**Did Dirk K. F. Meijer and Hans J. H. Geesink (2017) (University of Groningen, Netherlands) plagiarize my ideas (2002-2008)?**

The article that I investigate is “Consciousness in the Universe is Scale Invariant and Implies an Event Horizon of the Human Brain” written by Dirk K.F. Meijer and Hans J.H. Geesink (University of Groningen, Netherlands) in *NeuroQuantology*, September 2017, Volume 15, Issue 3, pp. 41-79 (doi: 10.14704/nq.2017.15.3.1079)

It is amazing that a person who has worked in Pharmacy his career (Meijer) founded (almost at the end of his career) the solution to the mind-brain problem!!! He has published papers related to the domain of Pharmacy, but INCREDIBLE just now he furnished us the solution to the mind-brain problem! Let us see a comment about Meijer and Geesink’s ideas:

Essentially, Dr. Dirk K.F. Meijer, a professor at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands, hypothesizes that consciousness resides in a field surrounding the brain in another dimension. The entire body is a conduit and a collaborator with consciousness as a feedback loop. **(in New theory: consciousness doesn’t reside in the brain or same dimension, at C**[**hristine Horner**](hristine%20Horner) **November 6, 2017,** <http://www.collective-evolution.com/category/consciousness/>**)**

Now, let me introduce certain paragraphs from their article (Meijer and Geesink 2017) that mirror UNBELIEVABLE similar ideas to my ideas (2008, for instance):

Furthermore we postulate earlier that a dedicated part of the total brain activity is employed for the dynamic and ongoing construction of an *integral personal universe/worldview (*Meijer and Korf, 2014), *in which consciousness represents a metaphenomenon (*Linton, 2015*)*. Such an integrated representation of the outer world should not only

include our individual ”autobiography” but also the intrinsic interactions with the external world, including the physical laws that determine. (p. 13)

We postulate therefore that an *external* memory workspace is operating in the human brain in a 4-D setting. The latter can take into account the hidden interaction with all natural forces/fields and also can integrate symmetric time and thus an aspect of backward causation. The proposed field-sensitive information workspace could function as a *non-material and wave field-like* simulation domain for a spectrum of mental representations. These may undergo a

superposition with the internal worldview, in order to monitor the quality of our individual being (Fig.9). (p. 13)

We envision such a monitoring system as *supervening* the basic neuronal communication networks, in order to generate a *global* type of a mental field. (p. 14)

The implicit suggestion of a *non-material* and *extra-corporal* mental workspace, that supervenes our neural system and provides the dominant part of self-consciousness (the big ”I”), that acts in addition to our daily experienced conscious state (called the small ”I”), is supported by earlier and also more recent observations in fNMR studies that

long term memory is *not correlated with scaled sizes of the brain. (p. 16)*

From the abovementioned phenomena it is obvious that a “final theory” in physics in the future, should describe *both* the *material* and *mental* aspects of reality and consequently must integrate a testable model of consciousness and self-consciousness. Such a comprehensive model of the whole should also be based on a mathematical and geometric framework and be compatible with a completed theory of quantum mechanics as well as an integrated description of the cosmos at the micro- and macro scale. (pp. 18-19)

Both the particular 4D-mental holographic domain and the supposed *universal consciousness field* (defined as implicate order by David Bohm, 1980, 1987) and more recently as a ZPE stochastic electro-dynamic field by Laszlo, 2007, Keppler, 2016 and Caligiuri, 2015) should be seen as crucial “steering” modalities that mutually communicate with the *whole nervous system of the organism*, including its neuronal networks with their conscious and non-conscious aspects. Bidirectional communication between the mind and such an extended mental workspace (formed by multiple event horizons) is proposed to occur by toroidal integration of the abovementioned information spectrum in both the physical and mental domains. (p. 21)

The proposed mental workspace is regarded to be non-material, but in relation to the individual brain, entertains a non-dual wave/particle relation according to quantum physical principles: it is directly dependent on the brain physiology but not reducible to it. The bidirectional flow of information between internal and external electromagnetic fields enables to build up a personal mental model that is instrumental in simulations of actualized

representations of the individual status as a basis for quality control of the whole organism (p. 26)

The particular holographic type of consciousness, situated in the particular event horizons as a sort of bordering memory domains, can effectively function as a nested information workspace, that in humans is instrumental in constructing a *mental model of reality for internal use in each individual,* thus functioning as a global reference system. (p. 27)

With regard to the potential dualistic aspect, we stipulate that we consider our model as clearly non-dualistic and in this sense, agree with the Operational Architecture model of Fingelkurz and Fingelkurtz, 2010, 2014 on separate phenomenal and neuro-physical aspects of consciousness, stating that *both aspects have an ontological relation but are not reducible to each other. (p. 28)*

They include long range and bidirectional correlations of the supervening mental workspace with the physical brain through entanglement and quantum tunnelling. This, in addition to holonomic sharing of quantum information through 4-D to 3-D projection and phase-conjugation (Mitchhell and Staretz, 2011).[[1]](#footnote-1)

**My verdict about this article is summarized in one paragraph:** *Reading these paragraphs (and many others from their paper), the reader will have the same feeling that I had it: as if reading some distorted paragraphs from my books! The main ideas and the “general framework of thinking” of this article are UNBELIEVABLE similar to my ideas and my EDWs perspective!*

1. [My footnote] These authors mention other authors that have published similar ideas in the last years. It seems that I have to include many more people on my list! [↑](#footnote-ref-1)