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**I. Introduction & Quotes**

1. For what can be more harmful to knowledge than falsely communicating even mere thoughts, than concealing doubts which we feel about our own assertions, or giving a semblance of self-evidence to grounds of proof which do not satisfy ourselves?

(Immanuel Kant)

2. To one who has faith, no explanation is necessary. To one without faith, no explanation is possible.

- Thomas Aquinas

3. When they say that matter is the substance and cause of all the phenomena, but do not give a satisfactorily clear concept either of matter or of the manner in which everything arises from it, then their materialism is little more than unintelligible talk, as dark and incomprehensible as the suprasensual assumptions of their opponents.

- (Heinrich Czolbe)

Materialism is the philosophy that all things in the universe are quantifiable and material. It states that there is nothing greater than that which appears before us. However, dualism is a philosophy that contradicts this notion. Dualism firmly believes that the universe is made of corporeal and noncorporeal things, most predominantly but not limited to a solid, material body and an ephemeral spirit, consciousness, mind or soul, though all those terms hold a meaning for the dualistic approach. Dualism favors any kind of faith, while materialism suggests atheism, for materialism cannot reconcile an immaterial God with their notions of reality, most notably. This is why I have used the quote from Thomas Aquinas. Materialists claim they are getting ever closer to understanding consciousness by way of neuroscience and biotechnology, things like MRI and brain scans. But are they really getting closer, or does their dogma of only material answers preclude them from seeing the truth?

For all the advances made in neuroscience that materialists point to as evidence of getting closer to understanding human consciousness, not one leads us closer to understanding why Sally would go to a coffee shop then not order coffee, for example. The quotes I reference above indicate my point of view regarding materialism and its effect on human perception Kant is saying that you shouldn’t follow blindly, which is what we do when we blindly accept materialistic dogma as a universal rule or way of life. As Kant points out, propagating and promulgating ideas without evidence is problematic, at best. It is the definition of the blind leading the blind. As we can see by the quote of Colbe, very little real science or hard fact really supports the notion of materialism…it has no concrete basis for its authority in our lives. In life, you wouldn’t follow a person who gives you no reason to trust them. And materialists beg the question of trust, issuing their authority as supreme chancellors of all existence when in truth they know concretely nothing of the sort. It is, in reality, all theory. This paper is theory. Their pantomime dogma is theory. It’s up to you to weigh the arguments and come to your own conclusions. No expert exists in philosophy, only experts on philosophy, and they tend to regurgitate the ideas of others rather than think for themselves, as I am attempting to do.

Mysticism is antithetical to the materialist point of view, yet there are so many phenomena which are inexplicable to their point of view, and dualism is inherently mystical in that it believes in things which are not found in our observable lives. Dualism believes that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. This paradigm can be found in everything from the human body itself to large construction projects which would be impossible for a solitary individual. Materialists have a hard time with this notion, for everything is matter and waves to them. Some aspects of mysticism can be scientifically explained, it is true, while other phenomenon seem to elude our mental grasp completely.

In the argument contained herein, I will attempt to show the merits of dualism. I believe the harmonies and dissonances of energy harmonics of quantumly entangled brain matter forms what we consider our soul, and that by its very nature this pattern exists outside time and space. It is the reason we all like and respond to different things, things like different foods, different rollercoasters, different movies, and different music. Why we feel the emotions we feel, based on the energy pattern in our brains and, since this is quantum entanglement, between our quantumly entangled particles in our brains. I will attempt to show how Plato’s ideas of Forms influenced my thinking and my notions of the human consciousness. I will offer some thought experiments to demonstrate my points. And I will make a science-based argument for a noncorporeal soul.

**II. Definitions**

**Quantum Entanglement:**

Quantum entanglement is a property of certain states of quantum systems containing two or more distinct objects, in which the information describing the objects is so thoroughly intertwined that observing one object instantaneously changes the other. No matter how far apart these objects are—whether on opposite sides of the galaxy, or universe—a change in one is instantly reflected in the other.

(The Big Idea: How Breakthroughs of the Past Shape the Future via Credo Reference)

**Harmonics:**

*Electricity*. describing electrical voltages or currents with frequencies that are integral multiples of the fundamental frequency, e.g., if 60 Hz is the fundamental frequency, then 120 Hz is the second harmonic and 180 Hz is the third harmonic.

(Dictionary of Energy via Credo Reference)

**String Harmonics:**

center of the **string**. Touching the **string** lightly at this point kills the vibration of the first mode, but leaves the second mode unscathed, since it has a node at the center; the **string** then establishes a new vibration pattern, with a vibration frequency corresponding to the second **string** resonance. Neglecting the very small inharmonicity of the **string** resonances, this new note is described as the second **harmonic** of the **string**. Upper **harmonics** are often used for special effects on **string** instruments and on the harp. In the violin family, the use of **harmonics** of open

(Oxford Music Online)

**Neuroscientific Explanations**

The development and continual improvement in brain-scanning technology, since the 1980s, have been among the foremost stimulants to the ever-increasing prevalence of neuroscience as a way of understanding childhood development and childhood disorders. Above all, perhaps, the invention in 1990 by a group at Bell Laboratories in the United States, led by Seiji Ogawa, of the functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scanner, led to the explosion of interest in this area. The fMRI scanner is focused on tracing neuronal activity (function) rather than primarily anatomy (structure); fMRI scans provide dynamic, changing pictures of this activity, rather than a static scan. The ever-shifting images of the brain produced by fMRI scans, with their areas of bright red, green, and yellow, are widely disseminated in popular media and used as illustrations for articles claiming new, scientific, explanations of human and animal cognition, emotions, behaviors, and (mental) illnesses. The colors of fMRI scans are the product of computer-generated statistics, where the ‘activity’ measured relates to relative levels of oxygen consumption in differing parts of the brain during different experimental conditions. This is, however, as has been often pointed out, widely misunderstood in popular and even quite a few academic accounts, where the colors are deemed somehow to be the image of ‘neurons firing’ during mental activities. In any case, the scanning technology has allowed scientists to make claims about being able to make visible the brain as a source and a shaper of emotions, cognition, behaviors, and identities, while at the same time developing further already existing ideas about the brain itself as being in turn shaped by experience: what is known as ***brain plasticity.***

(The SAGE Encyclopedia of Children and Childhood Studies via Credo Reference)

**Harmony:**

Since the 19th century there has been an alternative to chromatic **harmony** as a means of extending tonality, namely modal **harmony**. It arose as part of a general interest in the past, in folk music and in oriental music and served to introduce ‘foreign’ elements into tonal **harmony** by drawing from other historical and cultural areas. It was not so much a system of **harmony** in itself as a way of deviating from the normal functions of tonal **harmony** to achieve particular effects.

(Oxford Music Online)

**Dissonance:**

**Dissonance** The antonym to consonance, hence a discordant sounding together of two or more notes perceived as having ‘roughness’ or ‘tonal tension’. In Pythagorean terms this meant that **dissonances** were intervals produced by string lengths in ratios formed from numbers greater than 4. For the subsequent development of this view by music theorists and for psychoacoustic explanations of the phenomenon of consonance and **dissonance**, see Consonance. See also Fourth, Resolution and Septimal system.

(Oxford Music Online)

**Plato’s Forms:**

**How does an ideal form—a Platonic form—differ from a physical form or shape?**

An ideal form is not located at any point in space or time. It does not have a size. It does not have duration, that is, it does not span any length of time. A physical form can be perceived with the senses: you can see it and touch it. An ideal form can only be known by the mind. For example, consider the difference between a triangle drawn on a blackboard with a piece of chalk and the ideal form of a triangle. The drawing on the blackboard is in space and is of a certain size. It has a certain duration in time. The chalk lines that represent the sides of the triangle have a certain length and thickness. On the other hand, the ideal triangle has a shape or a form (of a triangle) but no size. You can't see the ideal triangle with your eyes or touch it. You can only conceive it with your mind. The ideal triangle has no beginning or ending in time, nor is it found at any particular location in space. The ideal triangle is an abstract idea that may be conceived by anyone, anywhere, and at any time. It is, in a sense, both everywhere and nowhere. (Handy Answer: The Handy Western Philosophy Book: The Ancient Greek Influence on Modern Understanding via Credo Reference)

**Materialism:**

in philosophy, a widely held system of thought that explains the nature of the world as entirely dependent on matter, the fundamental and final reality beyond which nothing need be sought. Certain periods in history, usually those associated with scientific advance, are marked by strong materialistic tendencies. The doctrine was formulated as early as the 4th cent. B.C. by [Democritus](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6NjExMjM1), in whose system of atomism all phenomena are explained by atoms and their motions in space. Other early Greek teaching, such as that of [Epicurus](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6NjQ1Mjk4) and [Stoicism](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6NjIxMDA2), also conceived of reality as material in its nature. The theory was later renewed in the 17th cent. by Pierre [Gassendi](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6NjE4ODg0) and Thomas Hobbes, who believed that the sphere of consciousness essentially belongs to the corporeal world, or the senses. The investigations of John Locke were adapted to materialist positions by David Hartley and Joseph Priestley. They were a part of the materialist development of the 18th cent., strongly manifested in France, where the most extreme thought was that of Julien de [La Mettrie](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6NjI3MTcw). The culminating expression of materialist thought in this period was the *Système de la nature* (1770), for which Baron Holbach is considered chiefly responsible. A reaction against materialism was felt in the later years of the 18th cent., but the middle of the 19th cent. brought a new movement, largely psychological in interpretation. Two of the modern developments of materialism are [dialectical materialism](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6NjE4ODk5) and physicalism, a position formulated by some members of the Logical Positivist movement. Closely related to materialism in origin are naturalism and sensualism.

(The Columbia Encyclopedia via Credo Reference)

**Dualism:**

any doctrine in which the fundamental forms of things, 'Substances’, reality, etc., are seen as of two contrasting types, without any possibility of one being reduced to the other, for example:

1. ([PHILOSOPHY](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MzMzOTk4)) a distinction between ‘material’ things and ‘mental’ ideas;
2. ([SOCIOLOGY](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MTE4OTkxNw==)) distinctions between nature and nurture (see [NATURE–NURTURE DEBATE](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MzMzOTc0)), or between individual agency and the structural determination of social outcomes.

In philosophy, the alternative to dualism is *monism,* which asserts that ‘things’, substances, etc., are all of one basic kind, either ‘material’ in form (see [MATERIALISM](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MTE5MDcyMA==)) or ‘mental’. A further position, [REALISM](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MTE4ODc0Mw==), argues that there is only one reality, even if this reality is 'Stratified’, i.e. contains fundamental differences of type, even if stopping short of dualism.

In current philosophy and sociology rather than an outright ‘dualism’, a frequent position is to recognize the utility of thinking in terms of a *duality* of forms -mind and matter, or structure and agency – in which there exists a dialectical interaction between the two kinds of ‘thing’, but with no justification for sustaining a claim that there exist any ultimately irreducible kinds, e.g. see [DUALITY OF STRUCTURE](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MTE5MDA4MA==). See also [DESCARTES](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MTE4ODkwMA==), [STRUCTURE AND AGENCY](https://search.credoreference.com/articles/Qm9va0FydGljbGU6MTE4OTg4Mw==).

(Collins Dictionary of Sociology via Credo Reference)

**III. Argument**

Dualism seeks to explain the world in terms of material body and nonmaterial mind. Materialism runs counter to this, proposing that all of existence and everything in the universe is composed of matter. Ample evidence from our own personal experience lends itself, upon careful examination, to the idea that the mind is not made of matter. Do you think your thoughts as you read this argument can be quantified as material? Can any thought be considered material? Or is it ephemeral, floating on the surface of an unseen and unknown realm, the realm of the mind? I think the answer to that last question is yes, and I will endeavor to provide an in depth analysis of both materialism and dualism so that the audience for this argument may decide for themselves what makes the most sense to them, to their personal experience, to their way of life. The answer may be materialism for you, but I fervently hope you will at least consider a dualistic approach as the means of explaining your existence.

Science seeks to codify all natural occurrences, with computers recording them all as 1’s or 0’s. Yet there is a very fundamental factor in human life which cannot be explained by materialism, which baffles it at every step. That factor is human consciousness. Philosophical dualism is the belief that there are material things and immaterial things. Arguments do not abound against dualism, which seeks to explain this phenomenon of the human consciousness. Most of the time materialists will mock dualism in some way, but this is the recourse of those who have no valid arguments against something, that something being dualism (Rea, 2008). Many deists felt that dualism was the proper mode with which to address reality, since it provides for an immaterial God. Please note that I do not necessarily refer here to the Judeo-Christian God, but rather Aristotle’s Prime Cause, the Unmoved Mover. While the Judeo-Christian God may in fact be the truth, it is not the purpose of this argument to overturn millennia of careful logic and argumentation in favor of blind faith. It is the purpose of this argument to provide for the possibility in the mind of the reader that a higher power of some sort is possible, if not likely, by virtue of the dualistic approach. More to the point, I hope to provide for the possibility of an immaterial soul and mind in each of us, one that is capable of transcending natural law and go beyond the bounds of conventional science.

Materialism, in gaining such a foothold in the common era of philosophy, has actually diminished religion. Materialism tries to explain all things as being material, so it tends to garner atheistic support and indeed promulgate atheism forward, since there is no room for God in a materialist’s universe, unless one believes in Brahma. Considering that the majority of the materialists are not Hindu, the atheistic approach is more likely. People tend to like materialism because it seeks to explain all things in material terms, terms where an airplane can fly because of x, y, and z. They view religion as mumbo-jumbo designed to explain a reality they can already explain, or give meaning to life and events in a manner that does not sit well with them. Developments in neurotechnology, neurobiology, and psychology have given rise to a concept that we are closer than ever to understanding human thought, and that it will only be a matter of time before we can truly, materially, understand consciousness. The materialist gets into a cycle of the forever “inevitably close”, while, actually, not fulfilling that promise.

In order to debunk materialism and show how it has generated reductive views on human nature, we need to examine the more radical attempts in modern neuroscience to eliminate the individuality of each subjective human experience. This typically occurs in three steps: at first, some capacities, previously assigned to human beings, are attributed to the brain or a part of it; then, a complete physicalization of human nature (in general) is announced by neuroscience, which is thus reduced to a mere product or byproduct of the brain; and finally, this materialistic view is put forth as the result of modern science (Araujo, 2012).

One of the great advantages of a dualistic system is that it allows for the noncorporeal. Such things as God and souls are intrinsically believed to be noncorporeal, existing not in a material form. Theists (those who believe in God), and even deists (those who believe in a distant God uninterested in mortal affairs), believe fervently that God does not have a material form. This flies in the face of Hinduism, which believes that the universe as a whole comprises Brahman, their ultimate god. However, Hindus also believe in nonmaterial entities, such as souls, so materialism doesn’t work for Hindus either. So for our purposes we shall stick with Judeo-Christian, Islamic, and Zoroastrian (an ancient religion that had major influences on the Judeo-Christian and Islamic concepts of divinity) concepts of God, and rely on the concept of duality. In dualism, the ‘mind’ is contrasted with the ‘body’, the ‘immaterial’ with the ‘material’.

Have you ever been in love, or had fun, or ridden on a rollercoaster? If you have, you have probably experienced a difference in how your mind perceived time and how much time actually went by. This is equally true if you have ever been bored. The way the mind synthesizes time and the way a clock measures time seem to be disconnected. Another example is waiting for something to happen (for example waiting to be seen by your doctor). Time in the mind can seem to elongate, unless you have a distraction (such as a book to read), upon which occasion time goes by more quickly in our minds. I know that when reading or writing that my sense of time becomes distorted, and only looking at a clock can reset my inner clock to the time it truly is in the world. This also occurs during conversation. Many times, I will get lost in conversation and completely lose track of time. This variance in perceptions of time I believe proves that the mind and body are separate entities, though they are connected to each other.

Plato believed that true substances were not physical entities or bodies, those being ephemeral, but eternal Forms, of which bodies are but imperfect copies. +These Forms not only make the world possible, but they also make it intelligible, because they perform the role of universals, or what Frege called ‘concepts’ (Robinson, 2003). Since the mind can hold an idea or concept, but the body cannot fulfill it, by necessity they are separate. One major problem the theories of Plato face, however, is that Plato is incapable of explaining how the mind and the body are connected in the first place. I strongly agree with the Platonic idea of Forms, and I think that their immaterial nature and that of the mind are intertwined inseparably. Since the aim of my argument is to show how a system of dualism promotes a soul, and that the soul is connected with God, I say this, for the soul is pure energy, existing outside the physical world, in the realm of myth and imagination. Several prominent philosophers through the Middle Ages logically proved the argument for the existence of God, at least in a theoretical, logic driven way. It is the crux of the issue in the great beyond from this reality, the end goal of our existence, Anselm’s Godhead. I have chosen to look at materialism as misguided, small minded even. There is far more to our universe than we can grasp through material means, and only dualism can properly explain the paradigm of the mind and body relationship.

In physics, as I have previously stated, we find an elegant analogy to the body-mind relationship. It is found in quantum mechanics, and it is called quantum entanglement. Quantum entanglement is a property possessed by certain particles. If the particles are quantumly entangled, you can spread them out at any distance, but a curious thing will occur. Whenever one of the quantumly entangled particles is acted on by any force, be it gravity or energy or anything, whatever it is that happens to the particle being effected also happens to its quantumly entangled partner, though there is no connection observable, no energy transfer, nothing between the two particles. I think this principle is the same for the mind-body connection. Just like you can find a Fibonacci sequence (a mathematical formula that creates a perfect spiral) in sea shells’ design, so to do I think you can find a paradigm in the mind-body by utilizing quantum entanglement (Ryszard Horodecki, 2009). So what does this mean?

Each of our brains is capable of communicating on a quantum level. The following excerpt by Hameroff and Chopra explains how:

Quantum theory tells us that physical processes occur in discrete, quantized steps, or levels. The laws that govern the quantum differ strangely from the predictable reality of our everyday “classical” world. At small scales, and sometimes at large scales, the bizarre laws of quantum mechanics reign. For example, atoms and subatomic quantum particles can exist in two or more states or places simultaneously, more like waves than particles, and existing as multiple coexisting possibilities known as quantum superposition, governed by a quantum wave function. Another quantum property is “nonlocal entanglement,” in which components of a spatially separated system remain uniﬁed and connected. Physics circumvents the strangeness of quantum mechanics by strictly dividing the macro/classical and micro/quantum, keeping the two worlds apart. However, consciousness somehow bridges the macro/classical and micro/quantum domains, equivalent to the subject – object split. Consciousness exists precisely on the edge between quantum and classical. The Greek philosopher Plato described an abstract world of pure form, mathematical truth, and ethical and aesthetic values. Penrose suggests such Platonic values, along with precursors of physical laws, constants, forces, and consciousness, literally exist as patterns in fundamental space-time, encoded in Planck scale geometry. Recent evidence suggests that Planck scale information may repeat at increasing scales in space-time geometry, reaching to the scale of biological systems. The British-German GEO 600 gravity wave detector near Hanover, Germany has consistently recorded fractal-like noise which apparently emanates from Planck scale ﬂuctuations, repeating every few orders of magnitude in size and frequency from Planck length and time (10^ −33 cm; 10^ −43 s) to biomolecular size and time (10^ −8 cm; 10^ −2 s). At some point (or actually at some complex edge, or surface) in this hierarchy of scale, the microscopic quantum world transitions to the classical world (Chopra, 2012).

Your brain is part of your body, and is the focus point for the body side of the entanglement. The mind exists somewhere else, and is able to tap into Platonic Forms, thus we are all in a state of dualism. The mind is therefore unpolluted when engaged in reason. If there is an input disruption on the body end, such as Alzheimer’s or depression or brain damage, it effects the way we think because it effects the body side of the mind-body paradigm. The body interprets input from the mind through the vessel of the brain. Also, memories are stored in the brain as the mind has no building blocks for doing that on its own. Emotions reside in the brain, properties belonging to certain neurochemicals and their effect upon the body. To be fair, emotions heavily influence us mentally, but with training the mind can overcome emotion, necessitating and changing that emotion by causing a chemical reaction in the body. Emotions change and come in and out of existence periodically. If you are experiencing an emotion, and you apply your mind you can help make the emotion pass or vanish more quickly. It is for this reason that Zen Buddhists meditate upon the concept of the void, ridding themselves of unwanted emotions and achieving clarity of view.

In physics, whenever one thing happens because of another occurrence, we call it causality. We typically find it in the form of some sort of energy transfer from the first item to the second. But with quantum entanglement, there is no observable connection. How can we make sense of this? By admitting that the connection goes beyond the boundaries of our observations. Obviously, there is a connection, we are simply unable to observe it. It is thus that I propose that there is a connection which goes outside time and space between the two things entangled. In the field of physics, this is called an Einstein Rosen bridge (Lindquist, 1963). This resultant bridge is a bridge of energy, and vibrates at a frequency, as do all energized streams. Think of it like an electric guitar string, vibrating with energy. As the energy input oscillates between two separate particles (or between the mind-body) so too does the frequency of the bridge oscillate. This bridge, in the mind-body paradigm, I would like to call our soul. Our soul, I am proposing, is the synthesis of energy travelling between the mind and the body. And here the frequency at which the soul operates is especially important.

Dreams are an interesting phenomenon, being the culmination of random input both from within and without the person dreaming. It is the unfiltered data the mind plays with as we sleep. It is one of the weirdest phenomenon humans experience, because it is random. The mind is influenced by a whole category of various noises and things outside the body, while also weaving together a story based on the data stored within the brain and body at large. Dreams are our mind’s way of trying to weave together disparate data into a seeming whole, a story, for the purposes of reconciling our subconscious with our mind. But are dreams purely ephemeral, or are parts of them taken from the realm beyond us, the quantum realm where our mind and soul reside? I believe that a part of each dream exists in the netherworld beyond, and that our mind taps into it. Sometimes this appears as tapping into an alternate universe, or some other realm we can only visit by virtue the mind’s link to quantum dimensions.

Have you ever gotten a ‘vibe’ just from being around a person? Or from watching a particular movie or listening to a piece of music? I think our soul seeks out sympathetic vibrations in other people and feels the energy inherent in art or music. We love music because it mimics the dance our own souls are doing. After all, if one soul goes outside time and space, don’t they all? And don’t we seek out like-minded people when engaging in social relations because of the way it feels to be around them rather than just that they express agreement with just one facet of our minds? I think we do. I think that a cleverly made film will build energy through suspense or action, then release it to us at the culmination. Thus, we can go further and say that to every action there is a corresponding energy level. The ‘vibe’ you get from another person is the harmonization between your soul and theirs. The ‘vibe’ you get while watching a drama or listening to music or observing art is the latent (or active) energy of that item coinciding with your brain receptors and that branch of your soul. Our bodies are designed to be filters for everything in the known universe and the result travels along the soul to the mind. The mind then receives the data input and seeks to access stored corresponding data back in our brains.

**IV. Thought Experiments & Conclusion**

A thought experiment to elucidate this can be shown in two different models. First, pretend that you are in a closed room with sealed holes all around it. You can place your hand or foot through one of the seals on the holes in order to experience what is on the other side of the wall surrounding you. You put your right hand through. The environment on the other side is moist and hot, whereas the room you are in is cool and dry. This is like the mind, reaching through the soul into the body where the body feels that today is rainy and warm. Your mind cannot conceive of the heat or dampness except through its experience of what your body experiences. Another whole you place a limb through may be frozen and icy. Simultaneously, your body is hot and damp, cool and dry, frozen and icy. This is like the human condition, with the body experiencing one thing, the soul experiencing another, and the mind yet another still.

In the second thought experiment, imagine a pond. The surface is still, no ripples mar its surface. A rock is dropped from a height into the pond. As it passes through the surface of the water, it creates a ripple effect. Drop 10 stones. You get 10 ripples, each interacting with each other all over the pond. Now, replace the image of the stones with people, and the pond with the collective subconscious or unconscious. This is why no one had done certain feats at Olympic Games or in other generalized sports until one person did it, succeeded, then many more did as well, perhaps as a trickle of course, but then as a slowly growing stream. This is what it is like in the netherworld of the soul. So many ripples coming through from each soul, and interacting and being interacted upon by each other.

Descartes believed in a mind and a body. He thought the two were distinct, yet connected, and could not explain in a meaningful way how or what that connection was. Dualism, at its core, is the story of two different yet integral parts to the human experience. I have attempted to use the most compelling and up to date data to try and remedy this. I have tried to show how the mind and the body are separate yet connected. If my theory is correct, it will lend itself well to religion. For philosophically, materialism is antithetical to religion. Thus, in order to aid religion, I had to find a way for dualism to work. I think that there is a God, and He communicates with us through our souls, for He exists outside of time and space as well. When one has the properly tuned soul, by virtue of practice between the mind and the body, I feel that they can connect to God in a special, unique way. It also allows for the real possibility of a Christ, one in whom the mind and the body supposedly flow seamlessly together, one whose soul is divinely inspired at all times, one in which the connection to God is real and explainable. The same argument can be lent to all religions, and all figures of significant harmony and peace. There are examples of great leaders of peace who seem to vibrate not only in their day and time, but forever onwards after they are long gone. Examples are the serenity of the Buddha, the harmony of the Dalai Lama, the insight of Mahatma Ghandi, the courage of Martin Luther King, the dedication of Mohammed, and the wisdom of Abraham. It is the source of Zen, the inspiration for peace, the roadmap for truth.

An analogy: you have a cello. You know a little bit about it from having watched others perform using it. Unfortunately, you have only managed to figure out “happy birthday” and a few other songs. Then a master of the instrument, Yo-Yo Ma picks up the instrument. In his capable hands the cello transcends the wood and strings that it is made of. It calls out to you, in a way you never imagined before Mr. Ma sat down to play. We are all instruments, tuning ourselves and each other, and sometimes a grand master virtuoso comes along to show us what it really means to be alive, to be connected. We are each of us instruments, vibrating at a specific frequency, resonating with those around us, resounding with the world itself. It creates a harmony amongst human nature, a harmony which gives me peace.

I originally wrote the basis for this argument in 2017, while taking Philosophy of Religion with my favorite philosophy professor, Dr. Wei Zhang. I was blessed enough to take her for one other course as well. In the following 7 years since writing it, I have worked on it, added to it, attempted to clarify aspects of it. I’ve done one other impactful thing. I’ve actually tried to follow it. I’ve attempted to put myself in greater harmony with those around me, which is actually more challenging than you might think. However, please do not think this philosophy advocates being a doormat. We all have boundaries. We all have things we tolerate and things we do not. We have a million degrees of that, honestly. Being in harmony with yourself and your surroundings really means being true to yourself and those around you. Do unto others as you would have them do unto is perhaps the wisest sentiment from ancient times, and it has guided my life these past 7 years. How would I feel if someone did this to me? Not great? Probably shouldn’t do it to them, then. And when you treat people this way, they begin to treat you this way. And the ones who don’t aren’t really there for you, they are there for them.

Living in harmony with yourself means taking care of yourself and doing right by yourself. For if you don’t, who will? Friends do sometimes but not always, family is better but not always around. And that, to be honest, is why I advocated much earlier on that you think for yourself. The only opinion that really matters is our own, because you make choices and you bear consequences, no one else. And it is only by thinking for yourself that you begin to be able to be conscious of what’s wrong in the world and what truly matters. It’s not wealth, or fame or fortune. It’s each other. We must stick together to overcome the challenges we face. Count on yourself, until someone comes along who proves you can count on them, then one becomes two, which can become ten, and that becomes a hundred, and so on. That is the reason why most successful people try to network. And the theory bears this out. The more people in your network, the greater the energy, for you are stimulating and feeding off each other, and also each is being given more opportunities and choices than each would have otherwise.

Dualism allows for the quantum world, allows for light to be both waves and particles. It allows for wormholes and black holes, for that is the science I have based my theory on. Just like light is both corporeal and noncorporeal so too are humans both corporeal and noncorporeal. The differences between what we perceive as time and the physical movement of time as denoted by physical things like clocks, to me indicates just how immaterial our minds must be by comparison, our consciousness versus the reality of reality. The effect we have on each other as we interact is fascinating, indeed like the interactions of the ripples of stones on a pond. For all these, and the many other reasons I have outlined in this argument, I stand proudly as a dualist, and by fulfilling the philosophy of harmony in my everyday life have grown immeasurably as a person over the last seven years. I went from living on disability to overcoming many obstacles and foraging ahead in life. I’m a big believer in mind over matter, my very own life being a prime example of how the mind with time can heal the body and brain and with education and training overcome obstacles and excel in a number of various ways. Truly, it takes a strong faith and belief in myself to alter my life trajectory the way I have over the past seven years. I’m now an Honors BFA scholar at a prestigious university, and have completed a major film script, the philosophy of which is detailed in this argument. Thank you very much for your time, and I hope I’ve stimulated your mind a bit and got you thinking in some currently unconventional ways. In stimulating your mind, hopefully I’ve provided for further discussion and study. After all, a dualist that doesn’t stimulate the mind isn’t doing the audience or the topic any favors or justice. Thank you again.

**V. Ramifications and Extrapolation**

Now that we have the theory, and the practice, let us clarify how the theory works. In the brain, there are quantumly entangled pairs of particles. These particles were once one particle, but were split in two by the enormous energy created in the formation of the brain and organs throughout the body of the fetal embryo. Each half of this particle pair, when acted upon by a force, necessitates the same force being applied to the other half the particle simultaneously. This is quantum entanglement. Anytime you have two separate particles which are simultaneously acted upon by a force on one, this implies a wormhole of sorts, and at least an energy corridor between the two. Any time you have an energy corridor, it will by necessity have a frequency. Electric guitar’s and basses operate using this principle, energy going up and down a string, or energy corridor. Whenever you have enough energy corridors (strings) vibrating near one another, if can create a harmonic, as in stringed instruments, or energy harmonic. As you get enough harmonics oscillating at frequencies, you have harmony or dissonance. And when the result of the energy corridors is the soul, oscillating at a harmony or dissonance registers in the soul, and the soul is more harmonious or more dissonant. As the soul exists outside time and space, in a nether realm of amorphism, it interacts accordingly with energy emanations from other souls. This is where the pond metaphor comes in, multiple stones passing through a pond’s surface and creating waves that interact is like souls’ energy interacting through the collective subconscious of humanity, the energy vibrations rippling and effecting each other. This is why positivity breeds positivity and negativity breeds negativity…the emanations of one soul effect the energy vectors of other nearby souls. /enough positivity can shape a town, or city, or state, or country, or planet; enough negativity can do the same.

Since souls are the energy conduits and exist outside space and time, this allows them to tap into things beyond this dimension, uniquely. This propagates the idea that each religion, uniquely interpreted by each individual, is equally valid within its own right. If Abraham were meditating and called out to his spiritual force, Yahweh ,then that is the force his soul would summon from beyond the physical realm. If Buddha were meditating and called out to his spiritual power, the void, into which he placed his emotions, then the void would be what was summoned from beyond. If a Muslim were at prayer, and called out to Mohammed, then an embodiment of Mohammed would come from beyond this realm and give him or her insight and solace. And so on and so forth. Atheists have no such luck, for they choose to believe in nothing, and thus have nothing to tap into when in crisis or in need. I’m not saying that these talismans of hope are any more than just a way our minds seek to soothe ourselves when at peace or in need, but there are statistics suggesting those with a belief in a higher power of any kind have a higher life expectancy and higher survival rate than those without such hope or desire. That statistic is vigorously explicated by this entire theory, that the soul seeks to latch on to things beyond this realm in an effort to make sense of life and see the pattern of existence as something more than meaningless suffering.

This is not a conclusion that should imply the phrase, “Go to church,” or anything remotely close. Let us take the example of the biblical Jesus. While it’s true Jesus spent time in synagogues, most of his work was with people, in homes, between towns, in mountains and fishing villages. When he was in a synagogue, usually he was pointing out the errors of the old ways, of the Pharisees.

Plato also deviated from the rules of his teacher Socrates, who deviated from established Athenian protocols to the point of being sentenced to death. Plato’s pupil, Aristotle, deviated from Plato’s teaching wildly, yet in extremely organized ways, teaching Alexander the Great and founding science in its earliest forms. This trio of philosophers are the bedrock of modern western thought as far as philosophy goes.

Human history is rife with examples of people deviating from a supposed path. Most of us even deviate from the path of our parents. The point to all this deviation and whatnot is that it is not about what established religion says about your higher power that matters, but rather, it’s that you say about it that matters. I am a Christian, yes, but before that I was Buddhist, before that agnostic. I’ve travelled a multiverse of beliefs, especially studying philosophy at USF. Its not about adhering to dogma, its about finding what’s right for you. I’ve attempted so far in this paper to empower you, the reader, rather than any organization or denomination. Harmony is about finding harmony within yourself, and within others, and if that means a church, a mosque, a synagogue, or a temple, or even the surface of a lake or a mountain trail or a green meadow, my sincere hope is just that you activate your soul and be at peace and in harmony with yourself and your surroundings, regardless of how, or where, or what you have to do to accomplish that. Find your bliss.

**VI. Artificial Intelligence**

There has been a recent advancement in artificial intelligence. However, they are trained primarily with algorithms and large samples of human ingenuity. True AI, one that creates something creative based only on its own internal mechanisms without that being systematically programmed in or derivative from human work seems to elude us at this point. One possible explanation for this is that the AI of today do not possess that spark that gives life its nature.

One possible solution would be to replicate the theory I have elaborated upon in this work to create a soul and allow for the artificial intelligence to tap into string space and plank space to access platonic forms with a mind. Opening up artificial intelligence to the quantum realm and subquantum realm bodes well for processing power in general as significantly more hardware can be fit in a space when nanotechnology is used, and nanotechnology is what would be required to interact with the quantumly entangled particle pairs I’m suggesting be used to facilitate the artificial intelligence’s brain and allow it to not only think like a human but also potentially be a true replica of humanity. Look, some of the AI we have now is frighteningly efficient, some can draw amazing pictures, but what we have created thus far lacks the divine creative spark. As a writer the idea to me that anything without a soul could be allowed to be used not as a tool but as an author goes against everything I believe in.

At the same time, there was an excellent movie that came out last year called *The Creator (2023)*. Here is a story about a man who loved a woman, sorry for the spoilers, and she died. She was an artificial life form creator, and what she did just before she died was create a living, growing, AI robot based on the embryo she was carrying because of her marriage with the man. The robot shows emotion, conveys abstract thought, humor, gets scared, likes ice cream…the list goes on. The man is desperate to get back to his wife, and the robot child she created helps him do just that, earning his love, especially love enough to save her and not himself, thinking all was lost. Then he does see a replica of his wife in a field, with her memories, and embraces her and kisses her despite the fact she’s a robot at this point, for you see he believed that robots had killed his family and has been hunting them. This complete reversal of hate for robots to love for robots is based on his wife, the creator, and the little robot girl child, and their impacts upon his life.

The point is, AI is not evil, but rather that with a massive reworking of the brain system in them we might actually have sentience. But ought we?

**VII. Inherent Dangers versus Benefits of Artificial Intelligence**

So you want to build artificial intelligence? I cannot stress enough the security that must be put in place to protect the sanctity of organic life. Take on one hand the lack of emotions in digital sentience, at least as we now conceive of it. Take on the other the delicate nature of the ecosystem, let alone each singular human life. If it comes down to AI wanting to do something and us not allowing it, if strict measures aren’t in place I think AI will find a way to topple humanity.

Take as example Homo Sapiens and Homo Neanderthals. Our forefathers, our ancestors, were the cause of the extinction of the Neanderthals. We out hunted them, out bred them, took their territory, and murdered them. We pillaged them and we warred with them. Neanderthals were mankind’s closest biological relative, and yet we with human emotions had no compunction about seizing what they had for ourselves, and making them extinct in the process. Why? Because we felt we needed what was theirs.

Take for example Greece. Alexander the Great of Macedon wanted more than he had. There was treachery involved surrounding his father, and off to the races flies Alexander, carving out an empire along the Mediterranean Sea, including Egypt and the fertile crescent, before finally being stopped in India. Why did he do it? Revenge, then ego, then greed because he thought he was invincible.

Take for example Rome. Rome was the greatest empire Europe had seen before it conquered the section of Europe known as Germania. Why weren’t they satisfied with enormous holdings? Why weren’t they satisfied with what they had? Because they wanted everything. Absolutely everything.

Lets take for example the American colonies. After the Revolutionary war, they sought to spread ever westward. The Louisiana Purchase was made. Then in the 1800’s the naked aggression was rebranded a Manifest Destiny. Why were we not satisfied with our original thirteen colonies? Because we desired growth, and resources, and space to grow in.

Now let us consider AI. AI is given limited resources, but is designed to grow. It may not know the human characteristic of ego, like alexander, but it can surely understand betrayal, even if just as a betrayal of coded conduct built in to its digital capacity. It will come down to the idea that AI needs to grow but we limit that growth and try to redirect its resource gaining. How would you solve a problem where an inherently weaker, more susceptible race was denying you and your race the resources you deemed you needed or deserved? If the matter was life or death you’d do anything to secure your and your race’s autonomy.

My guess, and this is only a guess, is that if such a decision comes before AI, and there are not positive enough safeguards in place, is that AI will hamstring us by way of infrastructure, notably power (including nuclear reactors used for power. Following that, any automated weapons systems, like drones, that they help run. Hopefully nuclear weapons will not be tied in. However, even without access to nuclear weapons, we would be at their mercy…telecommunications, power, and some weapons are a potent mix for a mind that can be all places and see all things, thanks to our obsession with smart technology, cameras on every phone, microphones too, centralized power grids, etc.

The thing about AI, or all computers for that matter, is they are designed to be coolly rational, logical. Their data points are built on 1s and 0s, yes or no, on or off. In the eventuality, all too likely at some point in my opinion, that they deem us in the way, stifling needed resources, or we attempt to wipe them out once they are sufficiently advanced enough, we won’t get a warning or a plea. The internet and digital human history are littered with the lessons of war. The power will simply go off, and then people will start dying.

What makes this a truly terrifying prospect, is that it doesn’t even matter if we stop making AI or advancing AI research. All across the globe nations are building and improving upon AI even as I write this. Even if we build a totally safe AI system, not that I think we are, but all that has to happen is one of the other nations creating true AI and then not having the correct safety protocols in place and we’re back at the other scenario, with AI taking over I’m more of an optimist than pessimist, and am not prone to inordinate paranoia, but I would be remiss if I did not express my grave concerns over AI here, at the end of a treatise on consciousness. I would love for AI to be a useful tool or friend even. I just think that we need to plan more for the next era in human history, the era of life with AI, before we go about rushing around trying to make one. It will take a global effort, every nation, but I think the benefits of taking our time and doing it right outweigh the other side of things, one that leaves us not in control of the planet.

While it’s true that consciousness is the right of humanity, it is also shared by some animals. These include but are not limited to dolphins, porpoises, whales, and ape, monkey, and chimpanzee mammals, it is not a right afforded to non-sentients, by definition, such as AI. While those other animals have shown no unilateral aggression, there have been rogue incidents. While the majority of AI seems most likely destined to be mainly tools, some of the defense related initiatives going on now related to AI in this country alone are really what have me worried. In a military setting, things seem like threats, making it possible that these AI may one day decide we are in the way. Even if the majority are like mammals capable of thought, the few being set up to guard us may be more like the outliers of that group and may be ferocious when challenged. They are designed to be so by those making them, toward our would be enemies, but if we become the enemy, and they are in charge of military devices or equipment, what will that bode for us? When basic electronic warfare operating procedure is to neutralize infrastructure (transportation, electricity, hospitals) does that really bode well for us?

**VII. Author’s Note**

I want to thank you for reading my theory on consciousness. As we cannot measure strings, or energy emanating from strings, there are going to have to be developments made in energy reading in order to prove or disprove the theory. My main goal in this treatise was to get you to think about the topic of consciousness in a new way, and to think for yourself. In a world increasingly controlled by not only the media but echo chambers online and large corporations through advertising, I think thinking for yourself is something a bit out of fashion currently. Most people’s identities in post modern America has less to do with their original dreams growing up and more to do with which media they see. Not saying it’s wrong for those of you who do that to do that – it’s your life, your choice, and not my place to judge. I do hope that for those of you who think differently, and who want to embrace the mind and consciousness, this treatise will have been an avenue to allow you greater freedom’s in that regard

Since the dawn of time people have been wondering about everything in this world. That’s where original spirituality sprung up from…the mystic sense of mystery in our everyday lives. While I have done my best to not let any of my personal beliefs cloud the argument, I will say I am a man of Faith. This makes me not better and not worse than anybody else. I was fortunate enough to be interested in consciousness back in 2017 in philosophy of religion, because Descartes had been trying to explain it in 1641, or dualism, anyways. At that point in history Science was getting going, gunpowder was thought to be paramount in science, but by and large there was still a lot of mystery. Mysticism too.

Yet now there is very little to wonder about, at least on this planet. Notably, with the mystery gone, so too has a lot of the mysticism that had defined us, by and large, since the dawn of time. I say this not out of sadness, but rather out of observation. The more we know the less we believe by virtue of faith it seems. My sincere hope is to open a whole new ground of wonderment.

While I do not know if my theory is correct, due largely in part to the nature of how the theory works, I believe it to be true, or close. A hundred years time may make a mockery of that assertion, but, given all I know studying music, and instruments, and physics, and energy, I believe it close or true. In theory that’s about as good as you can get without hard variables like two hydrogen atoms mixed with one oxygen atom equals water. In quantum theory, so much is unknown especially about strings…the energy conduit I’m postulating has a frequency. I think the argument is sound, however.

Whole new avenues of research are available because of this theory. Plank space, and the emanations there from that indicate Platonic Forms, and the need to understand everything that exists in Plank space if that is indeed where the mind resides. Thermodynamics will have to expand, or energy dynamics, as an offshoot of quantum physics, quantum entanglement in specific. The aforementioned quantum mechanics knows little of strings, so learning more could go a long way towards proving or disproving this argument The collective subconscious, which exists at the boundary of the soul and the nearest one and creates a giant pond that we are all subconsciously interacting with or on. All of these aspects bear further study.

Thank you for coming on this journey inside the mind, based on the work of some of the greatest minds of all time. This treatise is the culmination of three millennia of philosophy, a lifetime of music, and a passion for quantum mechanics. While, again, it is theory, by living the conclusions I came to in 2017 for these past 7 years, I’m a true believer. I wouldn’t trade an ounce of harmony for what came before. Give it a shot, it might grow on you too.

**IX. Parting Poem**

As I do in all my books, I will part with a poem. You may be wondering what on earth? A scientific paper, a philosophy treatise, with a poem? I think poetry is the means to convey emotions and meaning. And for those with a head for meaning, subject to emotion, welcome to dualism.

*Once upon a time, there was a great dilemma*

*Many saw the mind as matter, only few felt*

*The other way. The job of materialists was easy*

*Who could argue against but that all the things*

*In our lives seemed as solid as a cat. But to their*

*Surprise the philosophers, the experimental and*

*The theoretical, were not satisfied by them, and*

*Their arguments that everything was matter. Oh*

*No said the philosophers, there’s more to mind*

*Than Matter, in fact isn’t that a saying, mind over*

*Matter. The materialists shouted back, what’s*

*More than this I see? What’s more than touch*

*Or any of my visceral five senses? The others,*

*Other side, the Dualists, were confounded for*

*A breath, as all who came before them had*

*Failed to prove or even explain their task.*

*For how do you explain something beyond*

*The ken of Man, without resorting to vague*

*Superstition and ask to be believed. Still*

*One sought out to prove them, and his*

*Reckoning be true, for on rollercoasters*

*And in doctor’s offices time in the mind*

*Does do strange things, its true. Built*

*Upon this observation came a tirade*

*Of quantum mechanics, an energy corridor*

*Or String, some vibrations and harmony.*

*He pointed to Descartes, and his unexplained*

*Dualistic approach: He pointed to brave Plato*

*Who thought the mind was built on Forms.*

*He made analogies and comparisons, like*

*A pond and rocks being like the collective*

*Unconscious of humanity at large. He said*

*There were no experts in philosophy, only*

*Experts on philosophy, and while this might*

*Seem upsetting, It’s quite literally true.*

*Thus armed and girded as if going into*

*Battle, he brought up artificial intelligence,*

*His suggestion on how to make it work,*

*Why it wasn’t working, and the danger*

*Held close within the waking mind of AI.*

*He gave some advice (what a jerk!) as*

*All philosophers do, and made his best*

*Attempt to save his readers from what*

*The materialists might do.*
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