

A Teleological Argument for a Non-Material Consciousness

Ácárya Acyutánanda Avadhúta

I regard consciousness as primary. I regard matter as a derivative of consciousness. We cannot get behind consciousness. –Max Planck

1. Mainstream science has no proven theory for the origin of life.
2. Though mainstream science theorizes that consciousness emerges out of the physical matter of the living brain, it has no proven theory of how that might occur.
3. Even if science did have a proven theory for how that might occur, that would not be a complete theory of how and why consciousness exists, because of point 1.
4. Even if science could completely explain how life and consciousness could originate from physical matter, it could not explain why living beings should possess consciousness as a persistent trait. Science theorizes that the multifarious traits of living species, including extremely ingenious instinctive behavior traits and the intelligence of human beings, emerged from inert matter. The only support science can offer for this theory is another theory, Darwinism, which postulates that random mutations of traits occur and that natural pressures allow the survival only of traits that are adaptive in terms of the propagation of a species' genes.

Yet this theory does not explain why the trait of consciousness should exist. It explains why people think (thinking has an obvious adaptive value), but not why they would need to be aware of their thinking (no known adaptive value).

5. Not only does consciousness exist, but we know that we are conscious. (That is, not only are we conscious of our thinking, but we can think about our consciousness.) This too is inexplicable from the viewpoint of Darwinism. Yet one consequence of knowing that we are conscious is that we can better seek to identify with our consciousness. (See also points 7, 8 and 12.)
6. Even if science could completely explain how life and consciousness could originate from physical matter and why living beings should possess consciousness as a persistent trait, it could not explain another persistent trait -- the way human beings behave in relation to the trait of consciousness.

7. Individual humans during their lifetimes evolve, particularly if they meditate, in the direction of greater altruism, less ego, less fear of death, less body awareness, less “attachment” (less dependence for happiness on the material world that sustains their physical bodies), greater ecstasy, and greater peace. All these changes boil down to the fact that each human evolves in the direction of identification with his or her consciousness, as opposed to his or her mental phenomena (including those mental phenomena related to all self-seeking drives).*

* I’m prepared to elaborate on this and on other paragraphs.

As humans evolve during their lifetimes, various desires for worldly pleasure become lowered, including frequently the sex drive. Moreover, many humans choose to sublimate reproductive drives into consciousness by observing celibacy or adopting a spiritual path that involves minimal sexual activity.

There may be an argument for explaining some kinds of altruism as evolutionarily adaptive, but in other ways this trait of seeking identification with consciousness is not explained by, rather often seems to contradict, Darwinian theory.

“Less ego”: This is not just a synonym for “greater altruism.” We have a sense of self, and scientists argue that it is evolutionarily adaptive. Our sense of self is tied up with identification with our thoughts. Yet we have the ability to break that identification with our thoughts, and lose our ego, through meditation. This ability, and the reward (happiness) obtained by pursuing this ability, go contrary to the scientific argument about the evolutionary value of the ego.

What motivates a living being is happiness and the avoidance of suffering. According to Darwinism, happiness is the reward, and suffering is the punishment, that nature has designed in us in order to goad us into adaptive behavior. Yet we are designed such that the ultimate happiness/ecstasy available within us is its own reward, not a reward for anything that helps either the individual or the species as a whole to survive.

If we do not have the potential to merge with a loving intelligence greater than ourselves, why would we be evolutionarily designed such that we can develop the ability to feel that we are doing so? And why, if happiness is merely the reward that evolution has bred in us for evolutionarily-adaptive behavior, is this feeling, which is of no adaptive value, the culmination or nearly the culmination of everyone’s relentless search for happiness?

8. There is a range of techniques of meditation, but I and many others have found the most effective technique to be concentration on an idea of a cosmic consciousness (see also 12). And the best refinement of that most effective technique is to concentrate on consciousness with a mental orientation represented poetically as “O Lord, I don’t want anything for myself, I only want to please You by merging in You.”

9. If we say, against all the evidence, that the identification with consciousness *is* in fact of evolutionary value, why does it rarely occur early in life, and why does it rarely occur without effort?

10. Inescapably, a pattern becomes discernible: the whole of inanimate and animate evolution throughout the history of the universe has culminated in a living being that tries increasingly to identify with its own consciousness.

11. Without denying the validity of Darwinian dynamics per se, the above makes clear that another force or forces must be at work *also*. For those forces, there is no materialistic explanation.

12. A theory with perfect explanatory power for all the above is the theory of *Brahma Cakra*, the Cosmic Cycle. This theory postulates that matter emerges out of a cosmic non-material consciousness; then evolves, not inconsistently with the scientific description (but filling gaps in the scientific description), into living bodies and minds, including eventually human bodies and minds; and after enough evolution, merges back into consciousness. Thus this theory elegantly explains the origin of life as well as the “origin” of consciousness (consciousness has no origin, it has always been), and explains all the above-mentioned points that mainstream science cannot explain.

And finally, under this theory, we can understand why concentration on an idea of a cosmic consciousness is so effective (as mentioned in 8 above): mind is a condensed form of consciousness in the first place; therefore to direct the mind back towards its source has the effect of dissolving it once again into its source, accompanied by the peace, ecstasy and sense of oneness that are qualities of the least condensed stages of the mind.

A reviewer of a book subtitled *Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*, by the atheistic philosopher Thomas Nagel, writes:

Neo-Darwinism insists that every phenomenon, every species, every trait of every species, is the consequence of random chance, as natural selection requires. And yet, Nagel says, “certain things are so remarkable that they have to be explained as non-accidental if we are to pretend to a real understanding of the world.” . . .

Among these remarkable, nonaccidental things. . . . Consciousness itself, for example: You can’t explain consciousness in evolutionary terms, Nagel says, without undermining the explanation itself. Evolution easily accounts for rudimentary kinds of awareness. Hundreds of thousands of years ago on the African savannah, where the earliest humans evolved the unique characteristics of our species, the ability to sense danger or to read signals from a potential mate would clearly help an organism survive.

So far, so good. But the human brain can do much more than this. It can perform calculus, hypothesize metaphysics, compose music – even develop a theory of evolution. None of these higher capacities has any evident survival value,

*certainly not hundreds of thousands of years ago when the chief aim of mental life was to avoid getting eaten. Could our brain have developed and sustained such nonadaptive abilities by the trial and error of natural selection, as neo-Darwinism insists? It's possible, but the odds, Nagel says, are "vanishingly small." If Nagel is right, the materialist is in a pickle. The conscious brain that is able to come up with neo-Darwinism as a universal explanation simultaneously makes neo-Darwinism, as a universal explanation, exceedingly unlikely.**

* "The Heretic: Who Is Thomas Nagel and Why Are So Many of His Fellow Academics Condemning Him?" by Andrew Ferguson,
http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/heretic_707692.html?nopager=1