Certainly Sadaputa is taking pains (as I often heard him do) to establish that QM cannot be taken as a complete, accurate or sole description of reality. He came from a background in which the scientific community had utter faith that QM (in conjunction with Relativity) can explain everything and no other ideas were needed.

Neither did Sadaputa like the idea that the scientists might try to explain reality as totally observer-dependent - meaning that there was no role whatsoever for a supreme being. This inference by QM was expressed as a challenge by Einstein in his comment: does the moon not exist if I don't look at it?"

However, I think (and I apologise for taking issue with any aspect of Sadaputa's presentation) he is on weak ground in saying that it is possible to remove consciousness from the "spookiness" of quantum phenomena by claiming that the devices act as the observers. In doing so, he is relying on various physicalist theories devised over the decades - currently expressed that the measurement devices are entangled with the object under observation and which then cause each other's decoherence (collapse of the wave-function).

Although such physicalist theories are popular amongst those trying to deny that consciousness even exists, they have not found favour generally in the scientific community. They cannot explain the full extent of the phenomena and evidence that has been amassed in QM experiments. If it were possible for them to get rid of the role of the conscious observer, they would have. My feeling is that Sadaputa might not have written this up like this if we were doing it today.

The article then appears contradictory as Sadaputa lauds the work of PEAR in showing that consciousness has a direct tangible effect on physical systems - specifically REG machines based on quantum-tunnelling. The PEAR results demonstrate that conscious intention is a factor in the behaviour of quantum activity. So there is no difference in that aspect of what Sadaputa and we are saying.

But, I would also disagree with his rejection of the idea that reality is in some way observer-dependent. He comments that this would obviate the existence or the role of the Paramatma as (in the words of the Gita) the overseer and permitter of the universe. I see it differently. The arrangement of Krsna as the overseer and permitter is to facilitate the intentions of the atmas and allow nature to manifest in such a way that the atmas get to achieve certain things:

they feel themselves the controllers

they fulfil their desires

they experience the properties of matter in terms of their karma

they identify with their existence in a material body as part of the world of maya

The atmas actually are never the 'doers'. Only Krsna can manipulate material energy. But the atmas' desires and intent are facilitated by Krsna (in conjunction with his agents).

The demonstration of the role of the conscious observer in QM experiments seems to be a nice indication of that process at work in the lab. Perhaps, down the line there may be clarification of what is going on and the role, or not, of the conscious observer might be adjusted. Sadaputa warns us not to be reliant on present-day scientific ideas as they are guaranteed subject to change. And we should be cautious. However, the QM effect has been around for 90 years so I think it remains a useful example for now.

I hope this helps. Please feel free to raise further points in the discussion. I've also copied in two of our SPi Team in case they would like to add anything.

Thanks

Your servant

Akhandadhi das

-----Original Message-----  
From: Hirani, Vijay <Vijay.Hirani@partner.commerzbank.com>  
To: 'akhandadhi@aol.com' <akhandadhi@aol.com>  
Sent: Mon, 15 May 2017 13:13  
Subject: QM

Hare Krishna Prabhu

I was wondering what you think of this article by sadaputa prabhu where he doesn’t seem to attribute much value in QM shedding much light on consciousness. None of the experiments I looked at need a conscious observer unless I have missed something?

http://www.backtogodhead.in/consciousness-and-the-new-physics-by-sadaputa-dasa/

Ys

Vrindavan Bihari das