

Consciousness, the Life After Death Probability, and Intelligence Evolution in the Universe/s

K.L. Senarath Dayathilake

Human Well-being Science Program

Authors note

I have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to K. L. Senarath Dayathilake, Human Well-being Science Program, 177/1A, Epitamulla Road, Kotte-10100, Sri Lanka. Email:

klsearathdayathilake@yahoo.com

Abstract

This article explores the enduring mysteries of consciousness and the afterlife, two enigmatic topics that have fascinated humanity for ages. Despite extensive scientific efforts, the existence of an afterlife remains unproven, and understanding consciousness remains a significant challenge. The research introduces innovative hypotheses through simple thought experiments with empirical evidence and robust theoretical foundations. It delves into the complexities of consciousness, its relationship with the brain, and the need for interdisciplinary approaches encompassing physics, psychology, and philosophy. Boldly contemplating the probability of a continuous consciousness after death, the study argues that existing evidence strongly supports this idea. Beyond theoretical implications, it envisions practical outcomes, suggesting that insights into these mysteries could enhance human well-being and contribute to a more harmonious world. In summary, this article embarks on a quest to shed light on age-old questions about consciousness and the afterlife. Through fresh methodologies, it aims to provide new perspectives that could reshape our understanding of existence and inspire intellectuals to positive individual and societal advancements.

Keywords: Psychology, philosophy of mind, determinism, materialism, mind virus scanning

Consciousness, the Life After Death Probability, and Intelligence Evolution in the Universe/s

"Consciousness implies awareness: subjective, phenomenal experience of internal and external worlds. It also encompasses a sense of self, feelings, choice, control over voluntary behavior, memory, thought, language, and (e.g., when we close our eyes or meditate) internally generated images and geometric patterns. However, consciousness remains an enigma that plays an intrinsic role in the universe (Hameroff & Penrose, 2014).

Philosophers have used the term 'consciousness' within four main topics: knowledge in general, intentionality, introspection (and the knowledge it generates), and the phenomenal experience. Penrose and Hameroff have summarized that consciousness has no distinct role (Chalmers, 2012; Dennett, 1991; Dennett, 1995; Dennett & Kinsbourne, 1991; Wegner, 2002) for example, dualism/spirituality, within consciousness outside of science (Berkeley, 1975; Chopra, 2001; Kant, 1998).

Science with consciousness as an essential ingredient of physical law still needs to be fully understood.(Hameroff, 1998; Hameroff, 2007; Hameroff & Penrose, 1996; Penrose & Hameroff, 1995; Penrose & Hameroff, 2011; Whitehead, 1929; Whitehead, 1933).

This article delves into essential, unanswered questions regarding consciousness. Is there a considerable interconnection between consciousness and intelligence? Can we decipher the mechanism behind the evolution of individual intelligence? Is there a potential existence of an afterlife, and if so, how might it influence the evolution of individual intelligence? Furthermore, how does an individual's intelligence contribute to the broader evolution of global intelligence? Is there a novel physics theory that can bridge the gap between the functioning of the brain and the enigma of consciousness?

These profound questions continue to challenge our understanding. Some argue that 'consciousness' lacks a precise scientific definition, and we are learning to make sense of ourselves without invoking supernatural power (Zeman, 2008). Most scientists put aside the afterlife question, considering it a just religious and metaphysical belief. However, near-death experience represents a biological paradox that challenges our understanding of the brain and has even been advocated as evidence for life after death and a noncorporeal basis for human consciousness (Alexander, 2012; Chopra, 2006; Long & Perry, 2010; Thonnard et al., 2013; van Lommel, 2010). The near-death experience is based on an unsupported belief that the brain cannot be the source of highly vivid and lucid conscious experiences during clinical death (Facco & Agrillo, 2012; Thonnard et al., 2013; Mobbs & Watt, 2011; van Lommel, 2011).

Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that consciousness is not annihilated in the first few minutes after death (Reardon, 2019). While many studies have concentrated on near-death experiences, my methodology diverges from these studies and introduces a novel theoretical approach. This study was inspired by researchers who revitalized disembodied pig brains and challenged definitions of life and death (Vrselja et al., 2019). To philosophers, introspection and phenomenality seem independent or dissociable, although this is controversial. (Sutherland, 1989).

On the other hand, some biophysicists handle the issue of consciousness in a multidisciplinary way. However, when a scientific inquiry into the brain and consciousness occurs, considerable knowledge of physical theories of the matters in the universe and its psychology is unavoidable. However, considering the knowledge of the brain and physical functions, free will is an illusion that shares common cognitive elements with paranormal beliefs (Mogi, 2014). However, I believe that neither insights from general relativity nor quantum mechanics might not hold the potential to address these profound queries perfectly. When Stephen Hawking pondered the existence of a unified theory that could explain everything, he outlined three possibilities: Hawking found three possibilities;

- (a) There is a completely unified theory, (b) there is no such ultimate theory or just infinite

sequence, and (c) no theory of the universe and event cannot be predicted beyond a certain extent (Hawking, 2006).

In simpler terms, we have yet to attain a precise universal theory. Hawking once told The Guardian that "there is no heaven or afterlife for broken-down computers; that is a fairy tale for those who fear the dark." He likened the brain to a computer that ceases to function when its components fail (Hawking, 2011). However, I suggest the biological computer- the brain- naturally makes decisions that influence the stream of conscious thoughts with the impact of nature and nurture. I propose the existence of three key 'software' programs critical to cognitive functions, which I refer to as mind viruses vs. healthy mind viruses (MV vs. H MV) and neutral mind viruses, and those MV /H MV are interdependent along with hardware of the brain and nurture. (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2018). However, the central question remains: Does consciousness solely arise from the innate qualities of the brain and its upbringing, or does it emerge from a complex interplay of factors? I suggest that consciousness appears and vanishes due to multiple factors within our brain's sophisticated (creative 3D reflexes-like) natural network of neurons. Consciousness might be a fusion of the brain-mind "nature and nurture," a mysterious particle known as the X-ultraquantum unique particle of consciousness (X-UQUPC) (Dayathilake, 2017), and another intriguing entity called the X-ultra quantum genomic particle of consciousness (X-UQGPC). These particles differ significantly from conventional DNA sequences and constitute the 'ultra-quantum genome,' encapsulating the essence of our conscious minds. Although it does not conform to traditional DNA, it represents an adaptable hereditary trait of conscious thoughts that evolves. Consequently, there is no free will (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2018). According to Theravada Buddhism, Abhidharma outlines twenty-four types of conditional relations (Karunadasa, 2010) in the processes subject to relation (Gombrich), and

no self that no unchanging, permanent self or essence can be found in any phenomenon (Machin, 2013)." Within the rich tapestry of human thought, Buddhist philosophy offers unique insights into the nature of consciousness. Buddhist texts depict consciousness as "momentary collections of mental phenomena," portraying it as a sequence of distinct, unconnected, and impermanent moments that arise and perish swiftly (Hameroff & Penrose, 2014).

Buddhist teachings emphasize the transient and unbroken flow of consciousness, where each moment is characterized by distinct mental phenomena. Remarkably, these ancient writings venture into quantifying the frequency of conscious moments. For instance, Sarvaastivaadins, an ancient Buddhist school, described a staggering 6,480,000 "moments" occurring within a 24-hour period, averaging one "moment" every 13.3 milliseconds, equivalent to 75 Hz. This aligns with the notion of a continuous stream of consciousness, each segment existing for a fraction of a second. Some Chinese Buddhists further specified one "thought" occurring every 20 milliseconds—approximating 50 Hz.

Therefore, these ancient teachings with contemporary scientific insights are nothing short of intriguing. Modern science, particularly gamma synchrony electroencephalography (EEG), has provided a measurable correlate of consciousness. Gamma synchrony refers to coherent neuronal membrane activities oscillating at frequencies between 30 and 90 Hz, manifesting across various synchronized brain regions (Hameroff & Penrose, 2014). Interestingly, slower frequencies, such as those within the 4 to 7 Hz range, where nested gamma waves may correspond to phenomena like saccades and visual gestalts, further deepen our understanding (Woolf & Hemeroff, 2001; VanRullen & Koch, 2003).

The ancient wisdom of Buddhist Psychology, rooted in a time when modern science and technology were inconceivable, converges with contemporary neurological and cognitive theories. The precision with which Buddhism describes the ephemerality of consciousness sparks curiosity, encouraging us to explore the intriguing intersection of ancient wisdom and modern science.

Despite these fascinating convergences, I acknowledge that a comprehensive theory encompassing the multifaceted phenomena discussed herein still needs to be discovered. I advocate for an interdisciplinary approach anchored in a robust theoretical model to further our quest for understanding the mysteries of consciousness and the potential persistence of existence beyond clinical death.

In this journey, I invite the scientific community to join us in bridging ancient wisdom and modern science. Together, I embark on a path toward unraveling the enigma of consciousness and the tantalizing possibility of life after death.

Method and materials

In our study, I conducted three hypothetical experiments, assuming that all participants had healthy brains and minds while being in similar environments. I considered the first and third experiments valid "if cell death could preserve the anatomical and neural cell integrity" (Vrselja, Z. et al. 2019). During the period from "T1" to "T2", I ensured that six brains were in a non-functional state (brain death), effectively eliminating consciousness.

Participants in all three experiments belonged to one of three groups and were living in a laboratory-like setting before "T1":

I. Identical Triplets: This group included individuals represented 'a', while their identical siblings labeled 'b' and 'c.' For simplicity, readers of this article can assume themselves as 'a' and their identical siblings as 'b' and 'c.'

II. The Second Set of Identical Triplets: This group consisted of individuals labeled 'd', 'e,' and 'f'

III. The Non-identical Triplets: This group included individuals labeled 'g,' 'h,' and 'i'.

We maintained uniform conditions for all aspects, from subatomic particles and atoms to molecules and neurons, up to the entire brain structure, within each group I and II triplets. Participants received identical nutrients in quantity and quality, ensuring their physiological, psychological, and physical processes were similar and simultaneous. Groups I, II, and III were nurtured under uniform conditions. We assumed that all similar subatomic particles and atoms of elements in participants' brains were qualitatively and quantitatively identical. According to quantum theory, these particles functioned similarly, and analogous chemical compounds in the brain followed principles akin to chemistry. In simpler terms, all subatomic particles, atoms, and chemicals within these brains were identical with time. Additionally, we considered all identical and non-identical participants as distinct individuals without shared consciousness. Even if identical persons existed simultaneously in similar environments, their feelings and consciousness remained individual and did not overlap or interact.

Experiment 1

We initiated this experiment by hypothetically making healthy individuals 'a,' 'b,' 'd', 'e,' 'g,' and 'h' non-functional (brain death at the age of 18, precisely at "T1". It is important to note that we ensured this process did not harm their brains. Postmortem samples of these non-functional

brains were preserved in the laboratory until "T2" using advanced preservation technology (Vrselja, Z. et al. 2019). At "T2", we simultaneously revived these brains, returning them to a functional state.

Results

Shortly after "T1", the brains of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h' ceased functioning but were revived at "T2". On the other hand, 'c,' 'f,' and 'i' continued to live from birth beyond "T2". Notably, the brain sizes of 'c,' 'f,' and 'i' were larger than those of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h.'

Discussion

We contemplated what happened to the consciousness of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h' after "T1". Did their consciousness continue within the laboratory or elsewhere, as illustrated by 'a' (from "T1 to Tx") and 'b' (from "T1 to Ty")? We pondered whether their consciousness persisted in the laboratory setting after "T2" or if a different consciousness occurred within these six brains. Furthermore, we discussed the potential similarities or differences in their cognitive development or regression, as depicted in Venn diagrams.

Venn diagram one considered cognitive functions (excluding consciousness) among 'a,' 'b,' 'c,' 'd,' 'e,' 'f,' 'g,' 'h,' and 'i'. Specifically:

- $a \cap b \cap c = X1$: This represented that 'a,' 'b,' and 'c' exhibited similar cognitive functions (although with three distinct individual consciousnesses) from "T0 and T1".
- $d \cap e \cap f = X2$: This indicated that 'd,' 'e,' and 'f' had similar cognitive functions (although with three distinct individual consciousnesses) from "T0 and T1".

- Cognitive functions, including consciousness, in the case of 'g,' 'h,' and 'i', were inherently different despite similar nurturing.

Experiment 2

In this hypothetical experiment, we considered a scenario where we instantaneously disassembled the entire brain matter of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h' down to the atomic level at "T1". Subsequently, at "T2", we reconstructed these six brains simultaneously. We ensured that these reconstructed brains appeared physically similar to their state before "T1" and were nurtured consistently. This experiment was designed to address potential errors and concerns regarding quantum entanglement.

Result

If this experiment were theoretically valid, the brains of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h' would function from "T2" onward, akin to their state in experiment one. Brain volumes, anatomical features, and physiological activities would remain consistent with their previous state in the laboratory setting before "T1".

Discussion

A similar discussion applies to this experiment as it did to experiment one.

Third experiment

In our third experiment, we began with two groups of individuals: one with identical participants ('a,' 'b,' 'c' and 'd,' 'e,' 'f'), and the other with non-identical participants ('g,' 'h,' 'i'). These groups were nurtured similarly to the participants in experiment one until we reached "T1". Following this, we preserved the inactive brains of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h' from "T1 to T2" using a

preservation technique (Vrselja, Z. et al. 2019). Then, create three new brains for each of all nine participants using a similar method in experiment two. Here onwards, there are twenty-seven new brains in the lab. Each was designed to be similar to the triplicates of 'a,' 'b,' 'c,' 'd,' 'e,' 'f,' 'g,' 'h,' and 'i'. Consequently, we had twenty-seven new participant brains at "T2," labeled as ('a1', 'a2', 'a3', 'b1', 'b2', 'b3', 'c1', 'c2', 'c3', 'd1', 'd2', 'd3', 'e1', 'e2', 'e3', 'f1', 'f2', 'f3', 'g1', 'g2', 'g3', 'h1', 'h2', 'h3', 'i1', 'i2', and 'i3'). We also revived the six frozen brains of 'a,' 'b,' 'd,' 'e,' 'g,' and 'h,' and allowed 'c,' 'f,' and 'i' to continue living from "T2" onward. We have thirty-six participant brains in the lab from now on. All brains within each group ('a' to 'c3', 'd' to 'f3', 'g' to 'g3', 'h' to 'h3', and 'i' to 'i3') were physically and chemically identical. Human cloning would be the closest empirical approach to replicating these experiments. However, it is not ethical and currently not feasible due to present science and biotechnology limitations.

Results

If our third experiment were theoretically valid, it suggests that all twenty-seven artificially created brains, the six frozen brains, and the brains of 'c,' 'f,' and 'i' could be functional. Consequently, we would have thirty-three brains(except 'c,' 'f,' and 'i') all resuming their functions at "T2" and beyond. Includes the three live brains of 'c,' 'f,' and 'i' there are thirty-six brains after T2 that continued to function in the lab.

Discussion

However, it would be practically impossible for any researcher to externally observe whose consciousness exists within the lab, except for 'c,' 'f,' and 'i.' For instance, if you, as the reader, assume you were labeled as " 'a' until T1," scientists would face significant challenges in identifying the brain where your consciousness currently resides at "T2" among the eleven

identical brains ('a', 'a1', 'a2', 'a3', 'b', 'b1', 'b2', 'b3', 'c1', 'c2', and 'c3'), whether they are inside or outside the lab. Assuming that your original (single) consciousness ('a' before time T1) onwards(after T1) exists in all eleven identical brains is not logically sound. These questions raise what happened to your ('single') consciousness before "T1." Did your consciousness cease to exist permanently, or did it move to one specific brain out of the lab? Claiming that your consciousness is destroyed without an afterlife is a complex issue. Alternatively, significant questions remain if your consciousness selects one particular brain out of eleven identical options. We must explore how and why your consciousness emerges within a specific brain among these identical choices (as shown in Venn diagrams one and two).

\

General Discussion

How did brains gain 'new' consciousness at T2? Whose consciousness identities are now of new thirty-three brains? For example, how do the similar eleven brains, identical to the brain 'a', start new consciousness simultaneously at T2, as I discussed in the third experiment? It might be more convenient to understand the argument if any scientist or reader of this article could imagine 'you' and 'your' identical two siblings of the triplets and other participants in this research to analyze the results of the experiments. The third experiment is crucial to answering one of the research objectives. Someone can argue that the similar conscious minds originally in a, b, d, e, g, and h are not among the thirty-three brains after T2 in the lab. For example, did the similar consciousness of 'a' (you and your siblings 'b') exist among similar a, a1, a2, a3, b, b1, b2, b3, c1, c1, and c3 brains in the lab or out of the lab in an unknown place? (I labeled those two brains **'a?' and 'b?'**). If not, what happened to the 'a' and 'b' consciousness in the lab before T1?

If the original person 'a' existed brain in the lab while all eleven brains were identical, how and why did the original 'a' select a particular brain out of eleven identical-similar brains? These are crucial and big questions that need to be solved here. Otherwise, 'a' (you) should feel aware that 'a' simultaneously live within two or more identical brains in the lab after T2.

Suppose Orch Or or any other theory of materialism might suggest that the original 'a' might also be among those brains after T2. However, 'a' has no life between T1 and T2. In addition, no stream of series of the afterlife might be their conclusion. However, they might need to be smarter to answer how or why 'a' (and your siblings 'b') is or is not among such perfectly identical eleven brains simultaneously made at T2. Because the new life of twenty-seven and six brains (frozen) gains life at T2, it appears similar to emerge as in pig brains (Vrselja, Z. et al.

2019). Moreover, their current opinions of the afterlife make it challenging to identify who lives in each conscious of those brains. This article's argument might convince us that the new life in pigs' brains was probably not similar to "pigs" consciousness before specific brain death.

There are probably two, three, or more or an infinite number of brains physically identical to any given brain simultaneously in the universe/s. Our introspections indicate that a person's consciousness has a unique continuum throughout life and does not coincidentally overlap with any other life's conscious mind; for example, 'a' (your) or mine never experience someone else mind in your/mine brain. Furthermore, we are generalizing our experience, and scientific findings, personal experience, and feelings suggest that the identity of (your) consciousness would not exchange or move to identical brain/s elsewhere simultaneously. In other words, there is no overlap or coincidence of similar feelings within two or more similar brains, which might create confusion in the mind and feel simultaneously (you) being in two or many environments.

Everyone has a universal, unique consciousness, a continuous stream of distinct consciousness, and no series of afterlife continuums. However, such a proposal would create contradictions once again.

If cognitive function applies to a Venn diagram one for experiment three, their cognition (above T2) will be;

$a \cap b \cap c \cap a_1 \cap a_2 \cap a_3 \cap b_1 \cap b_2 \cap b_3 \cap c_1 \cap c_2 \cap c_3 = X$ or similar cognitive functions of these eleven brains will be identical from time T2 and beyond in the laboratory, except for similar consciousness.

According to these mathematical expressions, X depicts similarities in every aspect of identical brains' cognitive functions, except their unique - individual consciousness. The consciousness of

'a' and 'b' (who were until T1) might not be similar persons of '**a?**' and '**b?**' after T2. When there are no other beings except researchers and said brains in the laboratory,

$$\{a? b?\} \cap \text{Lab} = \emptyset$$

I did not arrange an additional experiment to find more precise facts on (two-in-one) microparticles to discuss the hypothesis in the results of this study. X-UQGPC (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017: Dayathilake, 2018) may carry the finally evolved (ultra-quantum) 'key' genome when somebody or/an animal is dead, which may help bond and 'lock' with the neuronal matters of new life. However, X-UQGPC (or X-UQUPC) might only be physically able to be tested in a laboratory if scientific facts support the working hypothesis of theoretical and logical arguments. However, thought experiments one, two, and three suggest that there may be naturally created two, three, more, or infinite physically identical brains to any specific in the universe/s and their similar 'keys' of X-UQGPC. Alternatively, if someone gets birth and their consciousness merely results from a coincidence, such coincidence might happen two or more or infinite times in the universe/s, which makes similar consciousness simultaneously. For example, 'a' (you) must be confused if 'a' (you) exists in many lives simultaneously, as I discussed in the third experiment. Therefore, X-UQUPC might naturally be created to avoid similar identical consciousnesses and universal confusion, which is universally unique to any being in the universe/s.

However, merely materialism and present empirical findings do not support such two kinds of particles that emit and move to bond with a suitable zygote/primary nervous system/embryo at infinite velocity. Previously, physics discussed hypothetical particles tachyon (Feinberg, 1967) that possibly move faster than light. Furthermore, the quantum entanglement speed is 10,000

times the light speed (Juan, Y. et al. 2013)), which encourages my hypothesis on the infinite speed of two-particle movement. However, if such a mechanism does not exist, it will again contradict itself because there may be two, many, or an infinite number of identical consciousnesses. Materialists might find it challenging to explain the results of the third experiment without the speculation of X-UQUPC and X-UQGP. In other words, a (you) and b (your sibling) might be a continuum out of the lab after T1.

Both (X-UQGPC + X- UQUPC) particles may be bonded exceptionally and cannot break when justifying the hypothesis. However, I need help to precisely answer how those particles originate in the universe/s and why they (if) never destroy. Buddhist teachings call the state of *Nibbana* ((extinction) "the ultimate and absolute deliverance from future rebirth, old age, diseases, and death from all sufferings and misery" (Nayanatiloka, 1952) and (after) the highest level of intelligence (Dayathilake, K.L.S., 2017) of a being, yet remain further in-depth studies remain. Moreover, these two particles may not exist without live neurons over time. The combined two particles may not be discussed with either general relativity or quantum theory. Moreover, such particles may be emitted from a dead brain and simultaneously move at infinite speed to bond with another suitable prematurely vacant nervous system.

Furthermore, the observers or researchers in the lab might never find or face a significant challenge in identifying whether the similar stream of consciousness of 'a' (you) and 'b' continues in new brains after T2, out of eleven identical brains. Scientists need to apply the results of three experiments logically. Otherwise, the confusion will continue.

Nevertheless, any person's consciousness continues in the live brain until death; in other words, the living brain is not a zombie like a computer. To Hawking, the live human brain is similar to a

zombie (unconscious) computer. He might assume that consciousness has no such unknown (such as X- UQCUP) particle, which quantum theory might not explain. Moreover, it may be a moment-by-moment manifestation of the mind, which is said to happen in every person all the time. (Karunamuni, 2015). Moreover, human consciousness flows like a stream governed by five characteristics (James, 1890).

In other words, materialists may say that participants' lives were a continuum from T0 to T1, which is an empirical experience fact. Nevertheless, there was no afterlife from T1 to T2, and the original consciousness of the six regained similar consciousness and cognitions at T2 in the lab. However, they will be unanswerable to the results of the third experiment; if someone asks them to show the brain of 'a' out of eleven identical brains, they will be in trouble. Furthermore, if they say 'a' was neither in nor out of the lab, they cannot answer why. Nevertheless, the only option is that 'a' might live from T1, elsewhere outside the lab.

We may assume that the reference to present life uniqueness of self-awareness might be a continuum from childhood (probably from an early embryo) until death. In other words, in the development of a given person's brain in size and its neural organization, new matter (elements, chemicals in different quantities and qualities) replaces inside or outer neurons of the brain (such as new proteins, evolving DNA, neuroplasticity, and neurogenesis) or shrinks in age, when after stroke, or brain damage, etc., an excellent still 'specific – unique' stream of consciousness continuum via time. Therefore, our theory might be an alternative to more successfully discussing those big questions with minimal contradictions than existence theories, including materialism.

Therefore, if the six brains did not die but minimized or neutralized (a reference to experiment one) their consciousness at T1, they would continue their unique psychological awareness from T2 and beyond. Nevertheless, if these six participants indeed die, researchers face a significant challenge to find the original consciousness of a, b, d, e, g, or 'h' consequently; however, a problematic issue seems essential to see what might happen to our continuum consciousness after death at T1. If materialism is acceptable, no new physics need or afterlife is involved. However, the issue is why six previous persons were not born at T2 among the thirty-three brains. Suppose one can argue that there is a possibility to be born again among thirty-three while keeping a time interval of T1 to T2. If those six were born again among thirty-three, one could question materialists in which specific brains previous life of six were born and why. Moreover, one can ask materialists who say similar consciousness will arise in a similar brain. If so, how does six specific consciousness (which were before death T1) select six specific-distinct brains among the several identical brains?

If scientists assumed that pig brains (Vrselja et al., 2019) regained similar 'unique' consciousness in (their empirical experiment), similar brains before death after being frozen might be their fault judgment. Analyzing the results of the third study creates contradictions with a particular conclusion. Furthermore, even identical brains are structural, biological, clinical, neurological, cognitive, psychological, and physically similar; however, consciousness is unique in a specific person. Therefore, researchers in the lab or reader face trouble finding answers, such as where 'a' (you) – indeed live after T2 (death) or whether you live in out of similar eleven brains of a, a1, a2, a3, b, b1, b2,b3, c1, c2, c3, including the defrost dead brain of 'a' and 'b,' when regaining life after T2'. Furthermore, where does consciousness of 'a' live, out of the lab -on Earth or in the universe/s?

Therefore, materialism, general relativity (GR), and quantum mechanism do not answer the above issues. Alternatively, in other words, unknown 'particles' (X-UQGPC) may be involved here. Here, I cannot precisely discuss in-depth the X-UQ particles and evidence of present knowledge of biophysics or other physics theories. However, such unidentified matter might closely function with a quantum particle in brain neurons, and the functions might depend on the Orch Or theory.

Quantum mechanics should adequately discuss such tiny matter in size, mass, speed, velocity, or time. If such particles exist, it is not always necessary for them to behave according to quantum mechanics. From a mathematical aspect, although one is a natural number, it does not present an absolute number (quantity-wise-wise). Nevertheless, one may indicate relative measurement (e.g., one light-year, kilo, or nanometer). Regardless, in any natural number, a between zero and 1 (one) has a decimal representation of relative quantities with an infinite decimal.

Moreover, it is unclear whether such absurdly tiny scales have any physical meaning (Roger, 1989). Therefore, asking for the most minor or minuscule mass particle or/and the little time fracture seems meaningless. However, finding all those measurements (quantities) and all qualities might be impossible in the future, too. Here, if there are countless smaller particles in size and different new physical qualities, they might behave differently from the laws in the present theories of physics as well. Those might be beyond direct empirical research, such as any elementary – subatomic particles. I use this mathematical application to assume the probability of the existence of particles smaller than empirical elements already found by physicists. I use these mathematical thoughts here to suggest the possibility of the two in one tiny particle, as I have already mentioned. Otherwise, when it travels through massive bodies such as black holes or colossal stars, it would also be destroyed, deviated, or attached to them by great gravity and

heat. (Dayathilake, 2018). Since electromagnetic waves and quantum particles have space-time curvature, such particles cannot pass through these massive bodies in the universe/s and have an absolute (limited) speed of 3×10^8 ms⁻¹.

Nevertheless, ultra-quantum particles (theory) assume that those particles have infinite speed and are massless or nearly 'zero mass,' so space-time has no curvature. However, without (firm) evidence, I suggest that those particles simultaneously have a multi(or infinite) dimensional movement within the live brain and, when death occurs, emit and attach in a new 'nervous system' at infinite speed, too. Such infinite-speed suggestions minimize contradictions within the significant issues of the argument.

Consequently, the life of the nervous system might be formed by union with two unidentified microparticles and travel in infinite velocity from one dead brain to a new vacant primary nerve system. Data show that subatomic particles break light speed (Eugenie, 2011) and quantum entanglement (Schrodinger, 1935), encouraging my idea of infinite velocity. I call it an unknown-X (X-UQUPC), which would be universally unique to any given person or animal. According to this hypothesis, there are no two or more X-UQUPCs in living beings elsewhere in the universe/s; therefore, there are no similar consciousness identities.

Neurobiological changes may impact quantum mechanics and be minimal, inactive, neutral, or less conscious. For example, if there is a lack of oxygen, glucose, and general anesthesia, such fluctuations of consciousness might occur. Here, I explain how consciousness might exist in the brain with the direct results of three experiments. Infinite movement of (X-UQUPC +X-UQGPC) in a specific brain's active areas of a person may result in present-moment awareness of consciousness. The evolution (or regression) of X-UQGPC may depend on the physical brain

function of a particular active area or area(s). X-UQGPC might exist in the whole live brain simultaneously. Therefore, the speed of thoughts might depend on the neuronal network's operating speed. However, (X-UQUPC + X-UQGPC) may have infinite speed outside (multi or infinite) dimensional (simultaneous) vibration and exist as a 'cloud' in the entire live brain.

Therefore, the 'cloud' size may be expanded while developing the brain. Here, I would emphasize that bonded particles do not represent the 'notion of a spiritual soul' that has been told particular and ever-suffering or happy birth after death and independent of brain functions, which has no scientific rationale.

The third theoretical experiment attempts to make exact brains develop in completely similar nurtures. (1) a physical foundation of the brain is a scientific fact, (2) we, billions of healthy humans on Earth, an experience that our consciousness continues from past to present, and everyone feels their consciousness of lives is unique and independent to each of their life awareness-consciousness-existence, (3) cloning identical animals or human is a fact-possible in present science and technology (4) already there may be numerous physically identical brains may exist in the universe/s, such as to similar cloning humans and animals. Astronomers suppose there are nearly $100 \text{ to } 200 \times 10^{21}$ - approximately 200 billion trillion stars- in (our) universe. More than one, two, many, or infinite numbers of universes might exist in infinite space (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2018). Scientists claim that billions of stars might already have possible planets where life exists in our universe. (5) Quantum and GR theories do not give a rational answer to materialism. Simultaneously, reductionists did not find unique empirical-physical matter in each brain to justify consciousness. I analyzed the results in the first table and Venn diagrams one and two for an acceptable answer, -especially in the third experiment.

(6) The latest research on consciousness, such as Orch Or theory (Hameroff & Penrose, 2014), or any other, might not be able to challenge the argument here of three experiments.

Because (for example) their hypotheses may need to be more robust to discuss what happened to 'a' (you) and your siblings' continuum consciousness in the lab. In other words, what happened to three of their consciousness ('a'), you and your two of 'a' and 'b' siblings? (Because no one existed between T1 and T2). Therefore, who consciousnesses existed in the lab after T2 (within eleven similar identical brains)? Who were actually in the new eleven identical brains in the lab?

According to my suggestion, it might be clear that you (a), your 'b,' and 'c' siblings might not exist in the brains of those eleven identical brains of **a? b?** and **a1 to c3** simultaneously.

Otherwise, (for example), 'a' (you) and your 'b' and 'c' two siblings would have been in all (two or many) eleven (similar) brains simultaneously;

however, it might not happen, and it is a contradiction. In other words, you and your sibling 'b' should feel simultaneously in two or more places (brains). However, as mentioned earlier, no healthy people on Earth have had such experiences. Furthermore, who was in the new eleven brains after T2 in the lab? These questions might only explain my points of one to six above. (7)

As I previously said, a universally X-UQUPC continuum is a stream from birth to death and the afterlife. Moreover, no healthy person is simultaneously confused with one, two, or more similar lives and multi-awareness (multi-consciousness) in them. Therefore, a person's consciousness contradicts unless we do not apply the X-UQUPC of this theory.

(8) Nevertheless, if the consciousness of life emerges just as a rare accident without continuum afterlives and with a purely physical effect, similar accidents might or should also occur (for example) at any time between two or many persons on Earth. Contradictions occur again if

similar consciousnesses arise (as I discussed above in point seven). Therefore, it is not logical to accept that the life consciousness of a person (or any being) arises from coincidence. If a similar person's life gains two or more places simultaneously due to (just) coincidence, the materialists' argument fails again with multiple identical consciousnesses. Therefore, if life results from a coincidence, you, me, or any other might be confused about multiple existences simultaneously in many places in the universe (9). Therefore, if life is just the result of a coincidence of only known and empirical physical matter, it cannot solve the problem. (10). Nevertheless, point nine will be a contradiction; if such two, more, or infinite similar coincidences might happen simultaneously, similar individuals may be born with identical consciousness (but not unique or independent); in other words, we should feel that we are concurrently in two or more or infinite places simultaneously. (11) Most importantly, I assume that (when) the origin of mysterious consciousness (naturally)is avoided, such as universal self-confusion. However, the nature of matter might naturally originate carrier particles of individual consciousness (unknown -X unique particle) and continuum stream of consciousness in the afterlife (might be with natural responsibility). However, it is too early to suggest whether this purpose of unique consciousness has any relationship with life in the universe/s. (To avoid those contradictions in the three experiment results), we need to assume that there is no time gap to travel to X-two combined microparticles (X-UQGPC and X-UQUPC) between the dead brain and new life in a primary nervous system. Therefore, there might be no issue with distance travel between those two environments of the dead brain to the vacant nerve system. (13) I emphasize that one, two, or more (X-UQGPC) with a similar 'key' may emit at any time. (14) Nevertheless, there may be many more vacant similar nervous systems than the number emitting any X-UQGPC at any given time. In other words, there may be more or infinite vacant and matching nervous systems

in the universe/s than any given number of similar 'keys' of X-UQGPC(+X-UQUPC)s that might emit at any given time. However, here, I should emphasize that two or more beings may have similar' keys in different 'independent' brains.' However, I may not suggest that there are two or more beings with similar X-UQUPC.

Therefore, the evolution (or regression) of life in the universe/s and consciousness might not be merely a result of known physical matters of the brain and a just outcome of coincidence, as materialism explains. However, it may result from phenomena only discussed with new physics and beyond empirical studies. Otherwise, the principle of individual-unique consciousness of life theory cannot apply. In other words, 'a' (you), your sibling's 'b,' and 'c' might experience two or more identical brains simultaneously at any given moment (in diverse areas of the universe/s), as I have demonstrated in research observations after T2. As I already emphasized several times in different ways in the paper.

Here, the X-UQGPC might be changed by the brain's quantum particles. Both combined microparticles may not move to any other brain or beyond the specific brain until death. In other words, when a person's brain has a velocity relative to any external matter, the 'cloud' of two ultra-quantum particles might move simultaneously with the brain. In other words, when the brain develops to larger or shrinks with age, the two particle sizes may adjust to the live brain area at any given moment. Because the two particles move simultaneously at an infinite velocity in the live regions of an entire brain, X-UGPC may not affect changes that evolve (or progress) in the physical brain. In other words, the evolution (or regression) of X-UQGPC in the brain depends on nature, nurture, biology, biophysics, and related behavior. Therefore, the total evolution (or regression) of these factors may impact the positive or negative effects of X-UQGPC. One may suggest that those particles act as an independent soul.' However, if there is a

liberated soul, such as a 'constant matter' in identical twins or triplets (nurtured similarly), it should have a variation of IQ and behaviors. X-UQUPC might not deviate from X-UQGPC or any person's materialistic brain, which continuously makes its stream of a unique individual consciousness. Therefore, X-UQUPC might never change over time in a particular life and might continue a unique consciousness even after death. However, the evolving or regression X-UQGPC in a specific brain and the characteristic final 'key gene/s' of evolution (or regression) may be crucial to selecting and bonding the next life.

I suggest additional theoretical evidence of a single unique 'cloud of the two microparticles' of any living brain(areas) in humans or animals. For example, billions of neurons in a human brain are not linked as a single network; there are always gaps- space between each other by synapse of every neuron and no unbroken microtubule links (a single network) within the entire brain. Therefore, it is only possible to make a possible argument for a single individual identity in one brain with the theory mentioned here. If we do not consider this hypothesis, one can argue that there might be billions of individuals— independent materialist persons—(therefore billions of separate consciousnesses) in a single brain, and why not?

I use split-brain research findings to strengthen my idea of the new physics 'matter' of two combined microparticle hypotheses. Suppose researchers on split brains suggest multiple modules. In that case, the brain is composed of hundreds of independent centers of thought called "modules" (Blakeslee, 1996), two minds in one person (Schiffer, 2021), leading to the conclusion that simple dual consciousness (i.e., right-brain/left-brain model of the mind) is a gross oversimplification and that the brain is organized into hundreds or perhaps even thousands of modular-processing systems. (Gazzaniga, M., LeDoux, J., 1978; Gazzaniga, M., 1985). However, they are not yet able to make a unified theory to suggest how the material brain is

responsible for origin and continuum (at least in the present life span) as a universally unique you (or your siblings) within two, more, or infinite identical brains, if in the universes in diverse nurture, without my theory of two microparticles. They do not yet suggest how individual self-consciousness-awareness-feeling is universally unique with (if) merely brain material function. My thought experiment points out that consciousness is not simply a function of the material of the brain and cannot merely be explained by relativity theory and the quantum mechanism of brain matter. Furthermore, assuming my view, it solves how consciousness might only exist in the brain. Second, two major apart hemispheres have distinctive functions and billions of apart neurons. However, specific functions unite, and we experience feeling as a single person, you or me, in a single brain on Earth, might among two or many possible identical brains in the universe/s. My alternative principle suggests how two hemispheres and billions of neurons unite for a unique individual-person-self, as explained. Third, split-brain research convinces us that (Why if such) microparticles are essential and might be the reason for making a unique (individual) consciousness and feeling as one person. However, combined two microparticles might not impact (in this point, microparticle function neutral impact on brain biology) the physical matter of a brain (just the microparticles communicate in coordination with each other live neurons in the whole brain). The materialistic corpus callosum and the physical matter of the live and presently active part of a brain, along with impacts with microparticles, might make your (for example) different feeling-awareness, perceptions, and memories, likewise. However, I cannot strongly oppose reincarnation researchers' arguments. If reincarnation results are scientific facts, microparticle genomes might deviate and impact the brain, recalling memories in those rare cases.

Accordingly, no alternative theory has yet been seen that may challenge this argument about the afterlife. Therefore, as Hawking has discussed, we cannot compare a significant afterlife question with broken computers because computers do not have life and continuum consciousness but are just materialistic machines. Moreover, reincarnation can save Schrodinger's cat (Merali, 2008), which may strengthen this theory.

The phenomena of X-UQCGP could naturally evolve positively (+) or negatively (-), impacting the nature and nurture of the person's brain (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2018). Moreover, the notion of a specific and eternal soul independent of brain functions contradicts while observing behaviors and thoughts of persons with Alzheimer's disease, mental disorders, and aging (Dayathilake, 2017). If humans have such an independent soul, patients' behaviors or other cognitive functions do not deviate from whatever brain matter makes them vary. In other words, if there is such a permanent and independent soul, neurological or psychiatric patients may not suffer from disorders of their physical brain. Therefore, there is also no free will (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017). I define *human intelligence* as the fundamental cognitive ability to solve problems practically with scientific creativity to optimize self and others' Psychological well-being (Dayathilake, 2017). MV scanning (meditation) by healthy mind viruses might impact their intelligence evolution. In other words, if a person scans mind viruses successfully, the resultant total level (state) of intelligence moves higher, according to my theoretical 3D graph. Alternatively, if the evolution of intelligence is more significant than regression, the resultant total state of intelligence might move to a higher level in the graph. In other words, a person's intelligence level is variable-fluctuating over time. Early Buddhist teachings emphasize five crucial facts: the 'fivefold law' is essential to someone's nature, nurture, and afterlife quality (and where you will be born). According to my studies on Buddhist

psychology (Dayathilake, 1991; Dayathilake, 2017), Buddhists teach different categories of 'laws' of life (more analyzed nature and nurture into five-fold laws) nature and nurture) as (1). *bija niyama* -'nature' heritable characteristics transfer from parents -fertile. (2) *utu niyama*- weather, climate, etc. (3). *Kamma niyama*- Here, I suppose this might mean heritable characteristics which transfer next life quality and when finding suitable place-nurture which has specific nature of the primary nervous system, one of the leading hypotheses, that I mention- suggest this article (as X-UQGPC). (in Buddhist teachings-literature) Buddha has defined that "*O Bhikkhus it is volition-decision that I call karma. Having willed, one acts body, speech* (in other words, behaviors), and (conscious)brain-mind (*Anguttara Nikaya*, 1929). I suppose decisions which might be 'recorded' in X-UQGPC (4) *citta niyama* – (because of the law of the stream of consciousness (mind). (e.g., the lawful sequence of the (consciousness) article function. (5) *Dhamma niyama*- I suppose that (other) nature of a thing ((might be discussed by materialism (physical, chemical, biological, and other theories might be addressed in scientific laws), justice, and righteousness (social psychological laws-theories), which impact brain-mind mechanisms. (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017: Dayathilake, 2018) evolving, along with nature, nurture, and time. Therefore, such MV scanning may impact X-UQGPC's natural evolution of X-UQGPC.

I found more than 30,300 peer-reviewed studies for keyword searches on meditation in PubMed Central on diverse research titles. Moreover, a study found that loving-kindness meditation may help improve subjective well-being (Chao, 2020). I discovered that 1690 research articles discussed loving-kindness meditation in PubMed Central when my article was writing.

"meditation – MV successful scanning- systematic cognitive behavior therapy may gradually enhance intelligence (according to my definition for the fundamental intelligence which designed

and selected when life originated in the biological evolution on earth and so on) along with personal and social psychological and physical well-being directly and indirectly" (Dayathilake, 2017). Therefore, I suggest such meditational therapy evolution of intelligence- not only helpful to a gradual decline of the grand delusion but might evolve X-UQGPC, which might be crucial to find and bond with higher level quality-next life when the death of the present brain. However, I will not analyze all the meditation research and how it impacts intelligence.

When a successful MV scan evolves, the intelligence of a given person and intelligent decisions. MV scanning (mental training in mindfully: one might use loving-kindness and compassionate healthy mind viruses for insight scanning related MV) might reward psychological and physical well-being. If decisions are harmful (inter- or intrapersonal), such decisions might increase the risk of psychological suffering (Dayathilake, 2018). A study showed that once a nerve becomes electrically active, it can influence the genes, influencing how the nerve develops (Gazzaniga, 1994). Therefore, consciousness and the brain have a close relationship. However, nature and nurture affect the IQ of adults (Campbell, 1994). Consequently, I assume that HVM—highly activated persons with relatively few and weaker MV might not decline their intelligence with age. (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017) —, Moreover, research has indicated that clever brains age more slowly (Rabbitt et al., 2003). Such research suggests a considerable relationship between the mind-brain of individuals and social intelligence.

However, any given person or animal has an individual consciousness, which is a primary principle of life in the universe and might be a continuum after death. The brain might strongly bond with these two unknown ultra-quantum particles. It might be sound reasoning for the uniqueness of identity of any individual regardless of whether the brain develops in size, damages, splits, shrinks, ages, and their unique consciousness continuum (at least) until death.

Because we experience "I feel so I am" to comment on consciousness, no exchange or make different feel of someone else in my or your brain in whole life. Moreover, those X-two microparticles might not impact psychological qualities in the physical brain. Moreover, other physical-material, neurological, and psychiatric drugs, nutrients, and anesthetic medications might affect the characteristics of the remaining X-UQCGP. Therefore, the quality and quantity of emotions and conscious awareness might result in the cloud of two microparticles, alive and active regions of the particular person's (or animal) brain.

Nevertheless, this may begin a different methodological approach for consciousness and afterlife studies. If we find more empirical facts strengthening the theory further, such findings help evolve our global unity, peace, health, happiness, and many other facts toward making a better world. These findings may emphasize to humankind how risky the natural continuum life in the journey we are in the universe/s (Dayathilake, 1991) (might be born) as a (suffering animal/humans/unknown-being who might be the highly diversified uncountable/unthinkable/infinite as by numbers) being. Those reviews convince us why we need to learn and practice from real intellectuals the methodologies - 'cognitive behaviors therapies' to scan our MV by HMV (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017), prevention, and cure brain by the scientific behavior according to said psychological methods. Such intellectuals and scientists may encourage or properly program and evolve people's minds and behaviors (Dayathilake, 2017; Dayathilake, 2017) along with these research findings. Here, I have shown a few inter- and intrapersonal biological networks that impact the evolution (or regression) of intelligence and well-being from individual to global. However, I have attempted carefully to avoid the exaggeration and errors of the conclusions, the big problem of consciousness in this study. If the consciousness continuum after death, the next life's location-nurture in the particular place in the

universe/s. Therefore, the new nature and nurture might be crucial to give the new direction for new life (the life after previous death) by the total influence of intelligent vs. non-intelligent persons (with higher MV) behaviors and your present biological and psychological potential to be evolved. In other words, a person with higher HMV impacts the direction and evolution level-state of personal, global, and universal higher goals of psychological well-being in natural survival. Strong determinism (Penrose, 1989) or no free will, and the afterlife hypothesis also do not seem contradictory. Therefore, a person's afterlife might depend on the cause and effects (continuum-series) of natural psychological, (brain) biological, and evolution (or regression) of microparticle phenomena. However, it is not easy to precisely find the natural purpose of (if there is a) the unique consciousness continuum in the evolution (or regression) of intelligence via the universe/s. Even though it is crucial but challenging to find how the microparticles travel at infinite speed and bond in a vacant 'brain in early stage X-UQGPC, positive or adverse evolution (or regression) might depend on the natural development (or degeneration) of the previous materialistic brain's cognition, including intelligence and nurture. The most intelligent person/s with a higher potential scans their mind virus and may survive happier and help others to evolve psychological well-being and intelligence, minimizing several personal, social, and global issues smoothly. Alternatively, we can find facts in the future on more robust hypotheses to strengthen my study. In that case, humankind may naturally attempt to find better methods to evolve their X-UQCGP and happier life on Earth and (higher probability to) be born in a more comfortable place after their death (of the present life) in the universe/s by positively evolving their intelligence further over time.

Acknowledgments

My sincere thanks for the tremendous respect for my dearest father, Mr. K.L. Senarath Premathilake (late), and mother, Mrs. K.L. Indra Kurulugama (late), who has given not only nature but also nurture of their best, and my immense gratitude to K.L. Martin (Late grandfather), Mrs. Punchimanike Dalukdeniya (late grandmother), Mr. K.L. Bandula (late grandfather) K.L. Podimanike (late grandmother) nephews- Sanidu Upamal Karunaratne, Nishal Paranagama, Sandaru Shamaindra Senarath, K.L.S. Kawya Kaushalya Kurulugama, and nieces – Ushara Dulakshi Karunaratne, Nishali Paranagama, Mr. and Mrs. Ekanayake and family; option Professor H.M. Petry, committee members, and all the staff, Prof. John Nicholls, Prof. Kenneth Muller, H. E. Mahinda Rajapaksa, H. E. Gotabaya Rajapaksa, Prof. Carlo Fonseka (late), Dr. N Fernando, Sir Arthur C. Clarke (late), Prof. Y. Karunadasa, Mr. H.B. Jayewardene (late), Mr. W. G. Rodrigo (late), Mr. Douglas Perera (late), Dr. Hashitha Mahen Dombagahawatta, Mr. Sanjeewa Wickramanayake, Mrs. Probodhinee Marasingha, and others who encourage and assist.

Reference

- Alexander, E., (2012). *Proof of Heaven*. (Simon & Schuster, New York).
- Berkeley, G., (1975). *Philosophical works* (Ayers, M., editor). London: Dennett
- Blakeslee, T., (1996). *Beyond the Conscious Mind. Unlocking the Secrets of the Self*. pp. 6–7. ISBN 9780306452628.
- Campbell, P., (1994). What if intelligence is inheritable? *Nature* 371,637.
- Chalmers, D.J., (2012). *Constructing the world*. New York (NY): Oxford University Press.
- Chao Liu, Hao Chen, Chia-Yi Liu, Rung-Tai Lin, & Wen-Ko Chiou (June 2020). The Effect of Loving-Kindness Meditation on Flight Attendants' Spirituality, Mindfulness, and Subjective Well-Being *Healthcare (Basel)*.; 8(2): 174. Published online. 16. DOI: 10.3390/healthcare8020174
- Chopra, D., (2001). *How to know God: the soul's journey into them the mystery of mysteries*. New York: Running Press Book Publishers
- Chopra D., (2006). *Life after Death: The Burden of Proof* (Harmony, New York).
- Dayathilake, K.L.S., (2017). *Nature of Human Intelligence*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3848408> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3848408>

Dayathilake, K.L.S., (June 16, 2017). A Multidisciplinary Hypothesis to Reincarnation: Does It a Universal Survival of the Genomic Particle of the Consciousness When a Brain Death?

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2986253

Dayathilake, K.L.S., (July 12, 2018). Life after death in the evolution of intelligence.

<https://psyarxiv.com/2hkw4/Preprint> DOI 10.31234/osf.io/2hkw4

Dayathilake, K.L.S., (2017). Nature of human intelligence evolution on psychological well-being. doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/T8CQN, [//psyarxiv.com/t8cqn/](https://psyarxiv.com/t8cqn/)

Dayathilake, K.L.S., (Feb.15, 1991). 'Scientific foundation for optimum happiness of invaluable and extraordinary humanity.' National Archives collection, Sri Lanka.

Dennett, D.C., (1991). *Consciousness Explained*. Boston (MA): Little Brown.

Dennett, D.C., (1995). *Darwin's dangerous idea: evolution and the meanings of life*. New York (NY): Simon and Schuster.

Dennett, D.C., & Kinburn M., (1991). Time and the observer: the where and when of consciousness. *Behave Brain Sci*; 15:183–247.

Editorial team of Bhikkhus (1929) *Anguttara nikaya*. Page 509. Colombo, Edition of Tripitakaya

Eugenie, R. S., (2011). Neutrino-experiment-replicates-faster-than-light-finding-1.9393#auth-1
Nature.452.

Facco, E. & Agrillo, C., (2012). Near-death experiences between science and prejudice. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 10.3389/fnhum.2012.00209.

Feinberg, G. (1967). "Possibility of faster-than-light particles." *Physical Review*. 159 (5): 1089–1105. Bibcode:1967PhRv.159.1089F. doi:10.1103/.

Gazzaniga, M.S., (1994).

Nature's Mind (Happer Colling Publishers, Inc.).

Gazzaniga, M., LeDoux, J., (1978). *The Integrated Mind*. Springer. pp. 132–161. ISBN 9781489922069.

Gazzaniga, M., (1985). *The Social Brain. Discovering the Networks of the Mind*. pp. 77–79. ISBN 9780465078509.

Gombrich, R., (December 31, 2009). *What the Buddha thought*. Oxford Centre of Buddhist Studies Equinox Publishing Limited.

Hameroff, S.R. & Penrose, R., (1996). Conscious events as orchestrated space-time selections. *J Conscious Stud*; 3(1):36–53.

Hameroff, S., (1998). Quantum computation in brain microtubules? The Penrose–Hameroff "Orch OR" model of consciousness. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond Ser A, Math PhysSci*;356:1869–96.

Hameroff, S., (2007). The brain is a neuro-computer. *Cogn Sci*; 31:1035–45.

Hameroff, S., & Penrose R., (2014). Consciousness in the universe A review of the 'Orch OR' theory *Physics of Life Reviews* 11 39–78(2014).

Hameroff, S.R. & Penrose, R., (1996). Orchestrated reduction of quantum coherence in brain microtubules: a model for consciousness. In: Hameroff SR, Kaszniak AW, Scott AC, editors.

Toward a science of consciousness; the first Tucson on discussions and debates. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; p.507–40. Additionally, published in *Math Computer Simul* 1996; 40:453–80.

Hameroff, S., (1998). Fundamentality: Is the conscious mind subtly linked to a basic level of the universe? *Trends Cogn Sci*; 2:119–27.

Hameroff, S. & Penrose, R., (2014). "Consciousness in the universe." *Physics of Life Reviews*. 11 (1): 39–78. Bibcode: 2014Ph L Rv.11...39H. doi:10.1016/j.plrev.2013.08.002. PMID 24070914.

Hawking, S.W., (2006). *The Theory of Everything*, Phoenix Books, ISBN 81-7992-591-9.

Hawking, S.W., (May 15, 2011). *The Guardian*.

James, W., (1890). *The Principles of Psychology*, Volume 1. H. Holt. p. 225.

Juan, Y., Yuan, C., (2013). Bounding of the speed of spooky action at a distance. arXiv:1303.0614v1(quant-ph) March 4 2013

Kant, I.,(1998). *Critique of pure reason* (Guyer P, Wood AW, Trans.) Cambridge University Press.

Karunadasa, Y., (2010). *The Theravada Abhidhamma. Its inquiry into the Nature of Conditioned Reality*, p. 262. Centre of Buddhist Studies, The University of Hong Kong. ISBN 978-988-99296-6-4.

Karunamuni, N.D., (May 2015). "The Five-Aggregate Model of the Mind." *Sage Open*. 5 (2): 215824401558386. doi:10.1177/2158244015583860.

Long, J., & Perry, P., (2010). *Evidence of the Afterlife: The Science of Near-Death Experiences* 29 (Harper One, New York).

Machine, W., (2013). on Anatta, Encyclopedia Britannica.

Merali, Z., (2008). Reincarnation can save Schrödinger's cat. *Nature* 454, 8–9.

Mobbs, D., & Watt, C., (2011). Nothing paranormal about near-death experiences: How neuroscience can explain seeing bright lights, meeting the dead, or being convinced you are one of them. *Trends Cogn Sci* 15 (10):447–449. CrossRef PubMed Google Scholar.

Nyanatiloka, (1980). *Buddhist Dictionary; Manual of Buddhist terms and doctrines*. Buddhist Publication Society. Edited by Nyanaponika.((Sri Lanka)

Parnia, S. et al., (January 16, 2019). AWARE—Awareness during Resuscitation—A prospective study" *Journal of European Resuscitation Council*. (DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.09.004>).

Penrose, R., (1989). *The New Emperor's Mind* Oxford University Press. ISBN 0 09 977170 5.

Penrose, R. & Hameroff, S.R., (1995). What gaps? Reply to Grush and Churchland. *J Conscious Stud*; 2:98–112.

Penrose, R. & Hameroff, S.,(2011). Consciousness in the universe: neuroscience, quantum space-time geometry, and Orch OR theory. *J Cosmol*.

14.<http://journalofcosmology.com/Consciousness160.html>. 28.

Rabbitt, P., Chetwynd, A., McInnes, L.D.O., (Feb. 2003). Clever brains age more slowly? Further exploration of nun results. *Brit. Jour. Psychol*.

Reardon, S., (2019). Nenad Sestan, brain rebooter; A neuroscientist, revived disembodied pig brains and challenged definitions of life and death. *Nature*, 568

Rospatt, von, A. The Buddhist Doctrine of Momentariness: a survey of the Origins and early phase of this Doctrine up to Vasubandhu. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; 1 995.

Schiffer, F., (2021). Of Two Minds: The Revolutionary Science of Dual-Brain Psychology, 2nd, revised edition: 978-0684854243

Schrodinger., E., (2015). Oxford Dictionary of Physics. Seventh edition. 461p.

Sutherland, S., (1989). "Consciousness." Macmillan Dictionary of Psychology. Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-333-38829-7

Thonnard, M., et al.

(2013). Characteristics of near-death experiences memories compared to real and imagined events memories. PLOS ONE 8(3):e57620. CrossRef PubMed Google Scholar.

Van Lommel, P., (2011). Near-death experiences: The experience of the self as real and not an illusion. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1234 (1):19–28. CrossRef PubMed Google Scholar.

VanRullen, R.,Koch,C.,(2003). Is perception discrete or continuous? Trends in Cog. Sci.7 (5) 207-13

Vrselja, Z.,et al. (2019). Restoration of brain circulation and cellular functions hours postmortem. *Nature* 568, 336–343.

Wegner, D.M.,(2002). *The illusion of conscious will*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.

Whitehead, A.N., (1929). Process and reality. New York (N.Y.): MacMillan; p. 27

Whitehead, A.N.,(1933). Adventure of ideas. London: MacMillan

Woolf,N.J.,hemeroff, S.R., (2001). A quantum approach to visual consciousness. Trends in
Cog.Sci. (5); 472-8

Zeman, A.,(2008). A Portrait of the Brain, Yale University Press Publication, ISBN 978-0-300-
11416-4.

Table 1

Results of experiments 1 to 3: Cognitive function and consciousness of participants

Experiments:	T⁰ to T¹	T¹ to T²	After T²
<u>Experiment 1</u>			
Cognitive functions of a, b, and c	Similar (except consciousness)	Life of c evolving in the lab	a and b have similar cognition; c is older than a and b brains. Therefore, c 's cognition is different from a and b
Cognitive functions of d, e, and f	Similar	Life f is evolving in the lab	d and e brains have similar cognition; f is older than d and e ; therefore, the cognition of ' f ' is different from d and e

Cognitive functions of g, h, and i Different cognitions Life of **i** evolving in the lab **g, h, or i** have no similar cognition; '**i**' is older than the other brains.

The Consciousness Of all nine brains('a' to 'i') All the original **nine** consciousnesses streams were in the lab, unique and independent. **Streams of consciousness of c, f, and 'i' were unique and independent (the big question is what happened to those original consciousness streams of a, b, d, e, g, and h who were until T¹)** Unique streams of frozen brains of **a, b, d, e, g, and h** whose consciousness before T¹ might not be in the lab. (What happened to **a, b, d, e, g, and h** consciousnesses who originally lived until T¹?)

Experiment 2 A similar result as in the experiment one Similar results as in experiment one. **c, f and i brains were still alive.** Nevertheless, there were no frozen brains of **a, b, d, e, g, and h in the lab.** However, there were just atomic elements that 'destroyed' the Similar results and similar questions remain as in experiment one.

**brains of a, b, d, e, g,
and h in the lab until
T². What happened to
the consciousness of six
of them who were until
T¹?**

Experiment 3

**Cognition of: a, a¹, a², a³, b,
b¹, b², b³, c, c¹, c²,
And c³**

**a, b, and c similar
cognitions(except
consciousnesses)**

**c still lives
(Then, what happened
to the original
consciousness of frozen
a and b, who were until
T¹?)**

**c is still alive; frozen
brains of a? and b?
Gain life in the lab.
The rest of the newest
brains of a¹, a², a³, b¹,
b², b³, c¹, c², and c³, and
a? and b? have similar
cognition. (What
happened to the
cognition of a and b in
the lab before T¹?)**

Cognitive function of similar brains of d, d¹, d², d³, e, e¹, e², e³ f, f¹, f², and f³

d, e, and f have similar cognitions(except consciousness)

'f' still alive in the lab (What happened to the original consciousness of frozen **d and e** those who lived until **T¹**?)

f still alive in the lab; frozen brains of **d? and e?** gained life; all nine newest brains of **d¹, d², d³, e¹, e², e³, f¹, f², f³** as well as **d and e** have similar cognition. (what happened to the consciousnesses of **d and e**, who were originally in the lab before **T¹**?)

Cognitive function of g, g¹, g², g³, h, h¹, h², h³, i, i¹, i², and i³

The cognitive functions of **g, h, and i** were different

'i' still live (what happened to the original consciousness of frozen **g and h**, those who lived until **T¹**?)

g to g³ have similar cognition; **h to h³** have similar cognition, and **i¹ to i³** have similar cognition. The brain 'i' is older than the other eleven brains and has different cognition. What happened to the

original consciousness
of **g and h**?


**The consciousness of thirty-
six brains of a to i³**

The **nine** original brains
in the lab had unique
and independent streams
of consciousness.

Unique consciousness
streams of **c, f, and i**
were still alive in the
lab. (However, the
crucial and significant
issue is what happened
to the continuum
consciousness stream of
a, b, d, e, g, and h, who
were in the lab until
T¹?)

All **thirty-six** live brains
have unique and
independent
consciousnesses
(However, the crucial
and significant issue is
what happened to the
continuum
consciousness streams
of **a, b, d, e, g, and h**,
who were originally in
the lab until **T¹**)

Figure 1




Venn diagram 1 of the stream of distinctive continuum consciousness of a, b, and c and their life span through time

Note: I demonstrate only one afterlife of **a and b** (Here, I only consider **a, b, and c** for easy reference out of **nine** original participants in the three experiments) of their continuum consciousness streams. All three streams of individual consciousness lived between **T0 and T1** in the laboratory. Here, I suggest that after the death of '**a**' might be lived (afterlife, from **T1 to Tx**) and **b** lived from **T1 to Ty**, **outside (unknown places)** of the lab that might be the only option to avoid logical contradictions. However, **c** might live **T1 to T5** in the laboratory. Here,

only demonstrated *a?* and *b?* (At **T2**) who independently lived **T1 to T3** and **T1 to T4** in the lab were similarly nurtured.


Figure 2



Venn diagram of the cognitive functions of a, b, and c and their life span over time:

Note: I demonstrate only one afterlife of **a** and **b** (out of nine participants in the three experiments) of their continuum consciousness streams. The laboratory's three streams of individual consciousness of **a**, **b**, and **c** lived between **T0** and **T1**. Three of them had similar cognitive functions until **T1**. Here, I suggest that after the death of 'a' lived from **T1** to **Tx** and **b** lived from **T1** to **Ty**, outside (unknown places) of the lab, that might avoid logical contradictions of results. However, **c** lived from **T1** to **T5** in the laboratory. The lives of frozen or artificially reconstructed brains of **a** and **b** (before labeled as **T1**) are at **T2** of '**a?**' lived **T1** to **T3**, and '**b?**' ((live brain at **T2**. I label them **a?** and **b?** as shown in the figure). Lived **T1** to **T4** in the lab were similarly nurtured.

Figure 3



Venn diagram of the probable relationship between existing theories of brain matter and the new hypothesis of two microparticles

This Venn diagram is a probable relationship between the consciousness of the human brain (or any other living being -), the theory of general relativity (GR), quantum mechanics, X-UQCPG, and X-UQCUP. Therefore, the union of four sets in the conscious live brain with Venn diagram symbols is as follows.

GR U X-UQCUP

$\cup X-UQCGP \cup$ Quantum mechanism = union of consciousness of a live brain. All four are disjoint sets:

$GR \cap X-UQCUP$

$\cap X-UQCGP \cap$

Quantum mechanism = \emptyset