

REFLECTIONS

Consciousness

There are thoughts

1. Consciousness refers to awareness through thoughts. Since I cannot get outside of my thoughts and know that I am, all I can know is consciousness and the thoughts which comprise it. Also, since I cannot know something solely through itself, I cannot really explain consciousness, except by explaining it through consciousness, so that I apparently never end up really explaining it. So I am left with awareness of thoughts through thoughts.
2. Thoughts are my first and only awareness in terms of intellect.
3. Anything I think no matter how far reaching, like knowledge about the solar system or evolution of the human species, is from thoughts which make up my consciousness.
4. Consciousness does not make sense because it is a thought, and at the same time representative of all thoughts. However, all thoughts face this self-referential problem. For example, I could replace consciousness with thoughts, in which thoughts refer to awareness through appearances. Yet, it does not follow how I can know that “thoughts”, an appearance, can refer to itself (“appearances”). So I stay with the term consciousness while acknowledging the apparent self-referential limitation of it and any other thought, due to my inability to get outside of my thoughts, thus my inability to truly know thoughts themselves and know that I do.
5. The term consciousness is not only self-referential, but any explanation of it, including neurons firing and sensory vectors, is as well. Instead of succumbing to arbitrariness from my apparent inability to know something (i.e. thoughts) solely through itself,

I use reason to distinguish one explanation or perspective from another.

Individual

There is a being or individual behind thoughts.

6. From consciousness and the thoughts which comprise it, I reason that I myself must exist, because there cannot be nothing behind thoughts, and there still be thoughts, and there cannot be everything behind thoughts, and I know that there are thoughts. [“Being as a necessity of reason” (Immanuel Kant)].

7. For there to be awareness of thoughts, there must be something behind the awareness which makes the awareness possible.

8. In order to distinguish thoughts, or be aware of them, there must be something separate from thoughts that does the distinguishing, otherwise all there would be is the oneness of thoughts.

9. Thoughts cannot have their own being behind each one of them because it would be impossible to have a system of thoughts or be able to think from a central perspective.

10. Since nothing and everything cannot be behind thoughts (Statement 6), and thoughts cannot reasonably have individual beings (Statement 9), it is a necessity of reason that there is a being or individual behind thoughts.

11. I label the something behind thoughts being or individual because the something has to be living in order to be aware of thoughts.

11.1 The something could have been created to be aware of thoughts. If so whatever created the something, existed behind

the something and its thoughts, and possibly still is. Though in order to have thoughts, the something created must be living, because there would be no point in generating programmed thoughts simply to be aware of them, and not act upon them. The creator may have created the individual to act. Regardless, there is still a necessity for a being or individual behind thoughts.

11.2 The notion of a creator of life does not make sense because to create is a conscious phenomenon. Whereas life appears to be beyond consciousness, because for example of the need for separation between thoughts and whatever is behind the awareness of them. (Statement 8).

The same reasoning applies to the idea that individuals and their thoughts and actions are invented and programmed like computers. (i.e. invention and programming are conscious phenomenon; whereas life itself appears not to be).

12. I am left with *the necessity of reason that there is something behind and beyond my thoughts*, which allows me to be aware of thoughts. I label it being, which signifies individual.

13. The ontology of being is irrelevant because being is inexpressible. (Statement 8) (i.e. I cannot know the ontology of something which is beyond my thoughts, except as representation of something I do not know.) The important consideration, from a rational and limited perspective, is that there must be a being behind [my] thoughts.

Knowledge

Knowledge is intrinsically separate from being.

14. I cannot get outside of my mind and know that I am. Therefore, all that I can know is apparently from in my mind.

14.1 I cannot know something (i.e. knowledge) solely through itself, because I need separation from what I know in order to know, and since knowledge from in my mind is all I can know, I cannot know knowledge itself. [1]

14.2 Since I cannot know knowledge itself, and **I know something**, it follows that what I know cannot be knowledge itself. Hence, what I know itself must be non-existent.

[1] It is assumed that all knowledge is fundamentally the same as in conscious meaning. To content that all knowledge is not fundamentally the same would invalidate the notion of knowledge, thereby self-defeat one's contention.

14.3 By knowledge itself being non-existent, knowledge as form must exist, otherwise there would be nothing I could know.

14.4 Since knowledge as form has no basis itself, **its origin and existence must be from outside of it.**

15. I know from what I know. However, the first ever knowledge(s) is created and known through whoever or whatever created it.

16. Knowledge, prior to being known, cannot exist as uncollapsed proto-knowledge, because I cannot have uncollapsed knowledge without collapsed knowledge to collapse uncollapsed knowledge, and I cannot have collapsed knowledge without uncollapsed knowledge.

16.1 Even if uncollapsed knowledge could somehow be collapsed without collapsed knowledge, **it does not follow how knowledge could exist outside of me, and knowledge itself be non-existent.** [2]

17. Since knowledge is not from outside of me, and knowledge itself is non-existent, knowledge must come from me myself and other individuals. [3]

[2] It is an unsupported assertion to assert that a God(s), for example, has created the form of knowledge to exist outside of my mind (i.e. external world), and to enter my mind without any of my conscious doing.

[3] The notion that human knowledge originates from human beings is supported by neuroscience in which knowledge is generally derived from neural mechanisms. (e.g. Pribram's analogical model, and more recent Marr's computational model based on sensory and the brain.)

17.1 I create knowledge, as a hypothetical origin of knowledge, from an unconscious exertion--a state of complete ignorance (i.e. a state of not knowing anything ever)--by giving conscious meaning to what does not have it. In other words, I create knowledge as form by exerting its existence in my mind, so that from my perspective knowledge exists, but outside of my perspective and all other individuals, knowledge as form does not exist.

18. I create knowledge from who I am, and through my sensory and thought process.

19. I cannot create who I am through who I am, except as conscious representation, because I need to be outside of the thing I am creating. Viz., I cannot create what I am creating from because whatever I create will be a step behind what I am creating from.

20. The form of knowledge in my mind is intrinsically separate from who I am while being connected to me through my creation of it.

21. From the premise that knowledge itself is non-existent, I reason the illusion of knowledge.

22. The illusion of knowledge, or form of knowledge, exists as the energy I exert onto it by exerting conscious meaning, thereby giving existence to knowledge, which it itself does not have.

23. The form of knowledge is an illusion supported by the necessity of me exerting meaning onto it. In other words, if I cease to exert meaning onto the illusions of knowledge, I will cease to know.

24. Since all knowledge is an illusion, it follows that everything I know is an illusion.

24.1 To distinguish one illusion from another, I use the illusory meanings I exert onto illusions to compare them.

25. Knowledge is valid by the mere fact that it exists whether as illusion or not. However, the validity of my use of knowledge is questionable, because I exist partly from knowledge which is empty of who I am. (Statements 19, 20) (i.e. I exist from knowledge, while at the same time being who I am. In order to exist from something, I need to be something else to exist from it.) So the more I exist from knowledge and its material extensions, the more I diminish myself.

(Note, this conclusion is partly offset by the limitation on what I can truly know viz., it would be unsound for me to detach entirely from my thoughts because I do not have evidence with absolute truth-value that says I should.)

Responses from Interaction

Unconscious, interactional source of information is necessary for the existence of conscious knowledge.

26. There is no knowledge without sensory of whatever is outside of me, because I need to create knowledge in reference to something. In other words, knowledge which is solely internal in terms of its meaning would have no meaning to me the one who exists from knowledge. It would be like me existing in the external world from knowledge which did not correspond to it. I would not survive. Hence, I contend that it is a necessity that conscious knowledge have at least a limited connection to

whatever is outside of me. (Note, to contend that there is no external world, is to succumb to the less reasonableness of us existing solely in the world of our minds versus us existing in the external world through our minds.)

27. Sensory entails stimulus from interaction with the external world, so that the unconscious information derived from sensory interactions is not from outside of me, but from my sensory relationship with the outer world. Therefore, the information for conscious knowledge is from my unconscious perspective (responses from interactions) or partly that of other human beings if the perspective is encoded in me.

28. I do not know the link between unconscious information and what I know, because it is from the unconscious to the conscious. However, I do know that I create knowledge from sensorial interactions, and any other interactions like biochemical and neurological interactions, just as my sensory receptors, and biochemical and neurological properties create information in relation to what they interact with. Hence, it follows that my knowledge is in an indirect relation to whatever is outside of my sensorial, biochemical, and neurological properties or any other properties.

29. My sensorial, biochemical, and neurological properties create unconscious information through responses to whatever is interacting with them.

29.1 Some unconscious information is converted into conscious knowledge, which I create to correspond to the unconscious information. I do not know that I correspond the conscious knowledge to my sources of interactions exactly, because the information being corresponded to is unconscious.

29.2 Even if my conscious knowledge corresponds exactly to my sensorial, biochemical, or neurological responses from interactions, so that the only way to distinguish them is that one is conscious and the other is unconscious, my conscious knowledge is still **limited** to knowing the responses from interaction, thereby leaving out knowledge of whatever is behind

interactions. (i.e. apparently there is no direct knowledge of actual objects).

29.3 I can infer through my conscious knowledge of my responses from interactions, what may be outside of them, but the inferences, as mentioned, would be limited to my interpretation of the responses instead of knowing exactly what is behind them. Thus I can only know through responses from interactions. I return to the origin of conscious knowledge through responses from interactions as the source of my knowledge. (Statement 14: "I cannot get outside of my mind, [or knowledge], and know that I am." The statement could be rewritten as "I cannot get outside of responses from interactions and know that I am".)

29.4 Though the information attained through the responses of my sensorial, biochemical, and neurological properties may or may not be objective due to my responses' unconscious state, I can only know the information of my responses after it has been converted into conscious knowledge.

30. I can indirectly perceive, including unconscious perception at the sensory and biochemical levels, anything that interacts with me, because of the apparent fact of something interacting. Hence, I must have at least limited understanding of the something interacting, otherwise it could not be interacting with me. I qualify this statement by the definition that "me" refers to only living parts of who I am, so that I may not indirectly perceive for instance something interacting with dead tissue on my arm.

Thought Process

Thought process is the mechanism which allows me myself to create and use existing knowledge in relation to the information from my responses from interactions.

31. Knowledge and conscious identity are bases for thought process defined as the comparison of different meanings and the creation of new meanings through comparison. In other words, in order to have thought process, I need both myself to compare, and things that can be compared.

31.1 Thoughts do not need opposites in order to exist and to avoid conscious wholeness. All thoughts need is comparison with other thoughts.

31.2 My brain is behind the mechanism of comparison and creation through comparison. Though I cannot answer how I use my brain to compare and create, because in the process of trying to understand how it does, I use it to compare and create. (i.e. I cannot truly know the brain, or its workings, through the brain, because I am outside of my brain and at the same time connected to it.)

32. Though I appear to store knowledge in my brain, because the knowledge must come from somewhere, I cannot express memorized knowledge because due to the flux of responses from interactions and thought itself, every perspective I have is a new perspective. For example, my initial perspective of a person will change when reconsidered later based on the change in my overall perspective in relation to my initial perspective of the person. Hence, the less change there is in my perspective, the more my current perspective will correspond to my past perspective. Though the important consideration is that due to the flux of responses from interactions and thought itself, my perspective is dynamic. (i.e. I cannot have identical perspectives)

33. Another individual cannot know my thought process or who I am, because he or she can only perceive from his or her mind.

34. My thought process is connected to who I am in the sense that my survival is partly contingent on my thoughts, and therefore I exert, unconsciously or consciously, my thought process. In other words, my thought process is not self-existent;

rather, who I am is behind the process, just as who I am is the creator of my knowledge (Statement 18).

34.1 Who I am and the make up my brain will determine the effectiveness of my thought process relative to the effectiveness of the thought processes of other individuals.

Perception

I perceive from thoughts at what I do not know.

35. Perception, in terms of intellect, is not about identifying objects outside of me, but about matching my thoughts to whatever is in my mind and whatever is outside of it. For instance, when I perceive a tree, I match the label tree to an unknown thing outside of my mind. My sensory, thought process, and existing knowledge allow me to match a conscious label like tree to an unknown thing, and match the label an unknown thing to something outside of my mind. (Statement 14).

36. I can perceive my own thoughts, but as soon as I think anything about them, I cease to perceive them. The same reasoning applies to my perception of unknown things outside of me. I can perceive an unknown thing like a mountain, but as soon as I think about the mountain I cease to perceive it.

37. Perception alone will not lead to knowledge, unless at some point I think about what I perceive.

38. It is a misconception to think that I perceive directly at things outside of me, so that my thoughts are the same as what is outside of me. Instead, I perceive thoughts through sensory of whatever is outside of me. (i.e. I perceive from in a box, while having limited connection to whatever is outside of me through sensory and existing knowledge.)

39. The process of me matching conscious labels to my sensory information requires, unconscious or conscious, exertion on my part. Whereas my sensory information, and instinctual responses to sensory information, appears to occur without any noticeable exertion on my part. Hence, it appears that sensory information and instinctual responses to sensory information are unforced occurrences, while perception from intellect is a forced occurrence. (This contention corresponds to Statement 20, “the form of knowledge in my mind is intrinsically separate from who I am...”)

40. Since all I can know is my perspective of things, I cannot know things themselves. In other words, whatever is outside of me is seen through my perspective, rather than directly at what it really is. (Statement 14: “I cannot get outside of my mind [or perspective] and know that I am. Therefore, all that I can know is apparently from my mind [or perspective].”)

40.1 My perception is subjective (or ego), because I can only perceive things from my perspective. So it follows that from my perspective, there is no objectivity, (or non-ego), except for what I imagine to be outside of my perspective, and even then my imagination is from my perspective.

40.2 There is no perception, in terms of me, without perception from my perspective. Hence, perception and perspective are the same, except for the labels.

40.3 My perception can be manipulated by other individuals who try to influence my perception through trying to get me to perceive what they want me to perceive, or take a certain perspective on something.

40.4 I can avoid perceptual manipulation by thinking for myself, which includes questioning my own beliefs and those presented to me. (Statement 37: “Perception alone will not lead to knowledge, unless at some point I think about what I perceive.”)

Hence, if I think for myself, I will have greater control over what I know than if I do not think for myself.)

41. My perception, including knowledge, is my consciousness.

42. “Subconsciousness” is a label for something apparently beyond my perception. I cannot know subconsciousness or any other entity beyond my mind, because all I can know is what I know or perceive.

42.1 All I can know about subconsciousness is the label as a hypothetical entity beyond my mind and in relation to my mind, so that the relation lies within my mind, though I imagine that it is not.

43. There is no perception in terms of intellect without thinking. In other words, I cannot perceive something outside of my mind and know that I do, without thinking at some level about what I perceive. Hence, to have perception in terms of intellect is to think.

43.1 Since I think from what I know, perception in terms of intellect is thinking about what I know.

43.2 What I know influences what I perceive in terms of intellect, because what I perceive follows from what I know.

44. My perception in terms of intellect cannot be separated from my conscious identity, because I exist from thoughts.

Reason

I think; I compare conscious meanings.

45. Reason is the comparison of conscious meanings. I exercise my mind or think, thus compare conscious meanings.

46. All thought is apparently a product of comparison. If correct, there is no thought onto itself or with absolute truth-value.

47. I know from what I know (Statement 15), whereby I compare what I know either consciously or unconsciously, thus derive knowledge.

48. There is an assumed fixity to thought in terms of meaning, which allows for comparison. Yet, upon closer inspection, the fixity does not actually exist. (Statement 32, "...every perspective I have is a new perspective ...due to the flux of responses from interactions and thought itself, thereby the flux of my perspective.")

49. By having thoughts as form (Statements 22 and 23) and conscious meanings, and thought onto itself is beyond comprehension, I have reason.

49.1 I can only know something in comparison to something else. For example, by asserting that the "sky is blue", the notion "blue", or even "sky", has meaning only in relation to other things like the colors red and white, or the objects ground and Earth. Hence, reason is inseparable from knowledge and language which comprises it. Yet, reason, knowledge, and language are all distinguishable through their labels and possibly their dimensional form.

49.2 To overcome the unnecessary distinction between reason, knowledge, and language, I define the notion "thought" as that which incorporates reason, knowledge, and language into a single entity.

49.3 Thought is a symbol of comparison (i.e. "comparison" incorporates reason, knowledge, and language, thereby my perceived consciousness.), while acknowledging as in Statement 18, that there must be who I am, the **creator and thinker**, and responses from interactions, the **supplier**, and thought process (i.e. brain), the **mechanism**, for there to be thought.

50. Even the first thought ever is comparative in nature. (i.e. comparative by referring to something outside of the individual's mind.)

51. The comparative nature of thought cannot be separated from thought by attributing the nature of thought to whatever is behind the thought process. In other words, from my perspective there is no thought without its comparative nature. (Statement 14, "I cannot get outside of my mind [or comparison] and know that I am" All I can know from my perspective is what I know (or compare).

52. The basis for thought is who I am through responses from interactions and thought process. (Statements 18 and 32)

Reasonableness

** All my thoughts are reasonable.*

53. Because all thoughts are defined by conscious meaning at some level, and I can only perceive thoughts rather than see them as they really are, all thoughts from my perspective are reasonable. However, by comparing thoughts, I can distinguish one thought from another based on their values of comparative reasonableness. (i.e. more or less reasonable.)....