

## Cognition and Causation

Marvin E. Kirsh

Comment for: [Hameroff, Stuart R. \(1998\) "Funda-Mentality": is the conscious mind subtly linked to a basic level of the universe?. \*Trends in Cognitive Sciences\* 2\(4\):pp. 119-127.](#)

I think phenomenon and consciousness are known via relations derived from self relation as in the example given below using the onion (its' layers, are alone, prominent demarcations perhaps related in the same way to the organization assortment and extraction of learned facts)

I am a scientist (biochemist) absent from the university 20 years and have recently pursued a study in philosophy. Current science education is very restrictive and does not consider history. In my own mind I have reduced all things(including cause and effect) to the word witness(of both unique witness A and the act of his(its') witness =A). From this scheme A chain is thus described of witness and events A.B.C.D ...over time of any change.. This must be true even for temporally unextended events. A question can be posed-can a volume of space exist that is closed such that a witness process within it leaves no external record from uncommunicated thought, and I do not think that this is possible. Between the past and the present, in general, the existence of a closed space implies the alignment of all witness processes from an origin. Thus if the molecular interactions within the brain are chains of witness in terms of communications between intracellular and extracellular events, thought produces a sum change of some type, rather than saying A causes B. Like the layers of an onion, it is conceived from a (differential-i.e conceived from a more previous change)..previous change.. and relates to itself that way...relates externally that way the same, and to the same, of objects of mutual witness and cannot be detected if it did not occur in this ad-infinity means of mutual relation . .e.g. occurred with intention as an external relation appropriate to the relations of another onion-set of onion like, layered entity. If such a relation did not occur, it did not exist; the suggestion of whether an uncommunicated thought/unextended event, could be detectable is not any different from the suggestion of being able to detect what does not exist. This is very different from a notion "does cognition alone produces detectable or undetectable change". The way one spends his time, where his thoughts rest can change the way he relates--self-relates. I think this fact might be instantiated to concepts of history.

With respect to the onion example, the world, all of its' processes might be divided into the appropriate (direct, basically originating proximally, and directly applicable to one's perceptions) and the inappropriate (indirect, originating distal to what is proximal and relocated in the sense that it contains "information" more applicable to a distal place). These elements --appropriate and inappropriate, associated with momentum/energy-by comparison and difference, I believe, define time, are the perceived elements of change, as of the different layers of the onion-and the basis of all relations. Actual time itself I think to be of a higher order(e.g.  $x^2$ ) oscillation, with respect to our mental frequencies/wavelengths as space and volume seekers; are but a subset. Einstein himself did not believe that the correct elements to describe phenomenon had been ascertained (major topics being "observed and then reconsidered").

If one reflects on history, it is dominated (from description see Nietzsche "On the Genealogy of Morals" ) to be riddled with actions and concepts formed from inappropriate connections(the Arians and the Jews and their described activities and ascribed life positions with respect to others-one another).

To include the human habit of soul searching, but extended deep into the realms of science and philosophy, where serious controversies exist and a vast dark area continues to emerge, I would like to propose the notion that there is an inappropriate light in every beacon on this earth from its' beginning -- from the first recorded thoughts.

With respect to history and science, it is simple to state that all things emerge, but not so simple to accept that we might not find laws that enable us to assemble an understanding or order to provide explanation-but only a simple list of circumstances evolved over time from the past and unwitnessable. I believe that nature's mechanism for continuance is recurring in the sense that (information for) survival in (innately) included with conscious experience. Science, though, appearing useless, in this case of unpredictable emergence, might only suffer from a poor orientation(see personal manuscript in URL list) in its avoidance, or ignorance, of individual ratios (that might be, with empirical categorization, become individual potential

ratios, for each unique, causality becoming, in both science and individual perception a range of hierarchically ordered potentials uniquely suited for each unique relation). A newly ordered scheme that accounts only for a mechanism of transmission, transmission/replication of form, self avoidance as the issuer of force/momentum-the means of uniqueness (and uniqueness in perspective and emergence), is possible. In this sense though, I believe/fear that we have overextended our means to take an inappropriate direction for continuance with an excessive exploitation of nature arrived at from failed insight and overconfidence.

Marvin E. Kirsh

<http://www.authorsden.com/marvinelikirsh>

<http://www.marvinekirsh.com>

[http://philosophy.elte.hu/philphys\\_archive/2007/msg00015.html](http://philosophy.elte.hu/philphys_archive/2007/msg00015.html)