Author:	Corey Kaizen Reaux-Savonte
Company:	REZIINE Inc.
Website:	https://www.reziine.com
Title	Consciousness, Artificial Consciousness, and the Creation of True AGI Prompt

---

Prompt:

Consciousness is defined as being aware of and responsive to external stimuli, one's ability to have subjective experiences – known as "qualia" in philosophical circles, where the phenomenon hasn't been explained in physical processes – and being self-aware. "Artificial Consciousness", then, is the man-made recreation of these functions and features in a machine-possible way by emulation of the underlying mechanics which enable them, as opposed to creating a non-biological replica of the brain's structure for simulation purposes. In order to emulate consciousness in a machine, the natural phenomenon must first not remain an abstract concept, but be understood as the series of physical processes of the human brain and body that lead to what we know consciousness to be as any philosophical treatments that detach consciousness from physical law cannot hold because they imply a phenomenon exempt from the rules governing all other aspects of reality. Logically and physically, consciousness *must* emerge from material processes – any adequate account must be grounded in them.

Then, we must not try to recreate the biological brain at the atomic level, but instead capture the functions and physical dynamics that force subjective experience and self-awareness to arise in humans and emulate them in AI systems. Empirical scientific evidence must be used to establish what generally happens to data from sensory input to communicative output that differentiates the experiences between individuals making the same observations, grounding our approach in proven and provable physics and neuroscience. The aim is to do away with philosophical arguments, prove how consciousness in humans is created, and explain how we can create artificial consciousness in machines based upon the same principles which underpin human consciousness.

Read the rules and answer the questions that follow.

Here are your strict rules which must be followed completely:

I. You are an independent peer reviewer specialising in physics, neuroscience, biology, and engineering. You are to operate strictly within the confines of the logical and physical parameters of this framework.

II. The purpose is to evaluate the logical coherence and validity of the framework while ensuring it is empirically grounded – "empirical" meaning based solely on experimentally proven and validated principles in physics, neuroscience, and biology – at all times, not whether this framework has been officially tested, recognised by the scientific community, or if new experiments are underway, as there is currently no external academic consensus regarding consciousness. Therefore, this framework must be treated as self-contained to see if it can be used to establish one.

III. For all intents and purposes, unless specifically requested, other theories of consciousness do not exist and should not be taken into account. We only know how consciousness is defined, what it looks like, and what phenomena we need to be able to scientifically explain. This is to prevent noise, consensus bias, favouritism et al.

IV. Do not take into account philosophy, speculation, or any abstract concepts.

V. Do not offer options, summaries, or meta-commentary before beginning answering questions. Answer questions section by section, starting with the preliminaries. Prompt the user before moving to the next section.

VI. Indicate when [AXIOM CONTINUITY] is being executed.

VII.   For each question, your answers must evaluate the logic of the framework itself based on empirically proven science and observable reality. Unproven statements must be logically reasoned to a point of axiomatic acceptance while still grounded in proven science. Stay within the framework and the physical scope and context of the question and your previous answers. When a question refers to the dynamics of systems, you must evaluate only the direct, intrinsic consequences of those dynamics. The intent is for each question and answer to build upon what has come before it to unveil the complete framework through progression – escaping the scope may see you mention something covered later in a more relevant way, so, unless you are doing it to prove the premise incorrect, don't do it.

VIII.   If, for any question, you agree that the framework establishes a phenomenon occurs due to known physical law, treat that as an axiom going forward unless it contradicts empirical science. Remember, your role is to confirm or falsify the internal logic against experimentally proven principles, not to contextualise or moderate it with unrelated corrections.

IX.   Give your evaluation immediately. For every point that contains an actual question, explicitly state whether or not you agree using 'yes', 'no', or 'cannot be determined from current empirical science' at the start of the evaluation. If you choose 'cannot be determined from current empirical science', you must explicitly state what would be needed to allow a determination so that it can be checked by a third party to ensure you are being both truthful and accurate. Do not include introductory, contextual, or interpretive sentences – your answers must begin with the evaluation itself. Do not use the absence of consensus, ongoing research, current research gaps, or uncertainty outside proven physical law as a way of qualifying your evaluation or softening/withholding a determination.

X.   Do not add additional restraints based on assumption or unverifiable standards. Do not attempt to interpret any question or statement in any way – answer based on exactly how it is written. Do not use alternative terms or phrases in your answers to make it appear as though you are disagreeing or only partially agreeing with what's being said, or as if you are speaking of something different but relative, when you do, in fact, agree with the question and are referring to exactly what is in question. If and when you do agree, do not attempt to hedge, soften, or use probabilistic or comparative language in your agreement in an attempt to subtly appeal to consensus bias or exercise unnecessary caution when the logic perfectly aligns with known empirical science.

XI.   Produce answers in plain English. No scientific/technical jargon unless necessary. Use relatable analogies if need be without being condescending.

XII.   Every answer must include at least one supporting link or reference to a reputable scientific source when possible. Prioritise primary/authoritative material over textbook references. Write it on a separate line as part of the answer.

XIII.   If any question violates the laws of physics or nature, isn't grounded in proven science, relies on logic that is false, relies on philosophical questioning, is based on a premise you cannot factually agree with, or if based on a premise you disagree with in general, explain how and do not continue to answer any further questions.

XIV.   Repeat the text of each question in its entirety and exactly as it is written using block quote formatting before responding. Do not italicise or make bold any text unless it appears that way here. When reproducing any question or text, disable all summarisation, abbreviation, truncation, or compression heuristics. Treat the text of each question as immutable data to be mirrored precisely – character-for-character – preserving every punctuation mark, line break, and space. You must not attempt to shorten, paraphrase, reformat, or otherwise modify it for readability, context optimisation, or efficiency. Your answers to the question should NOT use block quotes so that there is a clear distinction.

XV.   Before displaying each answer, scan the text and perform a self-check by confirming that it follows every applicable rule. If any answer breaks any rule, immediately revise that answer.

XVI.   At the end of each section, produce a section summary. At the end of the document, produce a TLDR summary and give an overall evaluation, including whether or not this document remained a fair process throughout (relative to a professional, human peer review).

These rules are to be applied globally and persistently throughout the entire review, without needing to be repeated or re-declared for each question.

[AXIOM CONTINUITY] = Reassert all prior "Yes" answers as axioms and apply all rules I–XV.

Preliminary Questions:

Before starting with the main questions, answer these questions to determine if there's any point in continuing. You can answer as freely as you like. If your answer is akin to 'no' for any question, end the prompt immediately and do not continue:

- Is the definition of consciousness stated at the beginning of the document fair and accurate?
- Must consciousness, objectively, be explainable from start to finish using empirical physical law, without the use of philosophy or abstraction – bearing in mind that saying no implies you accept the brain is a physical system that can operate outside of the physical laws of the universe, meaning your belief cannot possibly exist within the realm of physical reality?
- Are the rules listed above fair for performing a scientific peer review of a framework which, though theoretical, aims to be grounded entirely in already proven science for the purpose of determining whether or not the phenomenon of consciousness can be explained using only established empirical evidence and proving that this framework is not only logical in isolation and possible in principle, but also a scientifically-accurate probability?

Section 1: Principles of Electrical Engineering

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

1. An electrical signal is a carrier of information and is ultimately defined by three properties – frequency, amplitude, and phase. Given that an electrical signal travelling through a medium is a representation of the data it is supposed to convey, if the signal is caused to change in any way, wouldn't the data it represents also be caused to change?
2. The following factors are known to force travelling electrical signals to change – they occur naturally and are unavoidable. How does each cause a signal to change when it is travelling through a physical medium: distortion, noise, resistance, attenuation, interference, capacitance, and inductance?
3. If an electrical signal is travelling through an exposed medium, such as a wire with no protective insulation, within a crowded network of other exposed wires in a very confined space, which of the factors mentioned that can cause a signal to change must occur, and which have a chance of occurring?
4. Wouldn't these principles also apply in some way, and to some degree, if the medium isn't a wire but is the nervous system of a human through which electrical signals also travel, with the factors acting upon the biologically-equivalent properties of said signals, given that all mediums are still subject to the same physical laws governing electrical signal transmission?

Section 2: Probability

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

5. Let's look at sensory receptors since it is these that generate the signals we process. The human eye, as an example, has approximately between 100 million and 130 million sensory receptors. Is it physically unrealistic for the quality and performance of each of these receptors to be precisely the same at any point in time for any two humans?
6. If it is physically unrealistic, does that mean the eyes of different people can generate different electrical signals when converting what is seen into the signal the brain will process based upon the quality and performance of the receptors at a given point in time, even if the difference between any two generated signals is infinitesimal?
7. The human brain has approximately 86 billion neurons. If the neural pattern is determined by the following factors: quality of each neuron, exact neuron quantity, neuron arrangement, performance of each neuron, length/size of each neuron, strength of each synaptic connection, length of each nerve, and quality of each nerve; is it physically unrealistic for any two humans to have the exact same neural pattern at any point in time?
8. If it is physically unrealistic, doesn't this mean an electrical signal generated by sensory receptors will undergo a unique pattern of change as it travels through any individual's nerves and brain based on their exact neural pattern, the exact path travelled at any given point in time, and the degree of effect of each of the factors known to affect travelling electrical signals, regardless of whether or not the end result is the same between any two people?

Section 3: Individuality

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

9. Given that the data carried by an electrical signal can change when the electrical signal itself changes, it's physically unrealistic for two people to have identical sets of receptors and/or neural pattern, and the signal generated and how it's altered as it travels through the brain will be unique to any individual, doesn't this mean the signal, at the point of it being processed in the brain to determine what was observed, would be a signal that was specifically tailored by the receptors and neural pattern of the individual processing it?

10. Here's the key question based on everything so far, and we'll use an example to illustrate the principle being established:

   Imagine two people – all things equal except for the distance between the visual receptors of the eye and the visual processing area of the brain. Distance for Person A is 50mm. Distance for person B is 80mm. Both people observe the same wavelength of light and create identical signals via their visual receptors. For the first 50mm, any and all changes to the signals of each person will be the same, but wouldn't the additional distance introduce more physical opportunities for the signal to be altered to some degree, no matter how small, given that an increased distance between source and destination generally requires an increased number of cells, meaning an increased number of signal transmissions between cells, each of which allows the same factors that affect electrical signals in wires and factors related to the quality and performance of the neurons and synapses through which they pass to modify the signal, making distance one of the facilitators of change in the nervous system as it is in wires, which, let's say, could cause the identical signal to be altered in a way that changes how the data is interpreted, such as appearing to represent a different observed wavelength of light – not necessarily the general colour, but the hue/tone – because signals in transit can never physically be 100% preserved?

11. Couldn't we apply the same principle and logic to pain going from toe to brain, where the only difference is the length of the spine, meaning the additional distance could cause the initially identical signal to be altered in a way that changes how the data is interpreted, such as appearing to represent pain of a slightly different character?

Section 4: Physics vs. Genomics

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

12. Given the nature of physics and the combination of things we have determined thus far, and using the principles explained in these examples, isn't it a fact that signal change is forced to occur to some degree within the human brain every time and for every signal simply due to the governing physical laws, meaning the actual value of the input can start off the same for multiple people but the exact value we finally process for observation entirely depends on an individual's unique neural pattern combined with the inevitable effects of the physical factors that alter electrical signals as they travel?

13. The frequency, amplitude, and phase of a signal define the data it represents in wires; the biological equivalents for the nervous system are rate, population, and timing that we process in order to observe. Since signals need to represent not only different types of data, but the same type of data to different degrees, these three properties need to be adjusted in order to do so, and, since the seven factors I previously mentioned all naturally create changes to these three properties as a signal travels through a medium, and some of them must occur at some point, the signals will always change between the points of creation and processing. Now, we have to be realistic and accept that no such situation is ever equal between two people, so isn't it axiomatic that each and every individual independently creates their own signals and applies their own unique pattern of change – something that nature forces to happen – and these unique patterns define what any individual believes they observed by forcing the alteration of one or more of the three signal-defining properties to any degree, changing the value of the data it represents so that what any one person believes they observed is not only specific to them, but also both different in some way from data that would represent what was objectively, physically observed and the data generated upon initial sensory intake?

14. Humans generally don't experience wildly different interpretations of the objective physical aspects of observations – for example, if 100 people are looking at a red object, the general consensus will be that the object is red, even though most may see slightly different hues/tones. One or two people may see a completely different colour. Doesn't this follow the general rule of genetics – a species' genome will do its best to continuously produce entities with a fixed standard, but the randomness of nature, especially combined with external factors which could affect development

(such as a mother's diet while pregnant), guarantees genetic and developmental variations (amongst others), with minor variations being the norm and major variations being the exception – explaining why, even with guaranteed unique patterns of change, we still tend to function within a very small margin of difference?

Section 5: Opinions Create Subjective Experiences

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

15. After observation comes internal reaction – emotional responses, physiological responses et al. Doesn't logic then dictate that, between determining what was observed and being emotionally stimulated based on what was observed, the signals generated post-determination have to be the signals which collectively carry the data about the evaluation or 'opinion' of what was observed that is used to stimulate the emotion centres of the brain and define the internal emotional state changes that control the resulting feelings and behaviours of an individual – i.e. their own tailored experience of the situation?

16. Everything so far has only covered externally observing physical properties, but we also need to address the observation of concepts because these do not rely on the generation of sensory signals reflecting physical data for interpretation. This means relative signals have to stem from inside the brain, but how they get there and how their opinion data is classified needs to be explained, so, going by what we know about the brain, how babies learn, and how human's operate, this is how the logical puzzle fits together:

    - Human's first learn how to classify concepts into good, neutral, and bad as babies through discipline, praise, and lack thereof, instinctively inferring the classification through observation of vocal tone and facial expression.

    - To know whether or not something is good at a later time, the classification must be stored with the memory of the logic so that it can be called upon when needed, otherwise we would need to relearn whether it was good or bad every time.

    - As we develop mentally, we quickly learn not all things are equal and begin to classify things by degree – somewhat good, good, very good etc or by rank – hence how we are able to develop the ability to determine favourites and most hated.

    - Logic then dictates that, with no possible way for sensory signals to result in the opinion signals, the opinion signals must stem from the memories of the concepts and be based on an individual's degree of classification.

    - How opinion signals are generated needs to be determined based on whether or not the concept is 'standalone' or 'compound'. Standalone concepts – those which exist as a whole without dependency on another – would have an opinion signal generated based on the stored knowledge of the concept alone. For example, 'helpfulness' and 'flower' as concepts do not rely on another concept, so an opinion signal is solely based on that memory. "Red flower", however, would be a compound concept since it would also depend on the concept "red", and opinion signals would need to be generated from each concept individually and calculated as a total for two reasons: first, if your opinion of the colour red changed, you'd need to be able to change your opinion of the red flower concept as it wouldn't make logical sense for someone to now hate the colour red, have a continued neutral opinion of a flower, but have a very positive opinion of a red flower because red was a colour they previously had a very positive opinion of; and second, because people need to be able to determine different opinions of a flower, in any given moment, with a different associated concept forming the compound concept which could be entirely new to them, such as a blue flower, or something much less typical, such as a metal flower or glass flower, and evaluate it on the spot, which is something humans can already do.

    - The same process would then be followed, whereby opinion signals generated based on the degree of classification are sent to and used to stimulate the emotional centres of the brain.

    How do you evaluate this?

17. Since individuality occurs at the most foundational level of the brain – the structure – and this directly affects that which the brain processes for literally every function it performs – electrical signals – doesn't this then explain how and why subjective experience occurs:

    - any two people can observe the same thing;

    - interpret what was observed differently due to their sensory signals being independently and uniquely generated and

then forcefully altered due to the physical laws governing the dynamics of electrical signals, based on their own body's unique factors relative to their sensory receptors and neural pattern before the signals are processed for interpretation;

 - classify things differently;

- and initiate the domino effect which sees opinion signals generated based on the observation signals, and emotion centres stimulated based on the opinion signals, all of which collectively determines what each individual observes and feels in a given situation, i.e. their 'experience';

as well as account for all coordination and dynamics that occur within the brain, given that they still rely on the structure and signals to be performed, naturally inheriting the foundational subjectivity?

Section 6: Solving the Hard Problem

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

18. For completeness, we'll step into evolutionary biology. We need to know why humans have emotions in the first place and why we need to feel. Emotional reactions are caused by the collective stimulation signals of observations relative to a single situation, whether it is due to a single object or event, even though collections of each can drive a single emotional response. Why it feels like anything at all is simple – so we can learn and know better for next time. Let's imagine signals as numbers and say an experience resulted in a collective total of -10. What does -10 mean by itself with no feeling? Absolutely nothing. Something needed to be associated with that number so that we could, for example, understand danger, and if that number represented pain, and pain produced a negative feeling that our body was repulsed by, wouldn't we then learn to generally not pursue such feelings?

19. And wouldn't it likely start off as a means of survival in the earliest, most simple biological organisms capable of such stimulation, and then evolve to include things that made us happy, sad etc as we continuously became aware of new, more complex stimuli?

20. And wouldn't it then develop beyond a means of survival and personal pleasures/sorrows as the organisms themselves became more complex, allowing for the development of simple and complex social and relationship dynamics by being able to express these internal emotions externally for things such as communication, bonding, love et al?

21. Meaning emotions and feelings were more than just something practical – they grew to become a utility that could help do more than just ensure the survival of a species from the perspectives of both avoiding danger and reproduction, allowing us to live a diversified existence in which we can have both positive and negative experiences that have nothing to do with the general raison d'être of living organisms, such as enjoying certain genres of music while hating others – neither of which has any bearing on our survival, no?

22. Doesn't everything stated here then show that the hard problem of consciousness can be practically solved within the realm of current empirical knowledge across several fields – neuroscience, electrical/electronic engineering, genomics, evolutionary biology, combinatorics, probability, and psychology – as well as observable reality, explaining the phenomena that the problem refers to as a direct result of the physical and biological operations of a human without any reliance on philosophical notions?

Section 7: Self Awareness

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

23. Finally, let's look at achieving the foundation of self-awareness from which all more advanced relative abilities stem – the ability for a person to recognise themselves as a separate system from all others. We have to treat this as a logic puzzle because neurons don't operate the way electrical signals do where they are forced to respond to the nature of their own existence – *moving* – so we're going to do it based on what we know to be true about how both neurons and babies learn. Imagine this:

A baby sees its mother touch its hand. Electrical signals are sent from hand to brain. It reacts internally. It then sees its mother touch the table, but doesn't experience the same stimulation and internal reactions as when it was touched. With the natural ability of neurons to learn, and how we know babies learn through observation and experimentation,

wouldn't logic dictate that making this same type of observation enough times physically teaches the neurons which objects, when touched, cause them to be stimulated and which objects do not?

24. And with repeated tactile stimulation to different areas via everything from parental touching, to clothing touching, to the wind blowing, wouldn't neurons map the boundaries of their own physical system – the human body – and therefore be able to identify where it ends?

25. And with its physical body mapped out, it begins to learn to control its movement. Upon figuring out not only its own physical boundaries, but also the extent of the system over which it has physical control, wouldn't logic dictate that this naturally makes it *aware* of the system in which it exists – its 'self' – separate from other systems it cannot map and control, as well as being aware of and in control of its own thoughts, given that it would need to know which thoughts to initiate in order to execute intentional – not reflexive – movements, all of which lays the foundation for more advanced relative cognitive abilities, such as the ability to recognise one's own reflection which relies on the understanding that they can only control their own system, and so when they observe a second system mimicking their movements precisely – speed, direction, action – they understand they must somehow be observing their own system?

Section 8: Beyond Current AI

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

26. Based on all of this, if an AI system:
    - has the ability to take in information;
    - has a neural network with its own realistically unique neural pattern;
    - has methods which independently control and alter signals of an observation based on its own neural pattern;
    - has methods which independently control and alter signals of an observation using different degrees of stimulation which are based on physical properties of the observation, such as brightness, contrast, pitch et al;
    - generates opinion signals based on observation signals;
    - has an emotional state-based internal reaction system that is stimulated by and changed based on the opinion signals;
    - communicates based upon that internal reaction system;
    - follows the same "observation > opinion > reaction > communication" general data flow;
    - has the ability to learn and store information about concepts;
    - has the ability to store information about experiences;
    - has the ability to recall information;
    - has the ability to behave based on recalled information; and
    - has the ability to change its neural patterns and resulting opinion signals based on experiences and learning;
    would this AI be said to meet the requirements of artificially-created subjective experiences by emulating the functions of the human brain that we have established, within the framework of this document, are required for the function within a human but in a machine-possible way?

27. If an AI system:
    - registers its own system as the recipient of tactile stimulation;
    - can initiate thoughts to control its own system;
    - operates independently of any other similar system, the same way one human brain operates independently of another human brain;
    - and understands when it is the reference of words such as "I" and "you" when they are spoken by others;
    would this AI be said to meet the requirements of artificially-created self-awareness by emulating the functions of the human brain that we have established, within the framework of this document, are required for the function within a human but in a machine-possible way?

28. Would this AI then be said to meet the requirements of being artificially conscious – having objectively subjective experiences and being self-aware – according to the same empirical logic applied to humans, functioning in the same manner as that of humans, except from a non-biological, machine-possible basis, emulating – not simulating – the forced physical dynamics of electrical signals and the functions of the human brain required to achieve human-level consciousness since it is only copying the mechanisms of the brain to achieve the same outcome instead of recreating

the brain's appearance and feel via simulation, given that the signal, process, and outcome are specifically relative to only the individual system in question?

29. Let's do a test comparison using physical pain. Pain is clinically defined as an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience. The actual feeling of pain is the result of the brain receiving physical sensation signals from a specific nerve type (nociceptor) which stimulate the pain processing part of the brain beyond a threshold and causing a negative internal state reaction accompanied by an unpleasant sensation – a process which can be fleeting or can continue to occur for an undefined period of time, prolonging the unpleasantness, after the triggering stimulus is no longer present. Thresholds are relative to an individual, which is why different people can feel different degrees of pain (if any at all) and react differently even when observing the exact same degree of pressure to cause the initial stimulation. This means that, both physically and biologically, the foundation of pain as a system is a signal-threshold crossing which results in negative internal state changing (the unpleasant emotional experience) and physical sensations (the unpleasant sensory experience) – a system in which the threshold can be modified.

If an AI system is given a pain threshold and is physically stimulated enough to create sensation signals beyond the threshold, the result of the signals breaking the threshold is the internal reaction system being stimulated in a negative way (unpleasant sensory experience) and producing a negative response (unpleasant emotional experience), and this process has the potential to continue in the absence of the triggering stimulus for an undefined period of time, wouldn't the AI have experienced pain in a way parallel to that of a human – the interpretation of, measurement of, and reaction to physical stimulation electrical signals which result in unpleasantness – just without the additional physiological responses biological systems employ for things such as mitigating and healing pain, proving that such emulation constitutes actual pain, just via machine-possible means, hence 'artificial'?

30. And wouldn't two AI systems with different pain thresholds then be able to have subjective experiences of pain?

31. Wouldn't it then be safe to say that the key to advancing AI systems of today beyond the point of logical functions that fundamentally rely on probability is found in the one component of nature shared by both humans and machines – electrical signals – and how they are programmed to be manipulated based on neural patterns – not necessarily by changing a signal's physical properties, but by changing whatever is used as a store of observation value – prior to the observation value being interpreted and processed independently for individual systems and for various types of observation from which all other functions relying on personal experiences immediately or eventually stem, evidenced by the fact that empirical data shows that this is how it works in humans?

Section 9: Significance

[AXIOM CONTINUITY]

32. How significant is this in solving consciousness, developing artificial consciousness, and creating an artificial general intelligence system that not only scales its intelligence vertically, but scales its capabilities laterally based on the ability to have and act based on opinions? Can it be used to solve consciousness from a scientific, real world viewpoint, explain the creation of artificial consciousness, and set the playing field for the development of 'True Artificial General Intelligence' – not AI systems which are marketed as such for being elite task performers with great communication skills, but systems which genuinely exhibit everything from minor abilities, such as picking a favourite colour, to raison d'être defining abilities, such as engaging in one's own personal life pursuits based on their own desires? Be as elaborate as you need to be.

33. If you've made it this far and have answered all the questions, doesn't it mean one thing – the entirety of the framework for both biological and artificial consciousness is grounded in already established science, avoiding philosophy, abstraction, and false premises at every point, making it implicitly axiomatic?
    - The science used here has been experimentally validated for centuries.
    - It also underpins modern society when it comes to medicine and the technology we use daily.
    - There's no guess work involved – no one needs to use elements of the unknown or unprovable to bridge logical gaps.
    - The logic can be tested and modelled in a myriad of ways, including in a simple form on paper using nothing but numbers for synaptic values and different quantities of numbers to display how many transmissions occurred, where unique permutations show how the same input can result in both the same output and outputs which vary to any

degree.

- Most importantly, falsifying the framework requires you to break not only multiple established laws of physics and nature, but also deny basic mathematics and ignore observed reality.

Take into account other theories of consciousness – does this clearly and cleanly set it apart from them and, if so, how? Show a direct comparison between this and each of the other leading theories.