successfully completed the test. Specifically, this takes place due to the fact that the meanings of "pass" that are recorded in the memory of the robots are distinct from one another. A robot is capable of having its own distinct point of view, which

is a possibility. An other reason why human perception is subjective is because it is founded on one's own personal experiences. As we have seen in previous sections, human beings (and, more broadly, a great number of other living species) need to have a component in their system that is rather similar to software. This component is what we have referred to as the mind, and it is because they begin to learn from the moment they are born. Therefore, the things that two different human beings learn, observe, remember, or experience as a consequence of the same situation in the external world are likely to be slightly different from one another on account of the fact that they are exposed to the same external environment.

Every individual is born with their very own karma, which is a subconscious recollection of previous deeds whose repercussions will take place in the future, as well as vasanas or samskaras, which are abilities, inclinations, likes and dislikes, and so on that are unconsciously retained. This is the belief that is held by Indian philosophy. As a consequence of this, every individual is born with a customizable memory that has contents that are comparable to those that can be found in software. Because of this, the things that any two individuals learn from the same external environment or their perspectives on the same world are often distinct from one another. This is because perceptions and learning are responses of human brains, which are analogous to software, to the inputs that come from the environment. This is the reason why this is the case. To what degree, on the other hand, does the whole potential to acquire subjective knowledge comprise the entirety of people who are conscious? In addition to that, do you mean anything other or something that is more significant? Despite the fact that the two robots in the situation that was shown earlier are capable of making subjective judgments, they do not have any past experience and therefore not be held accountable for their conduct. When compared to subjective knowledge and inference, it would seem that awareness is associated with a higher level of complexity. The ever-present Consciousness that is witnessing the contents and thoughts of the mind is believed to be the basis upon which the subjective experience is created, according to the philosophical view that is prevalent in Indian philosophy.

Conclusions

Among the several aspects of consciousness that include memory, there is a distinction that is drawn in ancient Indian philosophy between awareness, which is the same thing as free will, and all of the other components of consciousness. We will refer to the latter as mind throughout the course of this paper. The idea that the mind is immensely faster than all of the senses, including sight, and that it is thus faster than light is a common assertion that can be found throughout this collection of literature. In addition, it is never going to be at rest. The idea that the mind is a memory that saves all of a person's experiences, emotions, desires, and other personal information is commonly held by many people. On the other hand, the mind is more subtle than the physical body. According to the nomenclature of modern physics, the assumption is that at least a piece of what we refer to as the mind is constituted of tachyonic matter. This is taken into

consideration when the mind is comprehended. The mathematical explanation that the memory component of the mind is made up of tachyons provides a mechanism to explain how the brain is accountable for the development of the mind as well as how the mind impacts the brain during the production of the mind. Experimentation is a viable method for establishing whether or not this statement is true. The brain and its mind were compared to the hardware and software of a computer in order to offer an explanation of the viewpoints that Indian Philosophy has on matter, mind, and consciousness. This was done in order to provide an explanation. Consciousness, on the other hand, is referred to as the computer operator. It is completely independent of the computer, yet it is nonetheless in command of it throughout its existence.

References

1. Caldirola P and Recami E. Causality and Tachyons in Relativity. Italian Studies in the Philosophy of   Science. D.Reidel Publishing Company 2007; 249-298

2. Cramer J G. Generalized absorber theory and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. Physical Review D 2011; 22: 362-376.

3. Chalmers David J. Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies 2009; 2(3): 200-19.

4. Hari Syamala. Psychons could be zero-energy tachyons. NeuroQuantology June 2008; 6 (2):152-160.

5. Hume David. A Treatise of Human Nature. Oxford Clarendon Press 2014; 413-418.

6. Mukherjee B D. The Essence of Bhagavad Gita Chapter 6, verse 34. Academic Publishers, Kolkata (2016);167-169.

7. Searle John R. Minds, brains, and programs. Behavioral and Brain Sciences 2013; 3: 417-457.

8. Swami Rama. Wisdom of the ancient sages: Mundaka Upanishad. Himalayan International Institute of Yoga, Science, and philosophy of U.S.A 2017; 99, 139.

9. Upanishads Sri Sankara's Commentary Isa, Kena, and Mundaka. Translated by Sastry SitaRama S. Natebran & Co. Printers and Publishers Esplande 1998; 9.

10. Von Wright, Georg Henrik. A Treatise on Induction and Probability. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd 2000.

11. Valarino Evelyn Elsaesser. The superluminal hypothesis in The Other Side of Life. Plenum Press New York, 1997; 193-228.

12. "Pramana-vinishchaya (Udostoverenie instrumentov dostovernogo pozna- nia)," ch. 1, Kariki 1–25, Istoria filosofii, trans. and annot. V.G. Lysenko, 2015, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 79–106.

13. J.P. Sartre, "Transtsendentnost' ego. Nabrosok fenomenologicheskogo opisania," Logos, trans. Andrei Krichevskii, 2003, no. 2, pp. 86–121.