DOWNLOAD PDF A UNIFIED THEORY OF GOD, MIND MATTER

Chapter 1 : Brink's Unified Theory of Nutrition

Xavier L. Suarez's book "A Unified Theory Of God, Mind & Matter" is an amazing intellectual feat that should impress both professional academics and all educated people who have ever tried to integrate various fields of knowledge or longed that someone else would.

In this graph, electroweak unification occurs at around GeV, grand unification is predicted to occur at GeV, and unification of the GUT force with gravity is expected at the Planck energy , roughly GeV. Grand unification would imply the existence of an electronuclear force; it is expected to set in at energies of the order of GeV, far greater than could be reached by any possible Earth-based particle accelerator. Although the simplest GUTs have been experimentally ruled out, the general idea, especially when linked with supersymmetry , remains a favorite candidate in the theoretical physics community. Supersymmetric GUTs seem plausible not only for their theoretical "beauty", but because they naturally produce large quantities of dark matter, and because the inflationary force may be related to GUT physics although it does not seem to form an inevitable part of the theory. Yet GUTs are clearly not the final answer; both the current standard model and all proposed GUTs are quantum field theories which require the problematic technique of renormalization to yield sensible answers. This is usually regarded as a sign that these are only effective field theories , omitting crucial phenomena relevant only at very high energies. In addition to explaining the forces listed in the graph, a TOE may also explain the status of at least two candidate forces suggested by modern cosmology: Furthermore, cosmological experiments also suggest the existence of dark matter , supposedly composed of fundamental particles outside the scheme of the standard model. However, the existence of these forces and particles has not been proven. String theory and M-theory[edit] Unsolved problem in physics: Is string theory , superstring theory , or M-theory , or some other variant on this theme, a step on the road to a "theory of everything", or just a blind alley? However, there is no widespread consensus on this issue. This lent credence to the idea of unifying gauge and gravity interactions, and to extra dimensions, but did not address the detailed experimental requirements. Another important property of string theory is its supersymmetry , which together with extra dimensions are the two main proposals for resolving the hierarchy problem of the standard model , which is roughly the question of why gravity is so much weaker than any other force. The extra-dimensional solution involves allowing gravity to propagate into the other dimensions while keeping other forces confined to a four-dimensional spacetime, an idea that has been realized with explicit stringy mechanisms. On the experimental side, the particle content of the standard model supplemented with neutrino masses fits into a spinor representation of SO 10 , a subgroup of E8 that routinely emerges in string theory, such as in heterotic string theory [20] or sometimes equivalently in F-theory. In the late s, it was noted that one major hurdle in this endeavor is that the number of possible four-dimensional universes is incredibly large. This array of models is known as the string theory landscape. Hence what we normally conceive as the fundamental constants of the universe are ultimately the result of the anthropic principle rather than dictated by theory. This has led to criticism of string theory, [29] arguing that it cannot make useful i. Others disagree, [30] and string theory remains an active topic of investigation in theoretical physics. There have been recent claims that loop quantum gravity may be able to reproduce features resembling the Standard Model. So far only the first generation of fermions leptons and quarks with correct parity properties have been modelled by Sundance Bilson-Thompson using preons constituted of braids of spacetime as the building blocks. Utilization of quantum computing concepts made it possible to demonstrate that the particles are able to survive quantum fluctuations. The electric charge, colour, and parity properties of such fermions would arise in the same way as for the first generation. The model was expressly generalized for an infinite number of generations and for the weak force bosons but not for photons or gluons in a paper by Bilson-Thompson, Hackett, Kauffman and Smolin. Another theory is called Causal Sets. Its founding principle is that spacetime is fundamentally discrete and that the spacetime events are related by a partial order. This partial order has the physical meaning of the causality relations between relative past and future distinguishing spacetime events. This theory provides an attempt of identifying general relativity and the

standard model within the Lie group E8. For example, no candidate theory is able to calculate the fine structure constant or the mass of the electron. Most particle physicists expect that the outcome of the ongoing experiments â€" the search for new particles at the large particle accelerators and for dark matter â€" are needed in order to provide further input for a TOE. Theory of everything philosophy The philosophical implications of a physical TOE are frequently debated. For example, if philosophical physicalism is true, a physical TOE will coincide with a philosophical theory of everything. The "system building" style of metaphysics attempts to answer all the important questions in a coherent way, providing a complete picture of the world. Aristotle is the first and most noteworthy philosopher to have attempted such a comprehensive system in his Metaphysics. While Aristotle made important contributions to all the sciences in terms of his method of logic and his first principle of causality, he was later demonized by later modern philosophers of the Enlightenment like Immanuel Kant who criticized him for his idea of God as first cause. Hegel - and the many philosophical reactions they inspired - took a decided turn away from natural philosophy and the physical sciences and focused instead on issues of perception, cognition, consciousness and ultimately language. Arguments against[edit] In parallel to the intense search for a TOE, various scholars have seriously debated the possibility of its discovery. Stanley Jaki , in his book The Relevance of Physics, pointed out that, because any "theory of everything" will certainly be a consistent non-trivial mathematical theory, it must be incomplete. He claims that this dooms searches for a deterministic theory of everything. No matter how many problems we solve, there will always be other problems that cannot be solved within the existing rules. I used to belong to that camp, but I have changed my mind. Analogously, it may or may not be possible to completely state the underlying rules of physics with a finite number of well-defined laws, but there is little doubt that there are questions about the behavior of physical systems which are formally undecidable on the basis of those underlying laws. Fundamental limits in accuracy[edit] No physical theory to date is believed to be precisely accurate. Instead, physics has proceeded by a series of "successive approximations" allowing more and more accurate predictions over a wider and wider range of phenomena. Some physicists believe that it is therefore a mistake to confuse theoretical models with the true nature of reality, and hold that the series of approximations will never terminate in the "truth". Einstein himself expressed this view on occasions. On the other hand, it is often claimed that, despite the apparently ever-increasing complexity of the mathematics of each new theory, in a deep sense associated with their underlying gauge symmetry and the number of dimensionless physical constants , the theories are becoming simpler. If this is the case, the process of simplification cannot continue indefinitely. Lack of fundamental laws[edit] There is a philosophical debate within the physics community as to whether a theory of everything deserves to be called the fundamental law of the universe. Another view is that emergent laws, which govern the behavior of complex systems , should be seen as equally fundamental. Examples of emergent laws are the second law of thermodynamics and the theory of natural selection. The advocates of emergence argue that emergent laws, especially those describing complex or living systems are independent of the low-level, microscopic laws. In this view, emergent laws are as fundamental as a TOE. The debates do not make the point at issue clear. Possibly the only issue at stake is the right to apply the high-status term "fundamental" to the respective subjects of research. Determinism is frustrated by the probabilistic nature of quantum mechanical predictions, by the extreme sensitivity to initial conditions that leads to mathematical chaos , by the limitations due to event horizons, and by the extreme mathematical difficulty of applying the theory. Thus, although the current standard model of particle physics "in principle" predicts almost all known non-gravitational phenomena, in practice only a few quantitative results have been derived from the full theory e. The TOE would almost certainly be even harder to apply for the prediction of experimental results, and thus might be of limited use. A motive for seeking a TOE,[citation needed] apart from the pure intellectual satisfaction of completing a centuries-long quest, is that prior examples of unification have predicted new phenomena, some of which e. And like in these prior examples of unification, the TOE would probably allow us to confidently define the domain of validity and residual error of low-energy approximations to the full theory. Infinite number of onion layers[edit] Frank Close regularly argues that the layers of nature may be like the layers of an onion, and that the number of layers might be infinite. So how can we know we have an adequate theory for describing the motion of projectiles? These

principles have worked so well on simple examples that we can be reasonably confident they will work for more complex examples. For example, although general relativity includes equations that do not have exact solutions, it is widely accepted as a valid theory because all of its equations with exact solutions have been experimentally verified. Likewise, a TOE must work for a wide range of simple examples in such a way that we can be reasonably confident it will work for every situation in physics.

Chapter 2 : Theory of everything - Wikipedia

Infinity and the Brain: A Unified Theory of Mind, Matter, and God by Glenn Dudley Infinity and the Brain offers a unique and logical solution to the mind-body problem. The book proposes that the relationship between mind and body is understandable only to the measure that we and our brains are unceasingly dependent upon the immanence of God.

Forces[edit] All four of the known fundamental forces are mediated by fields, which in the Standard Model of particle physics result from exchange of gauge bosons. Specifically the four fundamental interactions to be unified are: The exchange particle that mediates this force is the gluon. The photon is the exchange particle for this force. It is mediated by the W and Z bosons. The postulated exchange particle has been named the graviton. Modern unified field theory attempts to bring these four interactions together into a single framework. Classic theory[edit] The first successful classical unified field theory was developed by James Clerk Maxwell. Until then, electricity and magnetism had been thought of as unrelated phenomena. In , Maxwell published his famous paper on a dynamical theory of the electromagnetic field. This was the first example of a theory that was able to encompass previously separate field theories namely electricity and magnetism to provide a unifying theory of electromagnetism. In the years following the creation of the general theory, a large number of physicists and mathematicians enthusiastically participated in the attempt to unify the then-known fundamental interactions. In Kaluzaâ€"Klein theory , the gravitational curvature of the extra spatial direction behaves as an additional force similar to electromagnetism. These and other models of electromagnetism and gravity were pursued by Albert Einstein in his attempts at a classical unified field theory. This system is heuristically the super-classical [Varadarajan] limit of the not mathematically well-defined quantum electrodynamics. One can extend this system to include the weak and strong nuclear forces to get the Einsteinâ€"Yangâ€"Millsâ€"Dirac System. The French physicist Marie-Antoinette Tonnelat published a paper in the early s on the standard commutation relations for the quantized spin-2 field. In the s Mendel Sachs proposed a generally covariant field theory that did not require recourse to renormalisation or perturbation theory. In , Tonnelat published a book on the state of research on unified field theories. Modern progress[edit] In American physicist Sheldon Glashow proposed that the weak nuclear force , electricity and magnetism could arise from a partially unified electroweak theory. This unified theory modeled the electroweak interaction as a force mediated by four particles: As a result of the spontaneous symmetry breaking, the weak force becomes short-range and the W and Z bosons acquire masses of Their theory was first given experimental support by the discovery of weak neutral currents in Carlo Rubbia and Simon van der Meer received the Prize in In , Sheldon Glashow and Howard Georgi proposed unifying the strong and electroweak interactions into the Georgiâ€"Glashow model , the first Grand Unified Theory , which would have observable effects for energies much above GeV. Since then there have been several proposals for Grand Unified Theories, e. A major problem for experimental tests of such theories is the energy scale involved, which is well beyond the reach of current accelerators. Grand Unified Theories make predictions for the relative strengths of the strong, weak, and electromagnetic forces, and in LEP determined that supersymmetric theories have the correct ratio of couplings for a Georgiâ€"Glashow Grand Unified Theory. Many Grand Unified Theories but not Patiâ€"Salam predict that the proton can decay , and if this were to be seen, details of the decay products could give hints at more aspects of the Grand Unified Theory. It is at present unknown if the proton can decay, although experiments have determined a lower bound of years for its lifetime. Current status[edit] Theoretical physicists have not yet formulated a widely accepted, consistent theory that combines general relativity and quantum mechanics to form a theory of everything. Trying to combine the graviton with the strong and electroweak interactions leads to fundamental difficulties and the resulting theory is not renormalizable. The incompatibility of the two theories remains an outstanding problem in the field of physics.

Chapter 3 : Unified Theory and God | Physics Forums

Get this from a library! Infinity and the brain: a unified theory of mind, matter, and God. [Glenn G Dudley].

The town of La Haye, which lies 47 kilometers south of Tours, has subsequently been renamed Descartes. When Descartes was thirteen and one-half months old, his mother, Jeanne Brochard, died in childbirth. But he did not neglect his birth place in La Haye: He followed the usual course of studies, which included five or six years of grammar school, including Latin and Greek grammar, classical poets, and Cicero, followed by three years of philosophy curriculum. By rule, the Jesuit philosophy curriculum followed Aristotle; it was divided into the then-standard topics of logic, morals, physics, and metaphysics. The Jesuits also included mathematics in the final three years of study. Aristotle himself frequently discussed the positions of his ancient predecessors. Within this framework, and taking into account the reading of Cicero, Descartes would have been exposed in school to the doctrines of the ancient atomists, Plato, and the Stoics, and he would have heard of the skeptics. Hence, although scholastic Aristotelian philosophy was dominant in his school years, it was not the only type of philosophy that he knew. His family wanted Descartes to be a lawyer, like his father and many other relatives. To this end, he went to Poitiers to study law, obtaining a degree in But he never practiced law or entered into the governmental service such practice would make possible Rodis-Lewis , 18â€” Instead, he became a gentleman soldier, moving in to Breda, to support the Protestant Prince Maurice against the Catholic parts of the Netherlands which parts later formed Belgium , which were controlled by Spainâ€”a Catholic land, like France, but at this point an enemy. Beeckman set various problems for Descartes, including questions about falling bodies, hydrostatics, and mathematical problems. Since antiquity, mathematics had been applied to various physical subject matters, in optics, astronomy, mechanics focusing on the lever , and hydrostatics. Beeckman and Descartes brought to this work a commitment to atoms as the basic constituents of matter; as had ancient atomists, they attributed not only size, shape, and motion but also weight to those atoms At this time, Descartes discovered and conveyed to Beeckman the fundamental insight that makes analytic geometry possible: Descartes himself did not foresee replacing geometrical constructions with algebraic formulas; rather, he viewed geometry as the basic mathematical science and he considered his algebraic techniques to provide a powerful alternative to actual compass-and-ruler constructions when the latter became too intricate. Descartes attended the coronation and was returning to the army when winter caught him in the small town of Ulm or perhaps Neuburg , not far from Munich. On the night of November 10, , Descartes had three dreams that seemed to provide him with a mission in life. The dreams themselves are interesting and complex see Sebba Descartes took from them the message that he should set out to reform all knowledge. He decided to begin with philosophy, since the principles of the other sciences must be derived from it 6: In , he recalled 3: Francisco Toledo â€”96 , Antonio Rubio â€” , and the Coimbran commentators active ca. And in he was able to rattle off the names of recent innovators in philosophy 1: He was in France part of the time, visiting Poitou to sell some inherited properties in and visiting Paris. He went to Italy â€” Upon his return he lived in Paris, where he was in touch with mathematicians and natural philosophers in the circle of his long-time friend and correspondent Marin Mersenne â€” While in Paris, he worked on some mathematical problems and derived the sine law of refraction, which facilitated his work on formulating mathematically the shapes of lenses later published in the Dioptrics. His major philosophical effort during these years was on the Rules, a work to convey his new method. In the Rules, he sought to generalize the methods of mathematics so as to provide a route to clear knowledge of everything that human beings can know. His methodological advice included a suggestion that is familiar to every student of elementary geometry: But he also had advice for the ambitious seeker of truth, concerning where to start and how to work up to greater things. Thus, Rule 10 reads: These faculties allow the seeker of knowledge to combine simple truths in order to solve more complex problems, such as the solution to problems in optics By the end of , Descartes had abandoned work on the Rules, having completed about half of the projected treatise. In that year he moved to the Dutch Netherlands, and after that he returned to France infrequently, prior to moving to Sweden in In Summer, , an impressive set of parhelia, or false suns, were observed near Rome. When

Descartes heard of them, he set out to find an explanation. He ultimately hypothesized that a large, solid ice-ring in the sky acts as a lens to form multiple images of the sun [6: This work interrupted his investigations on another topic, which had engaged him for his first nine months in the Netherlands 1: The metaphysical objects of investigation included the existence and nature of God and the soul 1: Subsequently, Descartes mentioned a little metaphysical treatise in Latinâ€"presumably an early version of the Meditationsâ€"that he wrote upon first coming to the Netherlands 1: While working on the parhelia, Descartes conceived the idea for a very ambitious treatise. This work eventually became The World, which was to have had three parts: Only the first two survive and perhaps only they were ever written , as the Treatise on Light and Treatise on Man. In these works, which Descartes decided to suppress upon learning of the condemnation of Galileo 1: These works contained a description of the visible universe as a single physical system in which all its operations, from the formation of planets and the transmission of light from the sun, to the physiological processes of human and nonhuman animal bodies, can be explained through the mechanism of matter arranged into shapes and structures and moving according to three laws of motion. In fact, his explanations in the World and the subsequent Principles made little use of the three laws of motion in other than a qualitative manner. After suppressing his World, Descartes decided to put forward, anonymously, a limited sample of his new philosophy, in the Discourse with its attached essays. It offered some initial results of his metaphysical investigations, including mindâ€"body dualism. It did not, however, engage in the deep skepticism of the later Meditations, nor did it claim to establish, metaphysically, that the essence of matter is extension. This last conclusion was presented merely as a hypothesis whose fruitfulness could be tested and proven by way of its results, as contained in the attached essays on Dioptrics and Meteorology. In his Meteorology, Descartes described his general hypothesis about the nature of matter, before continuing on to provide accounts of vapors, salt, winds, clouds, snow, rain, hail, lightning, the rainbow, coronas, and parhelia. He presented a corpuscularian basis for his physics, which denied the atoms-and-void theory of ancient atomism and affirmed that all bodies are composed from one type of matter, which is infinitely divisible 6: In the World, he had presented his non-atomistic corpuscularism, but without denying void space outright and without affirming infinite divisibility Indeed, Descartes claimed that he could explain these qualities themselves through matter in motion The four Aristotelian elements, earth, air, fire, and water, had substantial forms that combined the basic qualities of hot, cold, wet, and dry: For earth, that activity is to approach the center to the universe; water has the same tendency, but not as strongly. For this reason, Aristotelians explained, the planet earth has formed at the center, with water on its surface. This form then organizes that matter into the shape of a rabbit, including organizing and directing the activity of its various organs and physiological processes. Although in the World and Meteorology Descartes avoided outright denial of substantial forms and real qualities, it is clear that he intended to deny them 1: Two considerations help explain his tentative language: In , Descartes fathered a daughter named Francine. This was the Meditations, and presumably he was revising or recasting the Latin treatise from In the end, he and Mersenne collected seven sets of objections to the Meditations, which Descartes published with the work, along with his replies , Some objections were from unnamed theologians, passed on by Mersenne; one set came from the Dutch priest Johannes Caterus; one set was from the Jesuit philosopher Pierre Bourdin; others were from Mersenne himself, from the philosophers Pierre Gassendi and Thomas Hobbes, and from the Catholic philosopher-theologian Antoine Arnauld. As previously mentioned, Descartes considered the Meditations to contain the principles of his physics. Descartes and his followers included topics concerning the nature of the mind and mindâ€"body interaction within physics or natural philosophy, on which, see Hatfield Once Descartes had presented his metaphysics, he felt free to proceed with the publication of his entire physics. However, he needed first to teach it to speak Latin 3: He hatched a scheme to publish a Latin version of his physics the Principles together with a scholastic Aristotelian work on physics, so that the comparative advantages would be manifest. For this purpose, he chose the Summa philosophiae of Eustace of St. That part of his plan never came to fruition. His intent remained the same: Ultimately, his physics was taught in the Netherlands, France, England, and parts of Germany. The Principles appeared in Latin in , with a French translation following in He also presented an image of the relations among the various parts of philosophy, in the form of a tree: Thus the whole of

philosophy is like a tree. The roots are metaphysics, the trunk is physics, and the branches emerging from the trunk are all the other sciences, which may be reduced to three principal ones, namely medicine, mechanics and morals. His intent had been also to explain in depth the origins of plants and animals, human physiology, mindâ€"body union and interaction, and the function of the senses. In the end, he had to abandon the discussion of plants and animals Princ. Nonetheless, he was drawn into theological controversy with Calvinist theologians in the Netherlands. Already by , Gisbert Voetius â€" , a theologian at Utrecht, expressed his displeasure over this to Mersenne 3: Controversy brewed, at first between Regius and Voetius, with Descartes advising the former. The controversy simmered through the mids. Descartes replied with his Comments on a Certain Broadsheet In the mids, Descartes continued work on his physiological system, which he had pursued throughout the s. He allowed his Treatise on Man to be copied 4: During this period he corresponded with Princess Elisabeth, at first on topics in metaphysics stemming from her reading of the Meditations and then on the passions and emotions. Eventually, he wrote the Passions of the Soul , which gave the most extensive account of his behavioral physiology to be published in his lifetime and which contained a comprehensive and original theory of the passions and emotions. In , Descartes accepted the invitation of Queen Christina of Sweden to join her court. On the day he delivered them to her, he became ill. He died on 11 February Readers of the philosophical works of Immanuel Kant are aware of the basic distinction between his critical and precritical periods. Readers of the works of G. Leibniz are also aware of his philosophical development, although in his case there is less agreement on how to place his writings into a developmental scheme. In effect, he adopted a hypothetico-deductive scheme of confirmation, but with this difference:

Chapter 4 : Philosophy Unified

Paragon House, home of books that make a difference.

Foundational Premise Philosophers throughout the ages have struggled with the issues of free will, spirit versus matter, mind-body dualism, politics, power, economics, good and evil, utility, value, suffering and pleasure, equality and class, virtue and vice, God and religion. Each of the philosophers stood upon the shoulders of the previous generations, and asked questions brought to light by the answers of their forbears. The entirety of this book will examine the philosophy of each of the Great Minds from the perspective of the Absolute Frame. The goal of this parallel examination of many of the philosophical concepts is to challenge the proposed Unified Theory of Philosophy against a significant number of the insoluble problems of philosophy, and show both consistency of explanation, and a general sense of satisfaction with the Theory. God created the soul, mind, emotions, and spirit to reflect, perceive, process and act amid the complex manifestations of life possibilities. Ultimately the purpose of life is experiencing a love relationship with God and man. The polarities of life which allow perception, thus black and white, good and evil, work and rest, light and dark, are illuminated by the presence of their opposite. Each moment of life requires finding the middle path, the point where we properly hold the opposing polarities. Most of the problems we face in life are issues of improper balance. But, if we avoid looking at the issues of life that bring up sadness, anger, and fear, we may be ignoring situations which can cause great harm. Thus, while positivity, hopeful expectation, prayer, and faith are important polarities of life, they are ineffective if the problems of life are not seen and acted upon. Thus, when we look to find the proper point of life in terms of positive and negative emotions and thoughts, we should always look first to God for the standard. We are to use all tools available; read the Bible, pray, seek the advice of elders, parents, and counselors, look at the signs of life, and feel your heart speak. The outcome of faith and works may be to avert pain and problems, things may stay the same, or they may get worse. If we survive an episode of trials, we will continue to live and learn as life goes on. But if we die during a trial, we are certain of receiving justice and mercy according to our own submission to the Lordship of Christ. The reward for our service of the kingdom of God will be appropriate and the entirety of the struggle will be counted as little cost compared to the gain. There are life skills that help make life work smoothly, but no skill or strategy works in all situations. Life is far too complex to formularize its conduct. Nevertheless, by studying, having options, and knowing some of the major paths that life takes, we can be prepared to hear the leading of the Holy Spirit speaking through the various vessels of life. We may be warned of disaster, and steer our life toward calmer and more productive waters. We may be led to charge the embattlements and fight insurmountable odds. Thus, the attitude of embrace and thankfulness for life each day, and gratitude to God for creating a world that is constantly interesting, engaging, and meaningful. The diversity and mystery of life is truly a miracle, and by holding this attitude, couples can be compassionate and allow each other the latitude to be different and appreciate the uniqueness of another soul.

Chapter 5 : - Infinity and the Brain A Unified Theory of Mind, Matter, and God by Glenn G. Dudley

Description: Towards a Unified Theory of Mind explores the development of the mind across the lifespan of a human being. Psychologist Dr. Lawrence Dugan introduces a Unified Theory of the Mind that parallels Newton's Unified Theory of Force and Einstein's Unified Theory of Energy.

For the most part, that is not so. At worst, most of what he said about the mind and consciousness can be detached from his idealism. Though often viewed as a quintessentially German philosopher, Kant is said to have been one-quarter Scottish. It is noteworthy, however, that his work on epistemology, which led him to his ideas about the mind, was a response to Hume as much as to any other philosopher. Central elements of the models of the mind of thinkers otherwise as different as Sigmund Freud and Jerry Fodor are broadly Kantian, for example. They have all become part of the foundation of cognitive science. The mind is a complex set of abilities functions. As Meerbote and many others have observed, Kant held a functionalist view of the mind almost years before functionalism was officially articulated in the s by Hilary Putnam and others. The functions crucial for mental, knowledge-generating activity are spatio-temporal processing of, and application of concepts to, sensory inputs. Cognition requires concepts as well as percepts. These functions are forms of what Kant called synthesis. Synthesis and the unity in consciousness required for synthesis are central to cognition. These three ideas are fundamental to most thinking about cognition now. To study the mind, infer the conditions necessary for experience. Arguments having this structure are called transcendental arguments. Translated into contemporary terms, the core of this method is inference to the best explanation, the method of postulating unobservable mental mechanisms in order to explain observed behaviour. He thought that he could get a priori experience independent knowledge out of them. Kant had a tripartite doctrine of the a priori. He held that some features of the mind and its knowledge had a priori origins, i. That mind and knowledge have these features are a priori truths, i. And we can come to know these truths, or that they are a priori at any rate, only by using a priori methods, i. Kant thought that transcendental arguments were a priori or yielded the a priori in all three ways. Nonetheless, at the heart of this method is inference to the best explanation. When introspection fell out of favour about years ago, the alternative approach adopted was exactly this approach. Its nonempirical roots in Kant notwithstanding, it is now the major method used by experimental cognitive scientists. Far from his model having been superseded by cognitive science, some important things have not even been assimilated by it. Since the Anthropology was worked up from notes for popular lectures, it is often superficial compared to CPR. Kant aimed among other things to, Justify our conviction that physics, like mathematics, is a body of necessary and universal truth. Insulate religion, including belief in immortality, and free will from the corrosive effects of this very same science. As he saw it and very fortunately, science cannot touch these questions. Laying the foundation for pursuit of the first aim, which as he saw it was no less than the aim of showing why physics is a science, was what led Kant to his views about how the mind works. He approached the grounding of physics by asking: What are the necessary conditions of experience A96? Put simply, he held that for our experience, and therefore our minds, to be as they are, the way that our experience is tied together must reflect the way that physics says that objects in the world must be tied together. Seeing this connection also tells us a lot about what our minds must be like. In CPR, Kant discussed the mind only in connection with his main projects, never in its own right, so his treatment is remarkably scattered and sketchy. Indeed, Kant offers no sustained, focussed discussion of the mind anywhere in his work except the popular Anthropology, which, as we just said, is quite superficial. They contain some of the most impenetrable prose ever written. Kant completely rewrote the main body of both chapters for the second edition though not the introductions, interestingly. In the two editions of CPR, there are seven main discussions of the mind. The first is in the Transcendental Aesthetic, the second is in what is usually called the Metaphysical Deduction for this term, see below. Then there are two discussions of it in the first-edition TD, in parts 1 to 3 of Section 2 A98 up to A and in the whole of Section 3 AA [2] and two more in the second-edition TD, from B to B and from B to B, the latter seemingly added as a kind of supplement. What little was retained of these remarks in the second edition was moved to the completely rewritten TD. For understanding Kant on the mind and

self-knowledge, the first edition of CPR is far more valuable than the second edition. Here Kant advances one of his most notorious views: The mind has two pure forms of intuition, space and time, built into it to allow it to do so. These claims are very problematic. For example, they invite the question, in virtue of what is the mind constrained to locate a bit of information at one spatial or temporal location rather than another? Kant seems to have had no answer to this question Falkenstein ; Brook It is not entirely clear how the two discussions relate. The chapter leading up to the Transcendental Deduction, The Clue to the Discovery of All Pure Concepts of the Understanding but generally called the Metaphysical Deduction because of a remark that Kant once made, B is totally unlike this. Starting from and taking for granted the logic of Aristotelian syllogisms and the Aristotelian categories, Kant proceeds by analysis to draw out the implications of this logic for the conceptual structure within which all thought and experience must take place. The structure in question is the system of the forms of judgment; the resulting theory is the theory of what Kant called the Categories. Kant seems to have thought that he could deduce the conceptual structure of experience from the components of the Aristotelian system. The first is a move up from experience of objects to the necessary conditions of such experience. The second is a move down from the Aristotelian forms of judgment to the concepts that we have to use in judging, namely, the Categories. One is inference up from experience, the other deduction down from conceptual structures of the most abstract kind. Recall the two movements just discussed, the one from experience to its conditions and the one from the forms of valid inference to the concepts that we must use in all judging the Categories. It reflects an important question: How is it that the world as we experience it conforms to our logic? In briefest form, Kant thought that the trick to showing how it is possible for the Categories to apply to experience is to show that it is necessary that they apply A He once called them the objective and the subjective deductions Axvii. The objective deduction is about the conceptual and other cognitive conditions of having representations of objects. Exactly how the objective deduction goes is highly controversial, a controversy that we will sidestep here. The subjective deduction is what mainly interests us. Kant argues as follows. Our experiences have objects, are about something. The objects of our experiences are discrete, unified particulars. To have such particulars available to it, the mind must construct them based on sensible input. To construct them, the mind must do three kinds of synthesis. It must generate temporal and spatial structure Synthesis of Apprehension in Intuition. It must associate spatio-temporally structured items with other spatio-temporally structured items Synthesis of Reproduction in the Imagination. And it must recognize items using concepts, the Categories in particular Synthesis of Recognition in a Concept. We will consider it in more detail in the next Section. Strangely enough, the chapter has only nicely got started. In the first edition version, for example, we have only reached A, about one-third of the way through the chapter. At this point, Kant introduces the notion of transcendental apperception for the first time and the unity of such apperception, the unity of consciousness. Evidently, something is happening something, moreover, not at all well heralded in the text. We can now understand in more detail why Kant said that the subjective deduction is inessential Axvii. From this point of view, anything uncovered about the nature and functioning of the mind was a happy accident. In the first edition, he seems to have achieved a stable position on self-consciousness only as late as this chapter. Certainly his position was not stable in TD. His target is claims that we know what the mind is like. The chapter on the Paralogisms contains most of what he has to say about consciousness of self. In the course of doing so, he moved the topic of consciousness of self from the chapter on the Paralogisms to the second discussion of the mind in the new TD. The new version of the Paralogisms chapter is then built around a different and, so far as theory of mind is concerned, much less interesting strategy. The relationship of the old and new versions of the chapters is complicated Brook , Ch. Here we will just note that the underlying doctrine of the mind does not seem to change very much. CPR contains other discussions of the mind, discussions that remained the same in both editions. Kant asserts this many times earlier but assertion is not argument. In the Antinomies, the discussion of the Second Antinomy contains some interesting remarks about the simplicity of the soul and there is a discussion of free will in the Solution to the Third Antinomy. The mind also appears a few times in the Doctrine of Method, particularly in a couple of glosses of the attack mounted against the Paralogisms. In other new material prepared for the second edition, we find a first gloss on the topic of self-consciousness as early as the Aesthetic B The mind also appears in a new passage called

the Refutation of Idealism, where Kant attempts to tie the possibility of one sort of consciousness of self to consciousness of permanence in something other than ourselves, in a way he thought to be inconsistent with Berkeleian idealism. This new Refutation of Idealism has often been viewed as a replacement for the argument against the Fourth Paralogism of the first edition. There are problems with this view, the most important of which is that the second edition still has a separate fourth Paralogism B Whatever, though the new passage utilizes self-consciousness in a highly original way, it says little that is new about it. Elsewhere in his work, the only sustained discussion of the mind and consciousness is, as we said, his little, late Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View. Though Kant sometimes contrasted anthropology as a legitimate study with what he understood empirical psychology to be, namely, psychology based on introspective observation, he meant by anthropology something fairly close to what we now mean by behavioural or experimental psychology.

Chapter 6 : Kant's View of the Mind and Consciousness of Self (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

out of 5 stars A Unified Theory of God, Mind & Matter by Xavier L. Suarez 13 March - Published on blog.quintoapp.com This book is a romping read through "all knowledge," and this author's attempt to make it all make sense together with his viewpoints and beliefs.

Regardless of the topic, a unified theory, as sated above, seeks to explain seemingly incompatible aspects of various theories. In this article I attempt to unify seemingly incompatible or opposing views regarding nutrition, namely, what is probably the longest running debate in the nutritional sciences: They base their position on various lines of evidence to come to that conclusion. They too come to this conclusion using various lines of evidence. This has been an ongoing debate between people in the field of nutrition, biology, physiology, and many other disciplines, for decades. The result of which has led to conflicting advice and a great deal of confusion by the general public, not to mention many medical professionals and other groups. Before I go any further, two key points that are essential to understand about any unified theory: However, underneath, or behind that theory, is often a great deal of information that can take up many volumes of books. So, for me to outline all the information I have used to come to these conclusions, would take a large book, if not several and is far beyond the scope of this article. Over time, different lines of evidence, whether it be mathematical, physical, etc. I feel there is now more than enough evidence at this point to give a unified theory of nutrition and continuing lines of evidence will continue with some possible revisions to solidify the theory as fact. This long held and accepted view of nutrition is based on the fact that protein and carbs contain approx 4 calories per gram and fat approximately 9 calories per gram and the source of those calories matters not. They base this on the many studies that finds if one reduces calories by X number each day, weight loss is the result and so it goes if you add X number of calories above what you use each day for gaining weight. Even worse, this school of thought fails to take into account the fact that even within a macro nutrient, they too can have different effects on metabolism. This school of thought ignores the ever mounting volume of studies that have found diets with different macro nutrient ratios with identical calorie intakes have different effects on body composition, cholesterol levels, oxidative stress, etc. For example, we now know different fats e. For example, followers of ketogenic style diets that consist of high fat intakes and very low carbohydrate intakes i. Like the old school, this school fails to take into account the effects such diets have on various pathways and ignore the simple realities of human physiology, not to mention the laws of thermodynamics! They always have and they always will. The data, and real world experience of millions of dieters, is quite clear on that reality. The truth behind such diets is that they are often quite good at suppressing appetite and thus the person simply ends up eating fewer calories and losing weight. Also, the weight loss from such diets is often from water vs. This is where we get into the crux of the true debate and why the two schools of thought are not actually as far apart from one another as they appear to the untrained eye. For example, studies often find that two groups of people put on the same calorie intakes but very different ratios of carbs, fats, and proteins will lose different amounts of bodyfat and or lean body mass i. Some studies find for example people on a higher protein lower carb diet lose approximately the same amount of weight as another group on a high carb lower protein diet, but the group on the higher protein diet lost more actual fat and less lean body mass muscle. Or, some studies using the same calorie intakes but different macro nutrient intakes often find the higher protein diet may lose less actual weight than the higher carb lower protein diets, but the actual fat loss is higher in the higher protein low carb diets. The effect is usually amplified if exercise is involved as one might expect. Of course these effects are not found universally in all studies that examine the issue, but the bulk of the data is clear: Or, as the authors of one recent study that looked at the issue concluded: Knowing the above information and keeping the Unified Theory of Nutrition in mind, leads us to some important and potentially useful conclusions: However, diets designed for fat loss vs. The actual ratio of macro nutrients can be quite different for both diets and even for individuals. Optimal macro nutrient ratios can change with total calories and other variables. What effects will this diet have on metabolic rate? What effects will this diet have on my lean body mass LBM? What effects will this diet have on hormones; both hormones that may improve

or impede my goals? What effects will this diet have on fill in the blank? To get the optimal effects from your next diet, whether looking to gain weight or lose it, you must ask the right questions to get meaningful answers. People that want to know my thoughts on the correct way to lose fat should read my ebook Diet Supplements Revealed. BTW, both ebooks also cover supplements for their respective goals along with exercise advice. There are of course many additional questions that can be asked and points that can be raised as it applies to the above, but those are some of the key issues that come to mind. Any diet that tells you they have a magic ratio of foods, ignore it. Will has over 15 years experience as a respected author, columnist and consultant, to the supplement, fitness, bodybuilding, and weight loss industry and has been extensively published. Will graduated from Harvard University with a concentration in the natural sciences, and is a consultant to major supplement, dairy, and pharmaceutical companies. Find more about me on:

Chapter 7 : RenÃ© Descartes (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

The computational theory of the mind was a huge breakthrough, because it allows us, for the first time, to conceptually separate the mind from the brain-body. How?

Chapter 8 : Unified field theory - Wikipedia

A Grand Unified Theory (GUT) is a model in particle physics in which, at high energy, the three gauge interactions of the Standard Model which define the electromagnetic, weak, and strong interactions, or forces, are merged into one single force.

Chapter 9 : towards a unified theory of mind | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

mind, matter and god Exploding the Myth of Evolution [To join a growing list of subscribers who are notified by email when new blog essays are posted, add your email in the box above.