

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

IN TWELVE PARTS

Ingo Swann (21Jan97)

INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION

The materials in the following twelve essays will help introduce a category of topics that need to be considered as preventing or defeating understanding that would lead toward the activation of at least some of the superpower faculties.

*

All of the topics discussed in this category were discovered to be structurally important within the psychoenergetics project at Stanford Research Institute which endured from 1972 through 1985 -- and I have worked toward fleshing them out since then.

Most of the topics were brought together as early as 1979 in a rather extensive paper requested by the principal leadership of one of the agencies that funded the project.

*

The identification of the topics that resulted in the extensive report was provided to answer a two-part question posed by the funding agencies, but which never before had been addressed.

1. Are there any factors that PREVENT the development and realization of the superpowers?
2. And if so, what are they?

These questions had come about because of earlier efforts at various institutions to test advertised developmental (or enhancing) methodologies, but which efforts had ended up with insignificant results.

*

The urge to enhance or learn or discover is always very strong, especially within the cultures of the modern West, since these are learning cultures whose basic premises regarding progress are based in organized educational methodologies. This is the "you can do it if you learn how" kind of thing.

*

However, various areas of potential learning don't respond very well to this positivistic approach. And in general, learning how to "become psychic" constitutes one of these non-responsive areas. This statement needs quickly to be quickly qualified, however.

*

The existence of "natural psychics," as it were, can be documented quite easily, as can occasional Psi experiencing among the broad populations in general.

However, how and why, and what internal factors result in natural Psi capabilities within given individuals have not been isolated or comprehended, even though a tremendous effort to do so has been attempted several times in at least five major nations, and several minor ones.

Thus, the general idea circulated in the public that such attempts have never taken place is not true -- and in fact never will be true, since it is acknowledged behind the scenes that such "powers" exist in our species, although latently so.

*

Thus, the existence of natural psychics, some of them very good at what they do, is not an issue in these database documents, and nothing in this database should be misconstrued as prejudicial to them.

*

However, social issues that arise because of their existence can be an issue, at least in terms of social tolerance or intolerance toward them and what they are representative of because of their natural abilities.

*

In any event, if a positivistic approach toward "learning how to" yields little in the way of progress, then it is quite justifiable to begin considering the possibility that unidentified deterrents may be present, and be stronger than expected.

The theory here is that once the preventing factors are identified and, well, "removed," it should become possible to better isolate and work with the key structural elements of the superpowers themselves.

To be clear here, the idea is this: OK, if we can't get it to work, let's shift focus to what's keeping it from working.

*

It was found that a very large portion of the preventing factors were social or sociological in origin. And as such, the preventing factors were embedded in the consensus realities that characterized the social or sociological environments to which individuals had adapted.

Most of the preventing factors could be equated with information processing viruses that became cloned in members of a given society or social sub-grouping, and which thereafter distort or negate mental information processing grids at the individual level.

*

It can be thought, then, that natural psychics somehow escape such negating factors, whatever they may consist of, and so presumably early in life -- or perhaps undergo a Metanoia shift later on (Metanoia being a topic of one of the essays ahead.)

*

As the preventing factors were isolated and took on visibility and understanding, a number of unexpected developmental fall-outs resulted.

Major among these fall-outs was that the superpower faculties apparently, and automatically, commence better functioning to the degree that the preventing factors are identified and understood.

*

The evidence regarding this more than suggested that once the mental information processing viruses, and their origins, are understood as such, they cease their deterrent functioning within the entire sensorium systems.

It would appear, then, that the entire sensorium systems undergo MICRO-CHANGES OF STATE once the information viruses are deactivated.

*

The change-of-state phenomena are consistent with the ancient Greek concept of METANOIA -- translated into English as when the brain-mind suddenly shifts from a lower to a higher condition of functioning.

*

In any event, it is quite logical and rational to assume that when information viruses are deactivated within given information processing systems, then something IS going to happen along the lines of enhancing those systems. In this sense, "enhancing" would imply restoration of processes which had been depressed or distorted by the viruses.

*

The human biomind almost certainly IS an information processing system -- rather, is an interlocking, interdependent series of them.

*

The most expedient and direct way to deactivate information processing viruses is simply to beat them to death.

*

This seems to be the case for two basic reasons:

1. that the viruses, once transmitted and cloned into individuals, are highly resistant to change of any kind; and
2. that to begin with they are invisible within cognitive systems that contain them, and so it is difficult to spot them via of cognitive introspection and "self-discovery."

*

One very expeditious way to beat an information processing virus to death is to cease processing information through it, or to construct new pathways around it.

*

Now, to move expeditiously on and to begin the beating-to-death process, in this database the phrase "How can I learn to become more psychic," is permanently replaced by the more effective concept of "ACTIVATING the superpower FACULTIES of the human biomind."

*

The term PSYCHIC will be utilized only with regard to dipping back into those consensus realities which have adapted to that term.

*

Gradually, all other psychic or parapsychological nomenclature that has any viral-like nature will be ejected -- and replaced with concept-nomenclature more appropriate to the superpower processes themselves.

In all cases, evidence and rationales will be fully and openly presented and discussed, even though there is the possibility of putting some readers to sleep.

Some of the evidence and rationales opened up in the essays ahead are complex. I'll do my best to make it generally accessible, but will not simplify or over-simplify it -- because over-simplification can easily act as an information processing virus.

*

As has been noted in other essays, the superpowers can be thought of as existing not because of psychics per se, but because a variety of the faculties spontaneously function in a very large number of people who don't believe they are "psychic." The manifestations might be temporary, as they usually are within the species populations in general.

*

Statistically speaking, the information processing grids of only an extremely small percentage of the human population are structured and organized in such a way as to permit more or less continuous performance of this or that superpower faculty. And even in the case of most natural psychics, they are limited regarding the larger spectrum that the sum of the superpower faculties seem to represent -- while many faculties along this spectrum have not been conceptualized or discovered.

*

Naturally psychic people are called psychics, seers, shamans, clairvoyants, and etc., and they are treated according to the social environments in which they dwell.

*

But about 90 per cent of all human populations occasionally experience a superpower manifestation of some kind, and then usually within some kind of emergency necessity or as a result of deep, concerted thinking about something that has taken on extraordinary meaning or importance for them.

*

Theoretically speaking, then, it can be assumed that the superpower faculties exist within our species since their spontaneous manifestations occur far and wide, in all cultures, and throughout our species history.

*

It is because of the continuous historical presence of the manifesting faculties that we can conclude justifiably that the superpowers are as old as is our species.

*

Their existence, then, pre-dates any subsequent social treatment of them, and pre-dates as well the very many conceptual treatments of them that have come and gone through the centuries and the many social enclaves that also have come and gone.

*

This may explain one consistent phenomenon regarding the appearance of superpower functioning among children before they have become fully adapted to their social environment programming and the transmission of information processing viruses within that programming.

*

Accordingly, and if only for purposes of theoretical speculating, it can be postulated that the most effective way of activating one's own faculties is to study the actual nature of the faculties at the species level, not at the individual or within the socio-cultural levels.

*

The functional reason for this SHIFT OF FOCUS is that the superpowers are treated and thought of in different ways with regard to individuals, social groups and sub-groups, cultures, nations, educational adaptations, and so forth.

Few of these ways are consistent with another.

In any event, the different ways are constituted more of sociological parameters, most of which divert (or can destroy) direct cognitive approach to the faculties.

*

At this point, it is somewhat mandatory to introduce the conundrum of social tolerance versus intolerance toward the superpowers.

*

Archaeological, historical and anthropological evidence is very strong regarding the high tolerance of the superpowers among ancient cultures.

This tolerance must have been based on knowledge of the superpowers, a knowledge via which the superpowers were EXPECTED to emerge at least within a certain percentage of people.

This knowledge, whatever it consisted of, has become lost, distorted, degraded, mythologized, or oversimplified.

*

Lost also are the consensus reality structures which encompassed the knowledge and must have in fact stimulated it into existence.

It is highly improbable that the lost knowledge can be reconstructed or reconstituted within the constraints of modern consensus realities.

We, therefore, are largely on our own -- with the exception of discovering contemporary concepts which correspond to the ancient ones. The difficulty here is that the nomenclature utilized will probably be radically different.

*

In any event, in earlier cultures the expected activation of the superpowers (at least in some form) was accepted when it did occur, and the high frequency of the occurring often needed institutional formats to manage it -- such as the seer systems of ancient Egypt, Greece, India, Persia, China, the Amerindian cultures, etc.

Thus, the ancient cultures of our species are particularly littered with evidence that if tolerance for the superpower exists, then they do manifest on a higher rate of frequency.

*

On the other hand, social parameters that are intolerant of the superpowers would not only suppress the frequency of superpower emergence, but would confuse the important issues involved so that cognitive functioning of the faculties would become difficult, or not possible.

*

But even so, such social parameters of intolerance could not erase the faculties themselves, since these appear to be a continuous endowment of the species rather than of any given social or psychological parameters.

*

Thus, various of the superpowers continue to emerge spontaneously even within social vectors that are intolerant of them.

*

Persons who for some reason have acquired various types of cognitive interaction with THEIR

superpower faculties can be called "a psychic," as they are in English. But in other cultures they are, and have been called by a number of other identifiers, meaning that they have been conceptualized differently.

*

And it is here that we can meet with a staggering problem most are unaware of, but which is one of the most important problems regarding ever achieving any real understanding not only of the species superpower faculties, but of all our species faculties including those which produce "creativity."

*

In explaining the nature of this great problem, the blunt fact of the matter is that different conceptualizations lead to and yield different results -- while some conceptualizations don't yield any results if they are off the mark regarding what is being conceptualized.

*

Different conceptualizations also lead to different expectations, and to different predictions not only regarding results, but regarding what is or is not needed, or required to obtain the results.

*

A conceptualization is a MODEL which people utilize as a basis for their think-functioning, and also use to interpret or judge the same regarding others.

*

It then must follow that a number of different specimens of our species who are adapted to a variety of different conceptualizations will comprehend, interpret or judge a given superpower phenomenon in a variety of different ways.

It will also be found that the different concepts extruding from the different models will be exceedingly hard to correlate.

*

Thus, if we attempt to look at the superpower faculties through our models and concepts, we will achieve only what our concepts permit. And whatever THAT is probably will not correlate with conceptualizations of others.

*

What is being emphasized via the above is that individual and social conceptualizations govern the mental lenses THROUGH WHICH the most visible of the superpower phenomena are judged in turn.

*

It is very important here to emphasize that hardly anyone ever "sees" the superphenomena directly and purely, so to speak.

What IS actually seen are (1) the phenomena, PLUS (2) the concepts through which they have been filtered, with the sum being 3, the combined result of $1 + 2$.

In this sense, then, $1 + 2 = 3$ whatever that may be. And 3 is more likely to be composed more of 2 than of 1.

*

It is almost certain that the phenomena will be reduced or altered to fit the conceptual lenses through which they are being viewed, judged or "understood." And direct experimental evidence accumulated over a long period of time shows that FUNCTIONING will correspond more with 2 than 1.

*

As will be discussed (rather endlessly) in this series of essays, the English identifier "a psychic" is a difficult and usually foggy conceptualization because those utilizing it are usually doing so as a label or a stereotype -- without understanding that the label itself will not reveal much about the functions behind it, save perhaps to say that THOSE functions are "psychic" ones, too.

The same was and is also true of the labels of seer, shaman, soothsayer, oracle, clairvoyant and so forth.

*

In other words, the way we refer to an individual who has achieved some kind of cognitive contact with THEIR arrangement of the superpower faculties, well, the referent itself tells us nothing about the functioning processes involved.

*

Throughout my years, it has been my good fortune to have met a fairly large number of "natural psychics," and I developed long-term associations with some of them. I was very impressed with their "products," and I tend to hold "natural psychic talent" in high esteem.

*

But, and as in my own case, all but three of them resented being called "a psychic," and usually for one

or both of two reasons.

It denied them their individuality, i.e., depersonalized them by lumping them together with all "psychics" -- whether real, questionable, idiotic, stupid, money-grubbing or ego-mongering.

The other general reason was that everyone has their own idea of what "a psychic" is, must or should be -- and so each person has different expectations, values, and judgments about "a psychic."

*

There is nothing worse than being caused, as a discrete individual, to disappear behind a stereotyping label -- and for no other reason than its widespread social usage as a pidgin-hole identifier.

*

Now, there is always a real person behind such a label, and so I can tell you that all of the "psychics" I had the good fortune to meet were exceedingly different from one another.

*

The individuals I've met and who did claim the identity of "a psychic" did so because they gave "readings" to public clients who paid for the readings.

Generally speaking, the public expect psychics to be, well, PSYCHIC, and will not pay anyone for a reading who is not identified as one. But this involves entrepreneurial economics, a topic which is not relevant to this database. However, I HAVE encountered some rather good "psychic readers," for example, a tea-cup reader in a sleazy club but who blew me away.

*

Now, a CONCEPT which has achieved broad stereotype usage usually acts as a pidgin-hole identifier, even though it applies to something other than a person. What's behind the label-concept can disappear, even if we know what we think we have identified by utilizing the label-concept.

"Ah, yes," I've often heard it said, "that [phenomenon or experience] MUST be psychic."

People do say this, you know. But if you ask them the details of what they are talking about, things usually drift off into a cloying ambiguity.

*

The fact that different people, cultural groupings, nations, etc., assign an identifier to individuals who demonstrate this or that type of superpower functioning, well this is a reductionist SOCIAL function, not an investigative one.

But the actual process-functions of the superpower faculties can ALSO disappear behind concepts that have merely become social stereotype concepts.

*

One of the more informative things about the superpower faculties being a species thing is that people who spontaneously experience and report them tend, in their "raw" narratives, to describe them in nearly identical ways, no matter what their cultural or environmental backgrounds might be. However, WHAT they say they have experienced is then subjected to social conceptualizing patterns. The concepts and nomenclature used by the social process are assigned to the raw reports of the experiencers.

*

I like to use the term "digested" here -- in that the raw narratives of the experiencers are digested by social processes. In this digesting, identifiers typically used in those processes are assigned, and thus everyone who uses the identifiers think they know what happened to the original experiencer. Accounts or interpretations of the raw experience are then based on the digested outputs, written up for others to read -- meaning that readers read the pre-digested forms. And since the readers, too, utilize the concept-identifiers, they end up thinking they understand what the original experiencer experienced.

*

Then, some few readers think they would like to "develop" the same experiential capacities, and so they utilize the pre-digested versions as their guidelines -- and tend to be a little disappointed when the "guidelines" don't produce much of anything. And which is to say, more or less, that nothing or little gets ACTIVATED in the way of superpower faculties which people nonetheless experience species-wide.

*

In Part Four ahead, under the topic of Information Theory, we will encounter an observation of one of the principal founders of the theory first published in 1948. This observation establishes that NONE OF US are free from entrapment in consensus realities of one kind or another. Although probably shocking at first take, this conclusion is firmly supported by semantic studies, linguistics and nomenclature analysis.

*

The conclusion is this: ". . . about half of the elements in writing or speaking are freely chosen, and the rest are required by the structure of the language." Those working in the discipline of semantic studies sometimes opine that the required elements constitute more than 50 per cent.

*

In any event, a large portion of the "required" elements, if not the whole of them, can be found to correspond with concept-nomenclature itself utilized as the basis for achieving consensus realities. If this concept-nomenclature is NOT utilized, then one might just as well be speaking the language of planet alpha-X in star system NYKD40.

*

The implication here is quite clear. If the concept-nomenclature of the "required elements" contains misconceptions no one realizes are misconceived, then these misconceptions will probably be cloned into all who utilize the required elements. And information mentally processed through or via those misconceptions surely results in some form of distortion no one realizes is a distortion.

*

The concept of ACTIVATING [something] is a particular challenge, especially when it is known to exist, but stubbornly refuses to get up and do its stuff -- because the wrong concepts are being used in the attempt to bring about activation. Expert problem solvers know there are two major routes to take: to learn how to activate it on the one hand, and to find out what's preventing it from activating on the other. You see, problems can be solved by learning how to solve them. This may or may not work. But problems can also be solved by finding out what's preventing their solution.

*

For reasons never made entirely clear to me, the majority put faith and trust in the learning-how-to method -- and where the superpower faculties are concerned, they have my best wishes.

*

On the other hand, spontaneous manifestations of the faculties have been around for a about six millennia. And very many ideas and concepts regarding how to "develop" them by learning-how-to methods have been tried down through the centuries. The major result here is that our species, although possessed of the faculties, is today not yet swarming with those faculties in activated forms.

*

So, the better part of valor is: if Plan A (learning-how-to-activate) doesn't seem to work all that well, let's move to Plan B (learning-what-prevents-the-activation.)

*

Organized psychical research was first established and undertaken in 1882, but was displaced during the 1930s by the emergence of parapsychology. While these two entities are generally considered the same or similar, they are distinct because their central theories and methodologies differed.

But both established concept-nomenclature that became utilized in general, and which contributed what turned into the consensus-reality nomenclature utilized almost worldwide. Thus, when anyone speaks or writes about "paranormal phenomena," so-called, the concept-nomenclature of the two fields falls into the category of "required elements."

In other words, we are obliged to utilize the concept-nomenclature of those two fields, or no one will know what we are talking about.

*

A full part of the resulting problems is that both psychical research and parapsychology evolved as rejected sciences, with the result that they were ghettoized within the much larger scenarios of the other developing sciences.

Any collective that is ghettoized usually introverts into its own ways and means, into its own concepts and understanding -- and this usually reinforces and solidifies the contours of the ghettoization rather than ameliorating them.

*

Once the contours have become solidified, a two-way exchange of information and concepts between the ghetto and the larger scenarios is usually unlikely.

This is to say that conceptual information, developments and discoveries in the ghetto and in the larger scenarios are not likely to be exchanged or correlated.

*

The basic reason is that if the exchange, if it took place, would tend to dissolve the ghetto contours resulting in some kind of integration. This integration is usually desired by the ghettoized populations, but is also usually rejected by the larger scenarios which brought about the ghettoization.

The overall result ends up as some kind of a stand-off. But this is not the end of the story.

*

All intrusions from the ghetto into the larger scenarios are defensively repulsed by forces within the latter, since those intrusions are seen within the larger scenarios as virus-like in nature.

This is to say that the intrusions will be interpreted as undermining the consensus realities of the larger scenarios that brought about the ghettoizing in the first place.

*

Collective Psi research has produced the concepts and nomenclature utilized by the public and media, and various generalized consensus realities have been formatted around them. The public of course realizes there is an on-going fracas between Psi research and science proper. But what is not generally visible is how the on-going fracas is maintained and kept ongoing.

*

On the part of science proper, the fracas is maintained by sanitizing proper science of all concepts and nomenclature emanating from ghettoized Psi research. That this sanitizing is possible, much less enforced, may seem unreal to the public. But then the public usually does not consume hundreds of scientific papers. And it is only by doing so that one can realize the complete absence of Psi nomenclature in them. Further, although some of those aspiring to find a place in proper science might wish to consider the contents and implications of Psi research, they can do so only privately and quietly. Any open consideration will end up in some kind of career disaster for them.

*

The dimensions of the fracas are maintained on the part of ghettoized Psi research for reasons that are a little more complicated. But the complexities can be summarized as the tendency to introvert into one's own basic operating realities, and which are maintained within the intra-ghettoized system because they seem meaningful and appropriate to the core work of that system. The basic operating realities of the core work are rooted in concepts and nomenclature appropriate to them, and thus constitute the consensus realities within the ghetto.

*

Via these mutual defensive methods on both sides, an information exchange barrier takes shape between the two parties of the stand-off. Psi research will not "go away," largely because aspects or elements of it are experienced on a worldwide basis. Yet Psi research cannot be admitted into science proper -- without the cost of dis-establishing some of its own fundamental, conceptual constructs. And it is this "complaint" I, personally, have been directly apprised of by a number of eminent scientists who have dared to talk with me. The same complaint, however, has often been seen in print.

*

Now, there has been a significant point in reviewing these certain aspects of the stand-off, a point that has required the format and contexts of the foregoing descriptions.

*

This important point has to do with the information-exchange barrier between science proper and the bad-child ghettoized in its scientifically isolated playpen. The organized ghettoization of Psi research was in effect as early as the 1890s, and has been maintained ever since, along with the information-exchange barrier. Psi research and science proper have thus evolved along their own pathways, and have remained divided with respect to the information-exchange barrier. In other words, we are talking about a barrier that, if wobbly at times, has endured for at least a hundred years. And this, in my sardonic opinion, is one of the silliest things ever, especially in Western democratic cultures where freedom of information is considered a fundamental, inalienable right.

*

In any event, the maintenance of the information-exchange barrier has worked to make it nearly impossible to correlate advances in science proper with advances in Psi research -- and which advances are applicable to each other. And these advances remain divided because in the two sides of the stand-off they have been arrived at via different theoretical and conceptual approaches -- and which are identified by nomenclature so radically different that it is extremely difficult to see any relationship between them.

*

As but one example of many, information theory and the basic concepts of information transfer (which ushered in the overwhelmingly powerful Age of Information) became available in 1948, nearly forty years ago.

*

Yet, the fact that so-called "clairvoyance," "telepathy," and "remote viewing" are, at base, problems of information transfer seems to have dawned neither on Psi researcher nor proper scientists. And so Psi researchers in general have not adapted to information theory precepts, while science proper never has adapted to precepts of clairvoyance, etc., no matter the gargantuan, well-documented evidence for it. And the public in general is totally unaware of anything in this regard.

*

In the essays now to follow, I will discuss WHY activation of any of the superpowers is unlikely UNLESS they are first and foremost conceptualized as INFORMATION TRANSFER situations.

It will also be discussed that the superpowers are matters of PERCEPTION only in some secondary or third sense -- in that in proper science it is now understood without question or challenge that perception itself is a matter of information flow and transfer.

*

It then must follow that any conceptualization and nomenclature for it that is not based in the now-understood nature of information and its transfer processes will act as mental processing virus deterrents.

*

But there are numerous other deterrents as well, and it is the most notable, and most easily identifiable of these which now constitute the topics of all of the following essays.

(End of Introduction)

TOWARD ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (22Jan97)

PART 1:

NON-CONSCIOUS PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL CONSENSUS REALITIES

There's a good chance I'll flub the message and the "text" of this particular essay -- the MESSAGE being whatever you can make out of the words; the TEXT being what is not put into words, but is being said anyway, the sort of read-between-the-lines thing.

But if I flub, there are two good reasons: We all are "victims" of the consensus realities among which we live; and it is necessary to utilize consensus reality concepts and nomenclature of the consensus reality in order to talk about it. So, plop! One ends up back in it.

*

However, consensus-reality formation, and thinking with or via its contexts, patterns, concepts, ideas and nomenclature, constitute the single biggest deterrent with regard to activating any of the superpowers.

Everyone of course has some idea about what a consensus reality is, if only from their mindset perspectives. But the idea is usually vague, and even so most feel they are free of consensus reality influences.

*

Allowing for differences at the individual level, the general consensus about consensus realities seems to be that they involve the majority who have trouble thinking for themselves and thus ape or imitate each other. But we, ourselves, are not like that, and even if influenced by consensus realities, we can escape from them any time we want.

After all, we are individuals with freedom of thought and choice, right?

Well, not if the language you are using is the same as the one the consensus reality is using. For when

you speak or read the language and words the consensus reality is using, you are actually participating in the consensus reality format.

*

Before getting into what follows, I must alert you that it will appear I'm being very negative and condemnatory about consensus realities, and am probably targeting specific ones.

Well, nothing of the kind is the case.

Although I may be in error so far as I understand them, the manufacturing of consensus realities is an ongoing artifact of our species which needs to fabricate thinking patterns that make community possible. So, not only are consensus realities NECESSARY, they are here to stay as long as specimens of our species are group-minded and interdependent.

Aside from the above disclaimer, I love to wallow within this or that consensus reality, simply to exercise my curiosity.

*

It will be obvious to just about everyone that consensus realities are always SOCIAL consensus realities, and that they can contain factors that boost any number of activities. But it is well known that they can prevent or deter any number of activities also. These deterring factors can be overt. Or they can be subtle and merely implicit. And they can have nearly invisible spin-offs. The deterring factors can also emanate from misconceptions not realized as such.

*

Social consensus realities are perpetuated by cloning their basic concepts into others via association with them, or by the tried and trusted method of educating, conditioning, convincing, or propagandizing. But the single, surest method of the cloning is one few could imagine -- language itself. For when one learns language, one learns its nomenclature PLUS the meanings assigned to it BY the consensus reality that determines what the meanings are.

*

With this prelude having been stated, here we go into a topic that is flubbable no matter who addresses it.

Major Characteristics of A Consensus Reality

In sociology, a **SOCIAL CONSENSUS REALITY** refers to what the greatest number of people (i.e., the consensus majority) think or believe is real.

*

A general consensus reality should be distinguished from mindsets, in that a given consensus reality can contain any number of mindsets, right down to and inclusive of the individual level.

Mindsets are more likely to be found among social sub-groups formed of individuals whose "inclinations" are compatible with those of the others. Mindset groups can indeed form their own particular consensus realities, but these are "local" to the group and seldom achieve a general universality.

*

Although proper science considers it to be a mindset of fools, the "field" of parapsychology possesses a general consensus reality, but also a number of contrasting mindset groups within it.

This social arrangement is true almost everywhere and regarding all activities.

*

The usual result of a consensus reality formation is that what the consensus thinks is real takes on some kind of stability, often becoming immovable, enduring, habitual, unquestioned and cement-like -- and thus exhibiting various degrees of resistance to any kind of alteration or change.

Even if things are not all that stable, what is more or less an illusion of it serves the purpose of making community possible and maintainable. The other option is what people refer to as "chaos."

*

Consensus reality formation seems to be a trait of our species as a whole, for consensus realities are everywhere formed -- and usually perpetuated to their last gasp, especially if they have become "prevailing" ones. The length of their prevail reinforces the idea of their correctness and efficiency.

*

Much can be said for and against consensus reality formations, usually without getting anywhere in the longer run of things.

On the favorable side, it is obvious that consensus reality formation is **THE** basis for social coherency. But somewhat on the questionable side is that social consensus realities are utilized to beat up on the social consensus realities of others' groups -- often with the result that members of two consensus reality groupings, neither of which have **ANY** hold on real realities, can mess around with each other in rather deplorable ways.

*

Consensus reality formations are so complicated that I personally would like to lift the panorama of the superpowers up and out of them altogether.

But this cannot be done, for reasons that ahead will be torn apart and beat up on.

The Relationship of Consensus Realities to the Superpower Faculties

There are THREE major reasons why the superpower faculties cannot be lifted up and out of consensus realities:

1. Such realities are everywhere, and the thinking-apparatus of each and everyone of us is linked into a variety of them. The link may be because of educational programming, but if not that then at least via language and nomenclature.
2. Many of the concepts that characterize a given consensus reality act as deterrents, sometimes permanent, to the activation of the faculties, and without much conscious awareness on our parts that they do so.
3. The THIRD reason mentioned here, but which will be discussed ahead in the second essay is "mental information processing viruses." This third reason is the most powerful -- and unavoidable -- of all. And it is THIS reason which, in my opinion, necessitates this somewhat over-long and possibly tiring essay.

*

Thus, anyone who might chance to want to activate their superpower faculties is obliged, without question, without release, to turn rather exacting attention to consensus realities (yes, you can take a deep sigh if you want).

These might at first seem very far removed from anything to do with the superpower faculties. But the two are right up next and against each other, no farther apart than two sides of a coin.

*

Now, any examination of consensus realities tends to be quite boring, complicated and thorny. So, to get into this I'll do my best to hack a path with the hope it won't immediately get filled in behind me merely because of boredom.

Two Typical Questions

Since the onset of my participation in research in 1971, I've found that people most frequently ask one or both of two questions. And since the inauguration of this website database, and the enormous amount of gratifying email resulting, the same two questions are still those most frequently asked:

1. What can one read to understand more about the superpowers? and
2. Are there any (inexpensive) documents, books or courses one can utilize as sources for self-development procedures?

*

Not long after this website got underway, I decided to address these questions in an essay. But I soon got bogged down -- because there simply was too much to put into it by way of preparing the reader for comprehension.

*

For example, the consensus realities regarding psychic stuff are relatively antiquated. Some, but not all, of the most important concepts applied are either misconceived or are ambiguous. The consensus reality does not notice the misconceptions. Ambiguity might serve for easy and superficial think, but is not constructive otherwise.

*

But most importantly, significant discoveries in other branches of science have been made during the last thirty years, discoveries that are entirely relevant not only within those other branches, but to the overall situation psychic problems represent.

Yet these new discoveries have not been transferred into Psi research, while the other branches of science haven't made the connection either. If these new discoveries are integrated into Psi research, then the entire conceptual basis of that research will have to undergo radical shifts. But this will also mean that consensus reality formation regarding Psi will have to undergo radical reconceptualizing.

*

For example, the signal-to-noise-ratio concept has been in existence for a number of decades, but never applied with gusto to Psi "perceptions." And indeed, those "perceptions" cannot be fully understood without that concept.

Thus, in order to prepare the reader for THIS series of essays, I elected to introduce into this database essays focusing on important information not contained in the consensus realities regarding Psi stuff.

And so you will find an essay regarding the signal-to-noise ratio already entered into this database, along with a number of other essays that expose and discuss important factors that are alien within the Psi consensus reality.

*

And here we encounter a tremendous, even over-sized situation which is intensely problematical in many ways.

*

The central fact regarding this situation is that if one wishes to discuss or communicate about something, anything, one has to do so via the use of concepts and words that stand a chance of being comprehended. In other words, one has to communicate via familiar contexts, not alien ones. The concepts and words best suited for speaking and writing within the familiarity are those that enjoy a large consensus reality about the topic of interest, and which is shared and sharable among the many who utilize the same language.

*

In this sense, then, concepts and words constitute the "currency" that is utilized in order to offer and obtain information. But the "currency" has to be standardized, recognizable and agreed upon.

*

As it happens, though, the larger this consensus reality, the smaller and smaller, and more simplified, are the number of concepts and terms that can be used. And as the number of sharable and familiar concepts DECREASE, many more complex concepts needed tend to become not just unintelligible, but absent altogether.

*

Another way of putting this, and as many editors and publishers have told me, is that one cannot talk above the heads of the mass market audience and hope to achieve a successful mass market book.

*

The above paragraph constitutes a consideration everyone seems to think is logical. And logical it is -- IF it regards only producing a mass-market book.

But in considering this, we can begin to see that one of the definitions of a general consensus reality has to do with the "mass-market" concept, in that a consensus reality becomes one by the increase of simplicity regarding fewer and fewer concepts, and not by the increase of number of them. The increase

of the number of concepts introduces prospects that might lead to social instability, and also introduces the likelihood that people won't understand them anyway.

*

You see, in order NOT to talk above the heads of the mass market or the mass consensus means that one has to utilize only those concepts and nomenclature most familiar to them.

*

In this sense, then, familiar and recognizable concepts PLUS nomenclature appropriate to them constitute the "currency" of the information exchange or transfer at the mass market, mass consensus level. But this also constitutes the concept-nomenclature basis of any language and which incorporates everyone who speaks it. And so the concept-nomenclature is the real basis for the "currency."

*

I have more faith in the understanding minds at the mass market level than publishers do. But none-the-less this rather naive publishing overview echoes something which IS true -- in that social consensus realities ARE tightly locked into and contained within familiar and recognizable concepts and nomenclature, and the more simplified or over-simplified they are the more widely recognized they become.

Stereotypes Within Consensus Realities

There is another difficulty that is always encountered in writing for consumption within the larger consensus reality. The larger the consensus reality, the more likely it is that what is traded as information packages among it will consist of over-simplified information packages, more commonly known as stereotypes.

There is a distinct deficit in this regard. Over-simplified information might not be information at all, but merely consist of fashionable, stereotype chit-chat which makes it easy to engage in conversation. This leaves people thinking they have "communicated." But over-simplified ideas and concepts are virtually value-less as information except within the over-simplified contexts in which they are used.

*

Individuals comprising a given consensus reality may have radical differences in the quantity of vocabulary at their disposal. But consensus realities are not formatted on the amount of vocabulary per se, but on simplified and simplifying concepts via which the majority can comprehend easier and faster.

The less one has to think, consider, and extrapolate, the better.

This, however, is not actually the fault of the individual. It is demanded by the social consensus reality, and the demand leads to adaptation of or the cloning of whatever is demanded.

*

If you feel bogged down by now, don't worry too much.

If you dig very deeply beneath their surfaces, consensus realities all tend to be swampy, and so it isn't your intelligence which has become boggy, it's the topic of this essay.

Questions Can Be Answered Only If the Answers Pre-Fit Into the Consensus Realities Within Which the Questions Have Been Formulated

In considering how the two most frequently-asked questions can be answered, I got the idea of asking those who asked them how **THEY** would answer them. Why, of course, they would direct the questioner to sources that would provide the information they are asking for.

In other words, the consensus reality within which the questions have been formulated seems to hold that one can turn to sources outside of themselves in order to obtain the information they are looking for. In the case of the superpower faculties, then, what is being sought, then, is outside information that will help "turn on" the faculties the questioners are interested in turning on.

*

This seems perfectly logical, doesn't it? Especially since all learning theories of the twentieth century have been mounted with exactly this in mind. And especially since there **ARE** a great number of things that can be learned via this approach.

And so there is a "prevailing" consensus reality that this is the way to go, and the predictive expectation is that with enough outside information acquired that information will rev up the abilities they are after.

*

However, there is a category of human activity that does not respond, at least on a one-to-one basis, to this "outside stimulation." For example, one can sometimes read all one wants about the creative processes -- and can even accumulate a vast expertise regarding what has been read and studied. But one's creative faculties can quite easily remain in a stupor or somnolent -- and so the activation of creative faculties is not really answerable within the learning-from-outside-sources stereotype.

*

And here is the very great contrast between "awakening" and merely reading-learning about a faculty. Indeed, creativity often "awakens" in those who never crack a book about how the creative processes function and don't even care about them.

*

The direct implication here is that certain faculties are self-starting in some kind of self-internal way while others respond to stimulation from outside sources. In this sense, the methods of the latter are not all that effective regarding the former.

Thus, we can rationally expect "enhancement" with regard to those faculties that do respond to stimulus from the outside, such as learning how to type. On the other hand, the self-starting faculties may be resistant to outside stimuli, no matter how much one slogs away with them.

*

Now, whether or not anyone has experienced any enhancement of their superpowers via or because of some kind of external stimulus is for them to say. My position in this regard is: if it works, go for it.

*

But the vast bulk of data in the collective archives of psychical and parapsychological research firmly establishes that hardly anyone developed significant abilities exclusively from outside stimuli. Indeed, most if not all natural psychics whose faculties endure over time will say that their faculties have occurred not because of any outside stimuli, but that they just "awakened" all by themselves.

*

In any event, and since the above is more or less the case, and also the confusion, I got to wondering why the dependency on outside stimuli has become so paramount, and why the concept of self-starting faculties is not active in our present consensus realities.

*

Now, this particular question fell within the boundaries and goals of the project I have referred to in the Introduction. And so the question was researched with some gusto.

*

With regard to the absence of self-starting faculties, an astonishing, but probable reason was found --

and this in turn shed light on the problem of learning only from outside sources. I'll be as brief as possible, but the details involved require an unavoidable length.

*

I'll begin simply by saying that the nineteenth century saw the greatest "outbreak" of "paranormal" phenomena ever directly recorded and documented by history.

Indeed, it was because of this outbreak, astonishing in all ways, that the first psychical research societies finally became organized to investigate "psychic phenomena." For anyone who wants to read up on this, and the history of the superpower phenomena in general, I recommend *Natural And Supernatural: A History of the Paranormal* by Brian Inglis (1977).

*

I'll next say that the outbreak dwindled into almost nothing after about 1920 -- even though the amount of information about "psychic" powers and abilities INCREASED many times over, and did so in organized ways.

To put this into perspective, we can say that the gross increased many times over, but the net in the twentieth century decreased beneath what it was in the nineteenth, the century when LESS information was available, and what there was of it was disorganized.

If you were an accountant, you would get alarmed and leave no stone unturned as to the reasons why.

*

I'll next state that my perhaps somewhat wobbly understanding of consensus realities led to the consideration that the consensus realities of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries might have something to do with all of this -- for consensus realities, although desirable in themselves, also contain deterrents with regard to which and what phenomena can emerge.

*

My general overview of the superpowers is that they are self-starting. So I looked into the nineteenth century for the existence of consensus realities that permitted and expected self-starting activity of any kind.

And then I looked into the consensus realities of the twentieth century for consensus realities that did not reflect the self-start concepts, and which advocated the outside stimulus kind of thing.

*

And you can believe it or not. The shift from self-start concepts to learn only from outside stimuli was found to involve only ONE WORD, but from which countless conceptual spin-offs arose.

*

ONE F-----G word, but one whose general consensus reality meaning in the nineteenth century shifted to the exact opposite in the twentieth.
And THAT word was

Dynamic

There is a great deal to be known about electricity, and all of which learning is compartmentalized and identified by a large assortment of terminology beginning with the prefix "electro."
But the largest consensus reality responds not to fifty-five terms beginning with "electro," but only to one which means "power," "energy," or "juice" to light up bulbs, or to activate something.

*

At the most over-simplified consensus reality, therefore, electricity, energy and "juice," are thought of as equivalents. But the source of electricity is a dynamo somewhere, and so energy-juice is obtained from an outside source.

*

This has led to the somewhat hidden consensus reality concept that it takes an outside source of energy to "energize" something, to turn it on, power it, juice it up, or to activate it.

*

And so in a simple, but social-consensus powerful way, people are always looking outside themselves for something to "turn them on," and the context and expectation revealed in this phrase is unmistakable.

*

If social consensus realities are based in recognizable concepts and nomenclature, then the going gets rough when there is an ABSENCE of needed concepts which exist outside of the parameters or boundaries of the consensus realities.

After all, there are many horrendous gaps in knowledge and which NEED new and/or different conceptualizations, even new nomenclature perhaps -- and which absent knowledge cannot really be comprehended by relying on existing concepts.

*

Absent knowledge might consist of knowledge that has not yet been discovered, or consist of knowledge that has not been simplified to enter into the consensus reality.

But another form of absent knowledge occurs when a nomenclature bit meant one thing in the past, but the meaning of which has somehow been converted into its exact opposite. In this case, the former meaning has become "absent."

*

For example, based on the all-available evidence, all life forms are self-starting, self-turning-on, and in their raw state don't really need outside energy to turn them on. Upkeep may demand energy from outside sources, but the essential life "thrust," so to speak is, by comparison, self-starting. Knowledge of how life forms START UP is completely absent in our knowledge pools. Food or nutrients are converted to growth and maintenance "energy," but the system that converts them belongs within the self-starting thing.

*

However, if the consensus reality into which one becomes immersed holds and, more importantly, SHARES the "reality" that one can do nothing without an outside energy stimulus, then that concept will be non-consciously cloned far and wide -- and the concept of self-starting will become devitalized and non-recognizable, even if one hears the words.

*

The vitalized and shared concept of self-start-up belongs to what might be called the Age of Dynamism which began roughly during the High Renaissance and dwindled into relative non-existence during the 1920s.

*

During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Dynamism was not yet associated with electricity or electrical power, but was a concept that belonged to VITALISM -- a concept-philosophy which held that all animate organisms are vitalized by a "life principle" distinct from psycho-chemical forces. The psycho-chemical forces were energy-expending forces, and so THEY needed outside sources of "fuel" that could be converted into it. But to the vitalists, the life principle was different in that it was interpreted as being self-animating, therefore self-powerful and self-starting as well.

*

The "animating" principle had to do with MOTION. Whatever had motion because of some self-contained interior set of factors was considered to have self-motion, and therefore was animate, an animate organism, a living organism. Any growth and development process of a living organism also

had motion, and so these processes were seen as animating motion, too.

Hence, the vitalists expected to find that the growth and development processes of the life principle would have structure and patterns of internal organization of their own.

These structure-patterns would be different from the structure-patterns of the psycho-chemical forces.

But it was expected that these self-vital patterns could be mapped much in the same way that the structure and patterns of the psycho-chemical forces were being mapped in the material sciences.

*

The term assigned to this life principle, self-vitalizing, self-motion kind of thing was DYNAMIC, most probably intended as an adverb or adjective.

The term DYNAMIC seems to have been introduced into German and English from the French DYNAMIQUE at about 1692, especially in the writings of Leibnitz.

The early conceptualizing meaning associated to it had to do with force-producing-motion in some kind of self-making sense, as contrasted to STATIC things that did not self-produce motion, but were inert or non-self-moving.

*

But the term DYNAMIC was derived from a Greek term, DYNA, and which referred to TO BE ABLE in a sense that was opposite to the Greek STATIKOS which meant NOT ABLE to be in SELF-MOTION.

Hence the English connotations of STATIC are motionlessness, stopped, non-changing, frozen up, or cement-like. Even today, TO BE ABLE is implicitly associated with motion, since what is motionless is not able.

*

To link DYNAMIC-STATIC to the superpower faculties, IF they belong in the self-start-up category, then they are dynamic. If they are not started up, then they are static, but for reasons that have prevented or deterred their starting up.

*

There is much justification for thinking about them this way, for when they occur spontaneously, they do so of their own accord. When we try to deal with them according to our intellectualizing will to do so, they stubbornly refuse to strut their stuff.

*

The only conclusion is that our intellectualizing about them is not consistent with their actual structure and functioning -- in which case the faculties just yawn and go back to sleep.

*

Additionally, when our intellectualizing faculties are drowsy, asleep or in some "altered state," we experience traces of the superpower faculties. Our intellectualizing will is principally formatted by consensus realities. Are you getting the bigger picture here? And an idea of why an examination of consensus realities, although boring in the extreme, is meaningful?

*

I've not been able to identify just when the term DYNAMISM came into full usage, probably somewhere between 1725 and 1800. In its original sense then, it referred to the philosophic-theory that sought to explain the phenomena of the universe by some immanent force or energy. IMMANENT means "inherent." INHERENT refers to self-containing, self-perpetuating, self-changing, self-processing, self-moving, self-motivating -- all in some kind of pre-existing way, and all without the need of any outside forces or energies.

*

In the sense of all the above, then, the vitalistic life principle was dynamic-active, defined as "self-full of power, or self-power" (sorry for the redundancy here.) And as such, it was marked by self-continuous, self-productive activity -- and that therefore all life forms were themselves internally dynamic-active in self-start-up kinds of ways.

*

The whole of this seems to have been broadly formulated into a consensus reality that "prevailed" during the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. THIS consensus reality seems to have produced innumerable conceptual spin-offs that justified individual self-starting activity of all kinds, since that activity was seen as inherently present within the remarkable human species -- and the universe as well.

*

For example, the maxims "rely on oneself" and "improve one's own mind by virtue of one's own dynamic-inherent factors to do so" belong to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. We retain the words today, but have lost their nineteenth century substance. These maxims are the famous "lift oneself by one's own boot straps" ideas. And those ideas and were very luminous during the nineteenth century, whose societies were just freshly released from the concepts of feudalism -- in which everyone was born into the status in which they were to live their life thenceforth without any hope of what we today call "upward mobility."

*

The boot-strap maxims were also entirely compatible with the fundamental concepts of capitalism -- the freedom of anyone to compete and make money who had the self-starting aptitudes to do so -- and to do so **WITHOUT** looking for outside guidance.

Indeed, although I'll paraphrase it for convenience here, many noted early capitalists have been noted to say something like: "Screw outside guidance, which, if followed, will doom one to poverty."

*

In other words, the general consensus realities of the nineteenth century were entirely saturated with self-dynamic concepts accompanied by an enormous variety of conceptual spin-offs. And historians have remarked on the sheer volume of discovery, creativity and inventions that were **TYPICAL** of that century.

The Destruction of the Consensus Reality Concept of Self-Dynamism

The concept of self-dynamism has not really been distorted at the individual level, of course, and many individuals today are self-made because of it.

But it has become considerably weakened in terms of general consensus realities -- especially during and after the 1920s when the concepts of **VITALISM** were wrecked and debunked as having no "scientific" or "philosophic" value.

One of the results of this wrecking was that the terms **DYNAMIC** and **DYNAMISM** became unfashionable and politically incorrect by the 1950s.

*

How this came about is a rather amusing sequence. But it's worth noting before going on that **IF** we can become fashion "victims," then we clearly can become victimized by general consensus realities.

*

The inverse of the concept of pre-existing, self-immanent, self-mobilizing dynamism would be the idea that one has to go outside oneself not only for energy, but for learning, guidance, and models regarding how to do something or anything.

In this sense, then, we would have to utilize outside sources with regard to shaping our own intellects -- this a factor which sucks one **INTO** consensus realities and often into a near complete cloning of them.

*

Shortly after 1831, a mechanism was invented that could convert mechanical energy into electricity. It was known as the GENERATOR, but was dubbed the DYNAMO.

However, a generator is not a self-dynamo strictly speaking, since IT needs an outside source of energy or motion in order to make its parts move and thus produce electricity. In this regard, a true dynamo would be the fabled perpetual motion machine which itself did not need outside power or fuel, but which none-the-less would produce electricity, etc.

*

One of the more amusing, but now forgotten, facets of the nineteenth century was that the terms GENERATE or GENERATION were a bit overloaded with consensus reality concepts having to do with procreation and SEX, SEX, SEX and the various formats of it -- this being one of the few areas of those nineteenth century consensus realities that did not permit much in the way of self-starting-up and self-realizing.

*

Serious public relations problems thus arose regarding the electric generator -- and it appears that these were quickly remedied by linking the machine to the concepts of dynamic and dynamism which the then-consensus-reality understood as self-productive of energy.

After a series of manufacturing failures and stock frauds, the Dynamo Corporation was formed and which dubbed generators as dynamos, a concept that detached from the sex connotations, fitted neatly with consensus realities regarding energy, and which aided in sales of the contraptions.

*

The inappropriate but hyped use of the "new" term caught on, as might be expected, and it was generally used until about the late 1950s when the concepts and contexts of dynamism became unfashionable. But by then it was permissible to refer to dynamos as electrical generators -- although I believe the enormous generators at Niagara Falls and at Hoover Dam are still called dynamos -- dynamos that mean energy from outside sources.

*

The shift of the meaning of DYNAMIC from self-internal starting-up to the need for external energy to start-up is easy to understand. You see, it releases the individual from the absolute necessity to self-start-up by increasing the concept and value of getting started-up via learning from outside sources.

And this results in a general consensus tendency to become dependent on outside sources that might effect the start-up for them. And to the degree THIS concept comes to prevail in general consensus realities is the degree the self-start-up concepts decline almost to the point of banishment.

*

Finally, there is that particularly difficult but widespread phenomenon present among our species already outlined: the intake of information by reducing it to fit with one's existing realities, group consensus levels, cultural cohesion processes -- and, last but by far not the least, to fit with one's ALREADY INSTALLED belief systems. (A very good example of this will be found ahead in the essay on PERCEPTION.)

*

For example, those that already believe that only outside stimuli can result in, well, stimulation of energy or knowledge will expect questions about how to get knowledge/understanding to fit that consensus reality.

*

The shift may be very subtle regarding the meaning of dynamism as self-start-up, self-motivating, to a meaning that refers to something obtainable from an outside source.

And I certainly am not insisting on anything in this regard. This essay, as are all those in this database, is offered for what it is worth to each individual who chances to come across it.

I'll only note in passing that during the nineteenth century "self-help" referred to one's bootstraps. Today it means "go buy a self-help manual," or consult some other external source.

What Governs Output and Input of Information

So, among consensus realities there are many overt, covert, subtle and non-conscious factors which somehow govern the output, transmission and intake of information at various levels. One encounters these limiting and limited factors everywhere and in any kind of mix or combination.

The most direct, but usually non-conscious, link is the language a society and all of its members are required to utilize, no matter their status or educational backgrounds.

Even if someone has a new idea, to communicate it verbally or in writing requires use of the nomenclature shared and utilized at the consensus reality level. As we shall see in an essay ahead, this factor is a very important regarding theory and information transfer processes.

*

In this sense, then, nomenclature is the first governing factor regarding information transfer, and the concepts behind the nomenclature are the second factor -- whether these concepts be exact, explicit, assumed, imagined, taken for granted, or whatever.

And one usually finds these governing factors running on automatic in various social echelons -- with

very few ever realizing that their innate and wonderful thinking processes are being reduced and victimized by them.

*

Even way before I began acting as a research subject, I had gotten some idea of the limitations resulting from the major concepts central to psychical research and parapsychology.

I had realized that some of those major concepts were not correct either in theory or in demonstrable fact.

I had thought, even since childhood, that some of the nomenclature used as a basis for consensus reality regarding psychic stuff was in fact silly and stupid.

*

For example, take the word PSYCHIC -- a term used with wild abandon so much so that everyone assumes they and all others KNOW what is meant by it.

As I remember it, I think I was about six when someone indicated to my parents that some of my experiences were PSYCHIC. I overheard this, and immediately chimed in by asking what it meant.

*

What then followed (and which went on for about two weeks and came to involve our extended family, various friends of my two grandmothers, my Sunday School teacher, and finally the local minister) was a great deal of psychobabble accompanied by an entirely disproportionate amount of ill humor.

*

Kids are noted for asking embarrassing questions, probably because they haven't yet fully adapted to the no-speak, absolute silence aspects of the consensus realities they will ultimately clone.

And in my case, after asking what SEX was all about, asking what PSYCHIC meant was the next single biggest nomenclature bit to cause a very unreasonable amount of upset.

The Useless Nature of the Term "Psychic"

I don't particularly care if the term "psychic" is used or not. After all, one has little control with regard to consensus realities, or regarding the mighty social forces that establish them. And so I'm not going to grind my dilapidated mental gears over "psychic."

*

But "psychic" is a good exemplar of consensus reality nomenclature that achieves wide usage -- but which has never had a stable definition. And so I'll use this word as exemplary of the other many definitionless terms encoded into this or that consensus reality.

I will only say that the word has never been adopted in a number of countries, precisely because it has no definition -- Germany, China, Japan, for example, while the French resisted its usage until just recently. The term was used in pre-Soviet Russia, but was eradicated during the reign of the USSR.

*

Of course, one then wonders how psychic matters are discussed in those countries without the term "psychic." Well, quite creatively, actually.

*

As to the term PSYCHIC, there IS a formal definition for it having to do with human mental phenomena "which lay outside of the boundaries of science." But this "definition" induces ambiguity which is shifty and unstable.

So, much beyond that ambiguity, PSYCHIC can mean anything anyone wants it to mean (including abnormal, wacko, crazy, illusory, imagination, unscientific, irrational, illogical, paranormal, transcendental, non-material, the work of the devil, a gift of God, an ability, an exceptional human experiencing -- and on and on) until one DOES realize why it exists as an over-simplifying stereotype the exact or detailed meaning of which is absolutely unnecessary.

*

So, discussing psychic stuff with someone who believes it the work of the devil, with someone else who believes it to be scientifically illogical, and then with a transcendentalist, actually consists of dealing with THREE confusions, of which ambiguity is the chief characteristic.

Here it would be obvious to all but a high-density dimwit that the conceptual information packages the three are utilizing are completely different -- although all three are utilizing the same word: PSYCHIC.

*

Indeed, there are many words utilized for which meanings are vague and ambiguous. And these are usually very popular -- such as the words "stupid," "groovy," "nerd," or "abnormal" which can ardently be utilized every which way, and much to the glee of those who do so.

*

In any event, stable meanings for an ambiguous term are "unnecessary," because each of us anyway reduces whatever it MIGHT mean so that it fits with our own "realities." This IS true at the individual level, and true as well of the vaporous realms of human activity I won't dare to point up because doing

so might erupt in volcanic overflows.

*

It is little wonder, then, that as the conceptual contours of parapsychology began to take on concrete formats (during the 1930s) that the term PSYCHIC was more or less expunged from it.

It was replaced by the "concept" of "PSI," this nothing more than a letter of the Greek alphabet. But this was a step out of one ambiguous frying pan into one hotter and bigger.

*

It could have been replaced by the letter "X" with just as good avail.

But I've often wondered why it wasn't replaced with something more dramatic and fetching -- such as "the Adelpus Factors" of human awareness.

*

At any rate, if one wishes to write about "the Adelpus Factors," one might get away with the neologism, but thereafter one must do so via EXISTING concepts and nomenclature -- such as utilizing terms as perception, awareness, mind, and etc., and all of which have established, over-simplified and somewhat ambiguous "definitions."

And PLOP, there one is back into the consensus realities which utilize and depend on those terms.

Concepts Missing or Absent Within Consensus Reality Formats

There is one additional category within consensus reality formatting that is of importance so supreme that few can even notice its egregious existence.

I'll pick up this category in another essay in this series, because before taking it on we need to examine at length a few examples of it and its overall implications -- always, of course, with regard to discussions leading to the activation of the superpowers.

*

But a very brief note here is required.

One of the primary or principal signatures of a consensus reality is that the string or interlocking of its fundamental over-simplifications are thought to have no holes or blank spaces in it.

If it is THOUGHT to contain such holes or blank spaces, the "consensus" tends to become shaky and even unglued. Even if such holes may be apparent, still it is thought that whatever they represent "will ultimately be explained within and by" the fundamental concepts of the consensus reality.

*

As but one example, when the modern sciences "went" totally materialistic, beginning about 1845, and then firmly so during the 1920s, it did so on the basis that science "expects to find materialistic explanations for everything." A noted encyclopedia (published during the 1930s, even states as much -- that science has already discovered basic materialistic explanations for everything. And what was left was only, to quote, "a mop-up job."

*

Unfortunately for THIS much vaunted and hyped "scientific" consensus reality, the electron microscope was in process of being invented at about the same time as the encyclopedia was published. Holes and blank spaces were thus discovered, and new mops were bought and employed, even though the electron microscopes showed that the mops themselves were, at a certain level of their atomic structure, not composed of material matter at all. Alas. I drift in my attempts at sardonic witticism.

*

And alas, again. If holes and blank spaces DO exist within given consensus realities, they none-the-less are looped over so as not to be all that visible. And if push comes to shove, they are merely stereotyped as the "unexplainable," and so everyone thinks they know what they are -- unexplainable. The "alas" part of this is that when one clones into a consensus reality format, one also clones the holes and black spaces, too, and usually with "unexplaining" nomenclature readily at hand.

*

One very good example of this looping over all the holes that need to be mopped up was the consensus reality which "explained" that humans have only five physical senses and no others. Most frontier people, miners, sailors, and the early aeronauts knew this was sheer idiocy. But for the masses, it "explained" the scientifically confirmed limits of the human senses, and also established why it was useless or neurotic or psychopathic to propose there were more senses, much less to utilize scientific funding to do so. All of which, of course, amounted to nothing more than a heaping pile of *mierda del toro*.

*

I will now postpone continuing this major discussion regarding the structure of consensus realities, and will pick it up again in two essays ahead under the headings of *Paradigm Shifts Relevant To The Activation Of The Superpowers* and *Performance Versus Knowledge*.

The Answer to the Two Most Frequently Asked Questions

Each specimen of our species is a fabulous specimen, naturally endowed with very many impressive faculties, most of which have never been identified, but many of which have -- and are defeated anyway.

*

Some portion of these faculties DO respond when outside stimulation is applied to them, the stimulation achieved by the inflow of information and by practical exercises pertinent to their enhancement.

*

Other of the faculties, however, apparently are of the self-start-up kind. Evidence for the existence of these faculties is not only voluminous, but convincing. The issue then is, if they are not activating, the resolution then more or less falls into the category of discovering what is preventing them from doing so.

*

Well, anyone who desires to do so is urged to search for THIS kind of information. I'd be interested in receiving notification from anyone who discovers the existence of something along these lines. I have nothing to recommend along these lines, at least regarding the activation of the superpowers.

*

However, many sages of the past have indicated among their separate selves, often divided by centuries, a consensus reality that makes remarkable sense. I crudely collect this consensus reality by paraphrasing it: that if one wants to understand something, one needs to construct mental concepts that are compatible with IT -- not develop and depend on concepts that constitute -- well, consensus realities that are full of looped over holes. For if a concept that is being utilized to comprehend something is not as exactly compatible as possible with it, then that concept is, in one sage's terms, an "erroneous thought-form."

*

I am very partial to the general context of THIS consensus reality, but am uncomfortable with the phrase "erroneous thought-form." This is because everything is what it is, even thought-forms, and as such is "correct" within itself -- "error" only being possible relative to something else.

*

I will therefore take what is a possibly unjustified liberty and shift the nomenclature of "erroneous thought-form" into "mental information processing viruses" -- this in an experimental or hypothetical sense only.

This concept-nomenclature was not possible even twenty years ago, but the concept of "viruses" has now been widely proliferated into the consensus realities of ComputerLand, and computer realities.

*

In that now monolithic Land we can see and have feedback regarding what an information virus can do to the information processing functions of computer software and even to computer hardware. I dare to adapt this concept into the contexts of the faculties superpowers of the human biomind -- because all of them can easily be conceived that at base they are information processing and information transfer systems.

*

Furthermore, and as will be discussed in detail in a following essay, the concepts of information theory ARE compatible with them as information-processing systems, especially in that information transfer is mitigated by the signal-to-noise ratio.

The increase of "noise" in an information transfer process or system can be likened to "viruses" -- loosely speaking anyway. The decrease in "noise" enhances transfer, reception, and more exact duplication of signal.

*

If the superpower faculties can be conceived of as signal receptors or signal monitors, whatever they transfer in the way of information to the cognitive mind/intellect is usually processed through its already-installed concept networks or concept "grids."

*

If the pre-installed concepts are not exactly compatible then the end product will be signal + the noise introduced by the misfitting concepts. If the pre-installed concepts not compatible at all, then the end product will probably consist of noise with the signal so buried in it that it can neither be located or decoded by the mind/intellect.

*

A central question then emerges: wherefrom do we get our pre-installed concepts that might be noisy ones?

The answer here is twofold. We can formulate them ourselves, and which is entirely possible, even though many doubt it of themselves.

But there is a "process" which, in some sense, is geared to "help" us NOT formulate our own concepts, and it is one process that all of us adapt to in many ways from day one.

*

And this process is called consensus reality making.

And we adapt to the elements of consensus reality making, for if we do not all hell descends from a wild assortment of directions.

*

Anyway, we have to learn our local language, and THAT language consists not only of its nomenclature, but the meaning-concepts that go with the nomenclature.

Zippo!

There you are (all of us, including my overly humble self, a CR Clone of some kind).

*

Two of the major deterrents or preventives toward the activation of the superpowers are:

1. information viruses inhabiting consensus realities and which distort and clog the grids (arteries) of our thinking processes; and
2. needed but missing information concepts -- which cause mental information processes to act like they have viruses

(End of Part 1)

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (22Feb97)

PART 2: INFORMATION PROCESSING VIRUSES AND THEIR CLONES

Digging into consensus realities tends to be a boring occupation if one considers only what they represent to those incorporated into them.

But if one investigates how information is processed because of them, they tend to become very interesting indeed.

*

As a general rule of thumb in this regard, it can be seen that information that can be fitted into a given consensus reality is processed, at least in some kind of way. But information that cannot be fitted is usually NOT processed at all.

*

There are very many examples of this that can be identified. But many of them, if they were pointed out, cause vigorous emotional responses that sometimes can be lethal.

So I'll select an example that will merely confuse rather than elicit emoting.

*

The general consensus reality about "paranormal" perception conceives that this IS basically a matter of PERCEPTION.

But if one says that paranormal perception is neither paranormal nor a matter of basic perception, the chances are that the consensus reality won't shake all that much -- because the message of that statement

is simply routed through those concepts that processes it as "idiotic," "stupid," or "he doesn't know what he is talking about." End of that tiny story.

*

However, if one goes on to say that the basic issue involves information transfer and the signal-to-noise ratio BEFORE perceptions are constructed out of them, then another thing happens. The eyes of those people firmly locked into the perception concept are likely to wobble. The wobbling is caused by the person's mental information processing grids attempting to find a suitable conceptual basis via which to process THAT message.

If no pre-installed concepts are found, then the message is shed from the grids like water off a duck's back. End of that story.

*

The above might be a bit crude as an example. And so it might sound rather far-fetched at first -- because most people think they can and do process all information they encounter. Others observing them, however, often can spot which information is not being processed, or which information is being mis-processed.

He or she "is not getting the point," as its often said. Or, how he or she "came to THAT conclusion is beyond belief."

*

However, if a given consensus reality shared among many does not contain concepts relevant to something, the chances are that NO ONE within the consensus reality will perceive it.

If whatever it is does get processed, it will be routed over to the nearest similar concept and processed through it.

*

For example, the neo-term REMOTE VIEWING has gained popularity and is even verging on entering into a very wide consensus reality.

But all evidence to date shows that the "meaning" of RV is being routed through the familiar concept of "psychic perception." And so "remote-viewing" is being accepted as an updated replacement term for psychic perception.

*

However, RV in its intended original usage was as an adjective merely to distinguish a particular type of clairvoyant experiment; and then later used as a concept involving a process having to do with a refined form of INTELLECTUAL INTEGRATION that depended on dealing with the signal-to-noise ratio.

Now intellectual integration is considered a normal process that does or can occur in anyone. And so it is far removed from psychic perception which is thought of as paranormal. So the whole of this is like unknowingly getting on the wrong train or bus.

*

Almost all consensus realities hold that everyone can mentally process, at the most basic physical level at least, the elements of everything that is in that physical level. And so no one ever thinks to look for examples indicating that this is not true.

But such examples can be found, and I will now digress to consider one of them so that it won't seem I'm simply talking that stuff which comes out of a bull's back door.

*

When Charles Darwin set sail as a naturalist aboard the BEAGLE, he embarked on a voyage that was to last six years (1831-1836.) Prior to this, the theory of ORGANIC EVOLUTION had been around for a few decades, but Darwin was to firmly establish it -- and shift the orientation of many consensus realities. For it was on this long voyage that Darwin felt he had found proof of the theory of evolution. But he encountered another kind of thing that was so alien to any consensus reality that hardly anything has been made of it.

*

As the BEAGLE wended its way southward along the east coast of South America, it came to what was then known as Patagonia, a region of some 300,000 square miles, now divided into southern Argentina, the extreme south-east part of Chile, and northern Tierra del Fuego. And it was in Patagonia that the Beagle's crew and Darwin encountered an exceedingly strange phenomenon -- one which, in my somewhat overworked opinion, was more important than the theory of organic evolution.

*

Unable to moor the big ship, the BEAGLE, close to shore, it was anchored at some distance from land out in a bay, and some of the crew and Darwin went ashore in a small boat. Once ashore they were welcomed with excitement by the local Patagonians of that particular region. In all this excitement, it soon transpired that the locals were amazed that Darwin, et.al. had traversed the great ocean in such a small boat.

*

Now, the BEAGLE was anchored out in the bay, but it was plainly visible. And so the crew said that they hadn't crossed the great ocean in a small boat, but a far larger one. And they pointed to the big ship

anchored in the bay.

Try as they might, however, the local Patagonians COULD NOT SEE the big ship -- and so a period of confusion ensued. The BEAGLE was literally INVISIBLE to the Patagonians, not only conceptually so, but *eyeball* so.

*

As it turned out, there WAS one person among the Patagonians who COULD SEE the ship. This was the local shaman, whose credentials imply the sighting of things and stuff others do not perceive -- although it is quite possible for them to do so, and as we shall now see.

*

Apparently the shaman set about describing the BEAGLE, its location, the shape of the hull and sails, and did so by comparing the forms to what was otherwise familiar to the Patagonians. Soon, and as Hollywood lingo might have it, the BEAGLE "faded in," and thus all the Patagonians ended up with eyeball sight of the ship.

*

This remarkable incident might never have entered historical sources, except that Darwin noted it in his diary -- after which it has persisted in existing in that rational limbo of the "unexplained."

*

But it does need to be explained, at least in some kind of theoretical way -- in that what it implies is completely relevant toward activating any of the superpowers. I'm not saying that the following is the only way, being merely one experimental way that chances to be somewhat consistent with similar situations.

*

Roughly speaking, although the Patagonians had a consensus reality regarding small boats, they did not have one regarding large ships that might traverse the immense Atlantic Ocean. One will have difficulty believing that the ABSENCE of this consensus reality could literally prevent eyeball vision of the BEAGLE, since we believe we see what does exist whether we understand it or not. In other words, the "normal" consensus reality of the Patagonians had a gaping hole in it regarding big ships. Sounds ridiculous, doesn't it?

*

There is another more precise way of putting this -- that the mental information processing grids of the

Patagonians had this hole in them. Meaning that there was no prior established mental grid which contained information points regarding large, ocean-going vessels. (Here, please note that [an essay regarding mental information processing grids \(MIPGs\)](#) is already contained in this database.)

*

The explanatory activity of the shaman did either one of two things. By comparing the shape-recognition required to things the Patagonians did include in their consensus reality, the BEAGLE thus faded up into visibility. Or, perhaps, the activity of the shaman caused a new grid to form up. In either case, the Patagonians finally could eyeball if not completely understand the BEAGLE, accompanied, it might be expected, by wonder and awe.

*

In leaving this incident, it is worth noting that the original theory of evolution was the theory of ORGANIC evolution -- and hence applied to organic (biological) systems. "Organic" was later dropped, and the theory became the theory of EVOLUTION, since mistaken as applicable to all things. In this sense, then, evolution is seen as a one-way route, always evolving, always evolving upward and onward. The concept of DEVOLUTION is obscured this way -- this a concept we will need to deal with in other essays since it is pertinent to the superpower faculties.

*

Due to the Worldwide Web, the days when isolated cultures "clashed" with others is over with, of course, save in the possible case of extraterrestrials. And so it is hard to notice gaping holes in their consensus realities. Yet anthropologists earlier in this century spotted quite a number of them, while those working in the diplomatic services have encountered many more. I will take the time here to give one example of each kind.

*

Take the concept of SNOW. We utilize the term SNOW to denote snow, and so snow is snow -- that cold white stuff, made up of frozen, crystallized water molecules. So we call snow snow, and that's the end of it, right? Well, not exactly.

*

The consensus realities of those living in warmer climates have no need of knowing, or even believing,

that there are many different types of snow. But such was important to indigenous people living and existing north of the Arctic Circle in Siberia, Alaska and far-north Canada.

You see, in those far north climates different types of snow (to say nothing of different types of ice) could be used in different ways, while the different types permitted various kinds of expectations and predictions to be made.

*

Depending on which sources one consults, the indigenous peoples of the northern Arctic Circle "evolved" seven to twenty-one different terms that conceptualized, identified and specified different kinds of snow and/or ice.

Thus, their understanding of the types of "snow" was very much intellectually integrated in a number of refined ways, and which enhanced their understanding of snow over those who merely have one consensus reality concept for it.

*

One of the most probable meanings here is that the Arctic dwellers understood the very many multiple FUNCTIONS of snow/ice, could discriminate uses, and discriminate STRUCTURAL forecasts of what the different types implied in terms of weather, building materials, and so forth. And knowledge of these types often meant whether survival would be easy, difficult or deadly.

In other words, they had not only definitive consensus realities about the types of snow, but also possessed intricate MIPGs which permitted more exact analyses of the implications of different kinds of snow.

*

As it is today, we have only residual echoes of this kind of thing. Expert skiers have some knowledge about different types of snow, mostly regarding whether it will pack up or remain fluffy. Park rangers also like to know if a given snowfall will pack up and melt steadily, or be loose enough to pile up and avalanche.

For most of us, though, snow is something to put up with and shovel into piles -- and we need only one bit of nomenclature for that, the result of which is the beginning and end of the snow story.

*

So, you may be wondering by now what all this snow stuff has to do with the superpower faculties of the human BIOMIND.

Well, for example, we have but one nomenclature bit for TELEPATHY -- which is, of course, telepathy. Thus, IF it should be that there are many DIFFERENT TYPES of telepathy, we are still reduced to utilizing only one consensus-reality making term for them -- and that is the beginning and end of the telepathy story within our present consensus reality.

*

On the other hand, and assuming there just might be different types of IT, if one wants to activate one's own telepathic faculties, well, one needs to know WHICH type to activate.

In this instance, TELEPATHY as a single generalization will be useless, much in the same way that snow as a single generalization was useless to earlier Arctic dwellers before prefabricated dwellings, welfare subsistence and the benefits of tourist trade.

*

If one examines in detail the literature and anecdotal information available about "telepathy," one can begin to espy the factual existence of different types of it.

The research method to be utilized to identify the types focuses on the apparent FUNCTION of each type -- i.e., what does this type DO versus that other type? Or what can be done with this versus other types? Or, which kind of information is transferred via one type versus the other types?

There can be little doubt that the different types of snow were identified by employing some such similar method -- with the end result that each type fell into a more exact functional category.

In other words, the earlier Arctic dwellers DID NOT just learn about snow as a conceptual generalization, but about different kinds of snow which enabled the conceptualizations of different kinds of application.

*

The meaning here is rather straightforward. If one partakes, so to speak, of a consensus reality within which only one generalized conception exists for telepathy, it is quite likely that the existence of TYPES of telepathy will remain as invisible as the BEAGLE was to the Patagonians.

*

Now jumping the gun a little here, and referring to a topic to be enlarged upon in subsequent essays, all of the superpower faculties appear to have one thing in common.

Each seems to be designed for a specific function -- meaning that if mental information processing grids are not set up (installed) to match each of those specific functions, then the different functions will be invisible and/or dysfunctional to their potential users. And this more or less exactly matches the BEAGLE syndrome of the Patagonians.

*

In other words, and as we shall see just ahead, the ABSENCE of such grids will function in ways quite similar to information processing viruses.

Another way of putting this, although more simplistic, is that the utilization of a single concept

regarding telepathy will probably disable identification of its many different types. So, you see, if telepathy is JUST telepathy, then that is the beginning and end of that story, too.

*

The remedial ACTION (toward activating the superpower faculties) regarding all of this is not complicated. Merely by assuming, if only for entertainment purposes, that TYPES of telepathy exist, the types tend to become more noticeable.

*

In the past, I've belabored my suffering MIPGs a great deal, but finally was able to identify thirty-five or thirty-six different types of telepathy.

I'll not provide this list -- because I think people accept and believe more in what they themselves can become aware of by upward pulling of their own bootstraps.

*

But one type of telepathy consists of "sensing," as it is put, sexual availability of others. This is a rather broad-based telepathic format TYPE pre-existing throughout our species. And it is noticeable because it has an undeniably SPECIFIC FUNCTION hardly anyone can miss. However, this type of sensing should go hand-in-hand with careful diplomatic approaches -- for reasons that should be obvious to those who did not arrive on Earth just twenty minutes ago.

*

This type of telepathy, however, is not usually referred to as TELEPATHIC at all, due mostly to its licentious characteristics, all of which have been edited out of psychical and parapsychological consensus realities in order to make their consensus contexts appropriate to "proper" think. This humble author, for example, wrote yet another manuscript entitled *Psychic Sexuality* -- which was rejected by so many publishers I lost count of them. You see, our present consensus realities about psychic stuff do not permit connecting up any of that stuff to sex.

*

Above, I have mentioned the term "diplomacy." My research into the nature of diplomacy revealed that one of its main functions is to comprehend consensus realities and try to figure out how to get around or trick them.

Thus, diplomatic "skills" are valuable in many ways, if only to try to prevent things going up in flames.

*

The worst diplomats ever are those who remain completely unaware of the finer points of consensus realities that both strategically and tactically contrast with their own.

This was the 1950s conceptual basis, for example, of "the ugly American" who bounced into contrasting consensus realities (i.e., into other "cultures") and who either did not realize very much or didn't care either which way.

*

As but one somewhat humorous example, detailed by the venerable diplomat, historian and author, George Kennan, the Arabic-speaking countries share a consensus reality conceptualized around the idea (referred to by the nomenclature bit "Kismet") that the future is in the hands and determination of Allah, and that mere humans shall not mess around by trying to shape the future to their own ends and designs.

*

Having attempted to comprehend the concept of Kismet the best I can, I am somewhat partial to it because it does have some interesting and beneficial merits -- if one tries to entertain the larger picture of things.

*

That aside, during a great part of this century, the Western world, and especially the United States, tended to view the Arabic nations as feudalistic -- which more bluntly meant "backward." Hence those nations were seen as potential consumers of modernization products, especially with regard to "building better futures" for themselves.

*

Transliterated, this means that Western entrepreneurs foresaw the merits of causing the Arabs to purchase implements, plans, designs, equipment, methods and whatnot under the guise of building a better future -- a concept which the Western entrepreneurs themselves place much faith and assuming foresight.

Also noted by the entrepreneurs, most of the Arabic nations had scads of money to effect such future-oriented improvements, for they had mucho fossil fuels the rest of the world was desperate for. In this sense, the Arab nations were a bank of unused, but presumably accessible, money reserves.

*

The first wave of Western entrepreneurs, their diplomats and representatives, appear to have been considerably unaware of the existence of the concept of Kismet, and subsequent waves of them thought that rational economic logic they themselves pursued would put the concept somewhat into abeyance.

*

Now, I've no desire to get into the egregious details of what thenceforth transpired within what then became known as "world tensions" because of this "conflict" of dramatically opposing consensus realities, or to discuss the merits and demerits of either.

The issue here is the often unalterable STRENGTH and POWER of consensus realities as might be applied solely to the problems and situation of the superpower faculties -- given into creation either by God, Allah or the Ascending Evolutionary Steps.

*

The point here is that IF a consensus reality is really locked into itself, it is then really hard to deal with or even to get around it -- without also setting into action a very dramatic paradigm shift.

Everyone utilizes the basic consensus realities they are part of, from the fundamental language-nomenclature foundations on upward to sophisticated versions of them.

And everyone utilizes these consensus realities because that is all they have to think and communicate with.

*

If you take a moment here to get the idea of a funnel, for example, as an implement utilized to get liquids into a narrow-topped bottle without spilling much, you might grasp all this somewhat better. Into the wide-open brim are poured the liquid elements of life and all its very many processes, and which liquid elements are narrowed down at the tight spout, and thence gotten into the bottle. If we can conceive of the bottle as a consensus reality, we can use bottles as handy metaphors.

*

But to complete the metaphor, we do realize that consensus realities differ. And so we have to put a filter somewhere in the funnel so that the elements and processes of life are filtered into the bottles in only such and such a way.

Now, we can put a label on the bottle, using this or that linguistic nomenclature for purposes of common identification among those who utilize it for communicating.

*

And there you have it -- in a somewhat weak metaphorical sense anyway: a prepackaged consensus reality, and each society drinks from THEIR bottle, and causes others also to drink from it. Naturally, all consensus realities think that their bottle is the best one.

*

However, to comprehend what actually is in the bottle, we have to pour out the contained liquid and submit it to detailed analysis, molecule by molecule, atom by atom, or concept by concept. As it THEN would happen, we can find only what we already have concepts for and expectations of finding, since it is easiest to find what fits into the consensus realities we are utilizing to do so.

When we find something totally unexpected, well, as is said in the sciences, we are "surprised." No consensus reality filter can completely filter out all aspects of life. Aspects of life inconvenient to the other contents of the bottle sometimes get through the filter -- especially if those aspects are indigenous to our species.

You see, each babe born is a container of life, and no one is ever born a prepackaged format of a given consensus reality bottle. THAT has to be installed or cloned into each specimen and always requires some kind of reductionism or another.

*

For its filters, each consensus reality depends on its approved concepts -- with the result that if the concepts are not truly compatible with aspects of life itself, then it will filter only those aspects which the filters permit. In this sense, then, the concepts that are incompatible with life will achieve the function of information viruses which distort, wreck or destroy the aspects of life itself. And, regarding the "bottles" of predigested consensus realities, the chances are very good that upon analyses of them we will find information processing viruses -- this because the "digestion" of any kind of information always contributes the preconceived conceptual "juices" utilized to digest them.

*

It's a good thing the somewhat shaky metaphors gotten up here are only for hypothetical purposes. So "chill out" a little. You'll probably need to "chill" a little in regard to what now follows.

Information Processing Viruses

ALERT! Here we have a topic that can be seized upon and used to beat up on others regarding their beliefs, the condition of their knowledge or expertise, and their supposed intelligence or stupidity if they have any of either.

The "best" people, of course, are those that are not thought of as being too extreme with regard to either their intelligence or stupidity, in which case they can be considered among the so-called "normal," or as "one of us." Each consensus reality establishes a so-called "normal" band used to determine deviation away from the fundamental concepts of the consensus reality itself.

*

Something now depends on which consensus reality is being utilized as the "proper" one, and which band in it is thought of as the "normal" one.

Then if one falls out of the up end or the down end of the "normal" curve, one is therefore considered too intelligent or too stupid to fit into it.

*

One of the situations relevant to this, though, is that intelligence and stupidity cannot really be nailed down unless there are "normative," consensus reality standards to utilize in doing so.

*

For example, via the prevailing consensus reality characteristic of the scientific discipline of physics between 1905 until about 1927, Albert Einstein was bombarded with vocal and PRINTED condemnations regarding his congenital stupidity and similar invectives.

On the other hand, there are plenty of examples of those hailed as marvelously intelligent, thereafter proven quite stupid, and whose names usually end up getting vaporized in historical memory. I won't mention any names here, for fear of treading on someone's icons.

*

In any event, one is considered sane (and rational and logical) if one fits snugly into a given normal band of a consensus reality. And in this sense, one is a "proper" exemplar not only of the consensus reality, but surely of our species as well.

If one doesn't fit in, one is thought of as different, deranged or impaired, or challenged; as psychologically unbalanced, disturbed, or whose mind functions are resulting from some kind of pathological condition; or as marching to a different drummer -- for lo and behold there seem to be different drums to march to; or as needing help -- the BIG "help" economy to relocate into the normal band -- and on and on and on some more, up to and including being politically incorrect as well as out of fashion, a retard, a retro, fringey, perhaps nerdish, wacko, or NOC (not of our class, which applies equally to the wealthy and the poor, the latter, too, having its collective consensus reality frameworks).

*

However, if one develops a larger picture of all this, it can be seen on the one hand that everyone WILL fit into some kind of consensus reality somewhere; and that all of us will NOT fit in to some kind of consensus reality somewhere else.

What one wants to do is find "my people" so as to fit oneself in with them -- and to avoid all those others which are "not my people."

*

However, in order to fit in anywhere, one has to clone not only the concepts, but the concept viruses, the two altogether being perpetuated as "reality."

*

At the brink of sermonizing a little, we are all of the same species, a species which preoccupies itself with setting up, or inventing or imagining, consensus realities in the first place.

It seems possible that we could therefore modulate a species level consensus reality which would incorporate most specimens born.

But I digress too far, except to note that SHOULD such a species level consensus reality EVER "evolve," it would have to include admission of the existence of the superpower faculties.

*

The dimensions of existing knowledge regarding the superpowers is not all that large, and what there is of it is pretty much clogged with information processing viruses. And so it is necessary to examine their nature, characteristics and effects on human thinking processes.

The references to information processing viruses in this database refer specifically to the central topic of this database and to no other topic.

And to get good mileage out of this topic, it should be stated that one can profit only by taking interest in the possibility of one's OWN information processing viruses -- since those of others are irrelevant to one's own self-activation of the interlocking networks of superpower faculties.

Virus

The term VIRUS is generally thought to be a bit of biological nomenclature identifying "submicroscopic infective agents."

But the term is descended on the one hand from an ancient Sanskrit term, VISA, meaning "poison or venom in the senses," and on the other hand from the Greek term, IOS, meaning "poison."

*

Our English term is taken directly from the Latin VIRUS, in which language it officially referred to slimy liquid, poison or stench, but was also probably utilized as Latin slang meaning something like "really smelly shit."

The third definition given in my trusty Webster's is "something that poisons the mind or soul."

*

It was apparently first utilized in English in 1599 in the context of heaping venomous and poisonous abuse on another person.

The earliest definition in terms of pathology date only from 1725 -- at which time it more or less referred to "A morbid principle or poisonous substance produced in the body as the result of some disease, especially one capable of being introduced into other persons or animals by inoculation or otherwise and of developing the same disease in them."

It is from this definition that I have adapted and adopted the term "cloning" with reference to exactly reproducing something in oneself taken or absorbed from others.

*

The term VIRUS has been seized from its modern biological contexts and entered into Computerese. There it refers to a nearly undetectable micro-package of information which can be introduced into software programs and/or hardware systems with the result of disorganizing, adulterating or obliterating them.

*

In its Computerese sense, a virus is actually an information virus which distorts or erases other kinds of information -- more or less along the same lines as the filters in the funnels of consensus reality bottles.

Clone

Our English term, CLONE, was taken from the Greek word meaning "twig or slip." Its first noted use in English was in 1903 in a scientific paper having to do with chrysanthemums and their clonal characteristics.

A later scientific paper of the same year pointed up that "the clones of apples, pears, strawberries, etc., do not propagate true to seed, while this is one of the most important characteristics of races of wheat and corn."

In this sense, a cloned information processing concept or a clone's information processing virus may not propagate true to seed either.

*

In any event, the first definition of CLONE dating from ancient Greece, etc., referred to a group of cultivated plants the individuals of which are transplanted parts of one original seedling or stock, the propagation having been carried out by the use of grafts, cuttings, bulbs, etc.

In this sense, then, CLONE was the term given to all bud grafts taken from a parent tree.

*

This can be extended into the analogy that a given consensus reality is the parent tree of conceptualizations, and that each of us specimens can be grafted onto it. As we are, of course. After the tree is recognized, and communicated within, by the nomenclature central to the tree, not just the bark of the tree, but the flow of information inside the tree and which makes it a tree. The bark of the tree constitutes only its superficial protective layers, three layers of quite simplified cells which harden -- something like the hard glass of the bottle that contains whatever is filtered into it. All the above for whatever it might suggest.

Warning

It is not correct to call a concept an information virus simply because one disagrees with it. For one thing, all of us completely assume that OUR concepts are correct and virus-free. And so if we enter into discriminating the existence of information viruses, we will normally assess the concepts of others -- not those we might just chance to contain.

*

The only purpose of entering this topic into this database has to do with locating information processing viruses within the general consensus reality we have cloned into -- and must subscribe to in order to speak, write and read in its unifying language.

*

Whether an individual or a group of them possesses cloned information processing viruses is irrelevant -- with one exception. And if you cannot identify that one exception, then you are already reading this essay from a viewpoint not at all intended.

*

Finally, the ENTIRE context of this essay is aimed only at the possibility that information processing viruses exist and which might deter or prevent one's own approach toward activating their own share of the superpower faculties. This is a specific area of possible interest only for some, not a general one applicable to all or any other area of human species activity.

*

In any event, we must move on.

If we search for the singly, largest common conceptual denominator regarding the superpowers, we will easily find that the concept of PERCEPTION is most likely to be it. This is specifically to say that in the English language, perception is assigned to all psychic matters.

This assigning is, of course, over-simplified to the extreme -- in that there are many different TYPES of perception in both the quantitative and qualitative sense.

*

But beneath that slight confusion is another more fundamental one -- an almost universal misunderstanding regarding what perception is and is all about.

And so in Part 3 now coming up, we will attempt to beat that misunderstanding to death -- and do so without overtly stipulating that this egregious misunderstanding is virus-like in nature.

(End of Part 2)

[The Superpowers of the Human Biomind]

The Human Genome As The Ultimate Implication Of The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

Ingo Swann (14Apr97)

The mapping of the human genome (now underway) is understood as desirable regarding two major areas: medical applications and genetic engineering.

Simply put, the major concept pertinent to those two areas involves deleting undesirable genetic materials and inserting desirable ones.

The ultimate goal, of course, is the production of the perfect human specimen -- "perfect" at least from the genetic point of view.

*

The potentials of this are awesome, staggering. One of the fall-outs is that human history will be completely redirected, more or less in one fell swoop.

The potentials, however, are not yet clear regarding their details. But whatever those will turn out to be, they are inevitable, certain, unavoidable.

*

You see, hardly anyone will resist the engineering of the genetically perfected human. And those who do resist, or have reservations, will find themselves pissing into the wind of this great change.

*

The purpose of this essay is to discuss a relationship between the genome, genetic engineering, and the superpowers of the human biomind. I have to point out that this relationship is hardly ever mentioned elsewhere -- even though it is an obvious one.

So far as I can determine, this relationship has nowhere been mentioned either in parapsychology or

genetics. It, and its implications, ARE AVOIDED -- as they would be, of course.

It might be okay to contemplate the genetic engineering of super bodies, super immune systems, super strength, even super intelligence.

But the genetic engineering of superpowers -- such as mind-reading, telepathy, clairvoyance or PK -- well, this will be another matter, so much so that its parameters almost surely will be dealt with in deepest secrecy.

*

To get into this topic (or dawning situation), it seems relevant to briefly and simplistically review certain pertinent past contexts regarding the superpowers. I have already expanded upon some of those contexts in other essays in this database.

*

Up until the advent of the modern age, the existence of the superpowers of the human biomind was accepted in most pre-modern cultures, albeit under different designations and nomenclature peculiar to each of them..

Among those cultures we might list those of ancient India, Amerindian, Egypt, Bablyonia, Israel, Greece, China, Japan, and the Western Nordic cultures, including the Eskimos, as well as all of the MesoAmerican cultures.

*

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, wide-spread acceptance of the superpowers began to diminish, ultimately becoming questionable, and finally opened up to skeptical trashing. One of the most obvious reasons for this diminishing and trashing can probably be laid at the feet of various philosophical artifacts that were introduced into Western thinking during those two centuries -- and which artifacts became intellectually fashionable.

*

During the modernist twentieth century, "objections" to the superpowers were based on those fashionable philosophical artifacts -- with the inevitable result that the modern sciences and psychology became fractured regarding an adequate conception of the whole human being.

As but one example, even intuition could not be fitted into the now dwindling modern contexts -- while intuition is clearly one of the most primary aspects of the superpower faculties. Although intuition's legitimacy has been played down, it has survived as a concept only because of its close connection to genius, creativity, inspiration, invention and problem-solving.

*

With the exception of conventional academe (which still teaches them), most of those philosophical artifacts have become passé and unfashionable by now -- largely because of the need to modulate new overviews more suitable to post-modern advances, situations and developed realities.

There is actually little reason today to base one's overviews on philosophical artifacts of eighteenth and nineteenth century thinking. Those past philosophical artifacts were workable in their time, serving their purpose in the light of the realities and perceived necessities back then.

Even the philosophical artifacts of the first seven decades of the twentieth century are out-moded, some of which are now useless. Things have rapidly changed and altered a great deal during the last twenty-five years -- not only because of advances, but because large and significant problems exist today, problems past thinkers could not imagine ever existing.

*

With regard to the modernist trashing of the superpowers, most people are aware that they were conventionally treated and taught as superstitious and/or irrational, certainly unscientific. During the twentieth century they were also dubbed as "abnormal" by sociologists, and as having a psychopathological basis in psychiatry.

The terms superstitious, irrational, unscientific, abnormal and psychopathological served quite well as cue words to warn professional people not to deal with the superpowers, to stay away from them or experience professional disrepute.

The cue words were very successful -- even in the face of the tremendous popular and lay response to the concepts of the superpowers. That response, however, was largely science-fictionlike, the predominant theme casting the superpowers as terrible, evil, hideous and of destructive potential.

*

One of the more interesting aspects of the objections to and trashing of the superpowers is one most people don't at all realize.

Indeed, this aspect can come into view only by achieving a rather thorough overview of the history involved.

This aspect has to do with the size and dimensions of the "resistance to Psi" -- and which can be seen as excessive, even hysterical, all things considered.

I don't like analogies. But two are apt in this case -- such as setting a Tyrannosaurus Rex to exterminate a gopher in the lawn, or to kill a fly by using twelve nuclear bombs.

*

Rather than accept all this at its apparent (and confusing) face value, one can dig a little deeper. For example, most people are not aware that behind the regrettable scenario briefly outlined above three other scenarios have existed among many major thinkers and scientists, and all of which are surprising.

*

FIRST: One of the earlier objections to the superpowers (such as clairvoyance, telepathy and mediumship) was based in the idea that even if they did exist, there was no use for them. This idea clearly expressed a lack of imagination. But none the less, when it was pointed out that the natural or spontaneous manifestations of the superpowers were fraught with undependability, the idea took on currency. When the problem was added concerning identifying the difference between those "manifesting" fraudulent and real superpowers, well, it becomes somewhat understandable why there WAS a problem.

*

SECOND: This objection concerned the idea that scientific advances would make any perceived need for the superpower obsolete. This concept was based in the consideration that the superpowers once may have played an evolutionary role within the species, a role relegated to the limbic system, the "old reptilian brain." However, our species had evolved the cortex and neo-cortex since then -- and which imbued the potentials of reason and logic, factors seen as leading to more accurate and superior functioning.

*

In other words, behind the simplistic and vulgar condemnation of the superpowers as superstition, irrationality, and psychopathological disorientation, lay the two faces: that the superpower faculties could not really be used for anything; that they were early, rudimentary brain artifacts superseded by the more recent evolutionary development of the higher mental functions embodied in the cortices.

*

Both of these two faces are drawn from the concept that reason and logic are better, more dependable and more efficient than any manifestations of the superpower faculties. This, of course, might be taken as apparently true -- if one does not study in detail the history of reason and logic. Of course, if one does this study, adequately, one might arrive at the idea that the difference between reason/logic and mierda del toro is often quite narrow and obscure.

*

The two objections briefly noted just above usually came from highly educated people, some of whom achieved a good deal of influence and power within the modern sciences and philosophies. [If you wish to achieve a broader picture of these two objections, I suggest *NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL: A HISTORY OF THE PARANORMAL* (1977), and *SCIENCE AND PARASCIENCE: A HISTORY OF THE PARANORMAL 1914-1938* (1984) -- both by the late Brian Inglis, and both published in England by Hodder and Stoughton. For a slightly different slant, I suggest *THE OCCULT*

ESTABLISHMENT by James Webb (Open Court Publishing Co., 1976.)

*

Now, one could hardly imagine that yet ANOTHER factor exists behind the two just mentioned. But one does. It is subtle, secret and legitimately qualifies as a conspiracy.

*

To grasp the fundamentals of this additional factor, one first has to realize how evasive (and silly) it was to suggest that the superpower faculties have no usefulness.

Clearly, achieved telepaths or mind-readers would be USEFUL. At least my humble self could find uses for them -- and for "traveling clairvoyants," too, providing they could surmount the signal-to-noise ratio in some dependable and predictable fashion. [An essay regarding the problems of the signal-to-noise ratio was placed in this database some time ago.]

*

It was also evasive to suggest that science and technology would make obsolete the superpower faculties -- a factor that might be true only IF the faculties were not identified, developed and enhanced.

There is a certain amount of spontaneous or deliberate stupidity in this case.

For example, we all have legs to run with. But developing the rudimentary running skills into Olympic Games status is something that technology will NEVER make obsolete.

Likewise, we all have many rudimentary, superpower biomind sensors and transducers. But identifying and developing them into Human World Games status is another matter. Further, another matter that might make science and technology obsolete.

*

And here is the crux of the third subtle, illusive, and deeply guarded factor -- which can be brought to the cognitive surface by considering the concept that perhaps it MIGHT BE DISADVANTAGEOUS to DEVELOP the superpowers of the human biomind.

You see, even ONE developed, truly developed, intuitive, telepath or mind-reader might shift the balances and parameters of all games played in the World -- especially if those games are idiotic and senseless to begin with. [And this concept was the theme of my novel, *STAR FIRE*, published in 1978 by Dell.]

*

Having considered this, if we shift our thinking just slightly, we can come up with the concept that perhaps it might be better to PREVENT the development in the first place. Indeed, tremendous power might ensue to the developed carriers, or their controllers, of any of the superpowers. Best then, would it

not be, to discourage the development in the first place.

And the best way to prevent anything is to surround it with disrepute and confusions so convoluted and intense that it takes developed superpower faculties to cut through the Gordian Knot that ensues.

*

The question now emerges: have secret hierarchical decisions actually been taken along such lines?

Well, yes.

For example, feminist historians have built a good case regarding the secret purpose of the Inquisitions. This goal was not to condemn and punish religious heresy, but to exterminate the female "psychic" healers and counselors of the times under the misunderstanding that the female line carried the dreaded Psi faculties. And indeed, the statistics of Inquisitions, still in existence, show that about 75 per cent or more of the victims were female.

*

Feminist historians majorly tend to interpret this as the determination of a macho male society to exterminate the source of undue female influence, a factor that does need to be considered. But the female influence was, in the first place, derived from higher-stage functioning of at least some of the superpowers of the human biomind.

*

During modern times, including the twentieth century, the objections of science to adequate investigation of the superpowers is virtually unexplainable. After all, the existence of the superpowers, at least in fundamental and rudimentary forms, is easy enough to confirm.

The modernist mainstreams, however, have not only NOT undertaken the confirmation -- but have adopted influential ways and means to prevent it, including denying funding to any effort along such lines and instituted effective anti-propaganda campaigns against the whole kit and caboodle of the superpowers.

The result was, of course, that the modern sciences, psychology and psychiatry were SANITIZED as an obvious preventive measure to ANY significant development of the superpowers. It's worth mentioning that the modernist anti-Psi platform did not even research INTUITION -- from which many scientific discoveries emerged.

*

And I personally know of one R&D project that lasted for about fifteen years. That project did resolve some of the signal-to-noise problems that yielded higher, dependable rates of efficiency. But that project was finally terminated by subtle hierarchical decision.

In this case, AFTER the increased efficiency could be demonstrated, very high level meetings were held regarding the "threat" of organized and developed superpowers. As one dependable source quoted to me,

two principal questions were asked: "Well, do we want achieved mind-readers and Psi spies?" "What if they get out of our control?"

And so, ZAP went that effort -- but not before organizing to send out unusual press releases to "prove" the inefficiency of the superpowers -- and also disinformation minions and functionaries to distort perceptions of what is involved.

*

I would not usually be so blunt regarding this issue or situation -- because there could be an element of danger involved.

But a new element has entered the picture, one that takes whatever is involved out of my immediate concepts, an element that by far outshines anything or anyone in the past as recent as a year ago.

And that element is the mapping of the human genome.

*

You see, IF it transpires that genetic markers do exist regarding the superpowers of the human biomind, it is as sure as your daily or weekly bowel movement that efforts will, will, will be secretly undertaken to bioengineer perfected "superpsychics." This goal will automatically include deep and penetrating research regarding whatever it takes to help achieve this purpose.

*

In the first instance, this genetic engineering process can be founded, easily enough, upon the recognized factor that elements of the superpowers DO manifest spontaneously in our species, and always have.

In this instance, all that needs to be done is to compare genetic profiles of a number of natural psychics in order to spot which gene markers they have in common -- and then to extract and splice them into the chromosomes of either the spermatozoa or ovum or both, and which when combined will then yield you know what.

*

In the second instance, the question of whether superpower faculties are hereditary will come up as a significant issue.

And so whether the faculties "run in families" will come up for renewed, and vigorous, interest.

*

So: do the express superpower faculties run in families?

The tradition that they do began, in the West, in ancient Israel whose prophets ran in families (sometimes skipping a generation or two, but reemerging later) -- and which phenomenon is adequately recorded in the OLD TESTAMENT.

The Irish take this for granted, as do even today's remnants of America's Amerindian populations. In short, shamans, seers, telepaths, clairvoyants probably do run along family lines.

*

Thus, the genetic basis can either be scattered and seemingly fortuitous, or more predictably run in genetic family lines.

As it was, my material grandmother insisted that such was the case. Her grandmother five or six times removed had been an Oglala-Sioux shaman. That genetic bequest seems to have excluded all male descendants -- until Moi, and which surprised Gram, and made her more than willing to directly answer my many early questions.

*

In any event, with the mapping of the genome the past (and future) objections to Psi are going to fall on rocky times in that the map will have the last laugh in this regard.

The public will probably never know of developments in this regard, for genetically engineered "superpsychics" will be too, well, too valuable to be exposed for public entertainment, skepticism, or any other kind of irrelevant whatnot.

But one day genetically-engineered superpower faculties will make their debut on the **WORLD STAGE**. At least, and for sure, the attempt will be made -- at a time not too far distant. For one nation is nearing the completion of the mapping process -- and that nation is **NOT** the Good Old U.S. of A.

The Genome

Many things have rerouted the historical direction of our species, of our existence on this planet, of our social, moral, ethical, philosophical and sociological perspectives.

Without any question, though, the mapping of the genome will eclipse all of them so far -- because for the first time (during our **RECORDED** history at least) humans will make humans in their **OWN** image. And if it becomes possible to fabricate novel "designer genes," then **THAT** image may ultimately consist of something neither seen nor conceived so far.

What this portends is never presented in our media, and only rarely mentioned in books devoted to the issue.

*

Indeed, the American public is quite underinformed regarding the genome. Many may be disinterested, many having never even heard the term. To those who know something about it, it may mean the eradication of genetic "defects" that underlay certain forms of cancer, hearing impairment, heart defects, etc. It might mean bigger tits for ladies that want them, and bigger pecs and biceps or whatever for males. In any event, the jump-connection between superpower faculties and the genome is avoided like the

plague. And doubtless this present essay will attract little attention because of the installed anti-superpower mechanisms widely distributed as the preventive measures earlier discussed.

*

So, to make this essay somewhat complete it seems the better part of valor briefly to describe the GENOME.

*

The modern term GENE is taken from an ancient Greek word that meant "to produce" within the concept of "this naturally or automatically produces that" -- as contrasted to the concept that something can be made or manufactured out of something else.

In other words, the acorn (seed) of the oak tree produces another oak tree.

*

In English, a number of words have arisen from the Greek source.

One of the earliest was the term GENE-SIS, taken directly from the ancient Greek term which meant coming into existence, being born, origin, creation. It was applied by early Greek translators to the first book of the Old Testament, appearing in Early English at about 1000.

*

Another early term (about 1300) was GENE-LOGY, roughly described as an account of one's descent from an ancestor(s) via the enumeration of the intermediate persons -- this concept being roughly equivalent to a pedigree, lineage, family stock, or bloodline. The term "pedigree" was later transferred exclusively to animals, especially dogs and horses.

Bloodlines were important in most premodern cultures for two central reasons. Inheritance, power and influence descended through them, and they formed the central core of family clans -- and, in some cases, formed the basis of ancestor memory.

*

Another term was GENE-RATION, appearing in English about 1374, and, in an active sense, principally referring to physical procreation or the begetting of progeny or offspring.

Also during the 1300s, GENERATION was also applied to all of the progeny of a given set of parents, and to the whole body of individuals born about the same period and the time covered by the lives of those.

*

The term GENITAL also appeared during the 1300s, but was taken from the Latin GENITALEM which referred to the external organs of generation, usually those of the male.

*

The adjective GENETICAL was occasionally used up through the 1600s, but later became obsolete with regard to a mathematical meaning I haven't been able to grasp.

*

The term GENETIC, now so familiar today, apparently did not appear in English until about 1831. GENETIC is not included in Noah Webster's 1828 edition of the AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. As used in 1831, GENETIC seems to have referred to histories of poetry, the origins and development of creative power and parts of speech or language, and the classifications of religions and systems of logic.

*

The use of GENETIC in its now familiar biological sense apparently began emerging only about 1859. It first referred to "one that is the result of a common origin," thus having "genetic affinity, connection, and relationship" to that common origin. Therefore, the term GENETIC as we basically use it today is only about 130 years old.

*

It is rather surprising that the term GENE did not really emerge in English until about 1913 -- and first utilized in the context of "the invisible rudiment or transmitted germ of a character." It is important here to enter into a slight digression in that the use of GENE in this sense referred to "character," not to biological structure. There are, of course, different ways of interpreting this. But for one thing, the GENE as we know it today as articulated protein structure, had not yet been discovered. A gene was more or less considered as an "invisible rudiment" along the lines of a plasma or germ. Astrologers, circa 1913, also considered the influences of the planets, i.e., as "invisible rudiments," much in the same way. The emphasis seems to have been on "causative formation" via invisible rudiments, the sum of which was seen as a kind of holistic "character" -- this more in a motivational psychological sense than in a biological structural one.

*

In any event, as of 1913 "character" was being used in a quasi mixture of psychological and sociological sense. This usage had a close or distant relationship to eugenics, then on the upswing. The assumptions of eugenics held that psycho-socio character, such as criminality and genius, ran in

families within which the character was transmitted as "fixed" if children demonstrated similar psychosocial characters as their parents and grandparents.

In other words, to the eugenicists (and to many psychologists) NATURE endowed psychosocial character. Sociologists, of course, disagreed with this -- largely because the dominant sociological platform held that character could be modulated or remodulated by NURTURE at both the collective and individual level.

*

The tremendous NATURE vs. NURTURE "debate" then arose. Eugenics and genetics fell into enormous convolutions and disrepute, and biologists in general fled from them in droves -- mostly because they were deprived of funding. The funding was given to sociologists who proposed to modulate wide and wise social reforms and reconstruction via the institution of proper nurturing. And there things might have rested, suspended in sociopolitical "debate" -- had not the electron microscope been developed in Germany in 1932, and which invention made the invisible gene visible.

*

At this, genetics had to be restored -- but with certain qualifications. The tremendous nature vs. nurture debate was still ongoing and of quite fierce proportions, although the "nurturists" stayed well in the forefront. The safest course for the neo-genetics was to detach from all phenomena believed to be psychological (and parapsychological) in origin, and of course to avoid the taint of eugenics at all costs. Genetics then charted a course strictly material-biological-structural -- and until quite recently geneticists since then inhabited solely a material universe, focusing exclusively on "nature" and leaving "nurture" to psychological and sociological behaviorists.

*

Strictly speaking, the modern origin of GENETICS is dated as 1908, under the heading of the quantitative scientific study of physical heredity -- as distinct from the qualitative manifestations and behavior of that heredity. The 1908 work was based on the earlier work (c. 1866) of Gregor Mendel on inheritable dominant and recessive FACTORS in plants, and the combinations and recombinations of those factors.

*

The concept of the GENOTYPE emerged about 1897, first established as "any typical material of the type species of a genus." [SCIENCE, 23 April 1897, p. 639.] By 1910, the definition had been slightly altered as "the combination of hereditary characters possessed by a race or organism; a race or group of organisms having the same combinations of heredity characters."

*

Here it is worthwhile to distinguish between GENUS and SPECIES, at least for the sake of the clarity that might not be immediately at hand.

The term GENUS was first used in English about 1551, described then as a "general word" for the characters shared similarly "in their kind" -- much as birds of a kind flock together -- the "in their kind" having mostly to do with "virtues and vices."

In about 1608, the term began to take on more physical botanical and zoological meaning, especially with regard to different types of crocodiles and roses.

By 1895, GENUS had come to mean a class, kind, or group marked by common characteristics or by one common characteristic, specifically a category of biological classification ranking between the family and the species.

*

The term SPECIES was first used at about 1559, and meant outward form or appearance, the visible form or image as constituting the immediate object of vision (or taste, apparently, as in this species of wine is better or worse than another.)

THE SPECIES, as the HUMAN RACE was not used until about 1711.

In terms of modern definition, SPECIES refers to a category of biological classification ranking immediately below the genus or subgenus, comprising related organisms of populations potential capable of interbreeding.

So, a SPECIES is defined by whatever it can interbreed with and produce progeny.

Our SPECIES belongs to a family of mammals represented by the single genus HOMO (man [which once meant male and female].)

After THAT designation, our single genus has styled itself as species SAPIENS SAPIENS (loosely translated (if we can keep from rolling on the floor in some instances) as knowledge that man knows that it can think).

And, we can interbreed only with our thinking other Sapiens Sapiens -- excepting, so far, the possibility of extraterrestrial genetic engineering, and which spaceside activity would need the equivalent of electron microscopes.

*

Not long after the development of the electron microscope during the 1930s, the concept of heritable physical FACTORS merged with the concept of physical GENES. The factors were then apparently being seen as the physical manifestations of the genes -- while any reference to CHARACTERS seems to have been sequestered into the depths of psycho-social behaviorism.

In any event, the nurturists had won the day by the 1950s, and which decade was also the paramount decade of behaviorism. Nurturism and behaviorism detached completely from genetics, much to the relief of the geneticists eagerly peering into the internal anatomy of the gene now visible.

*

And what they began to see was astonishing. To get into this, we need to introduce the term **CHROMOSOME**, technically defined (as of 1978) as the structural carrier of physical hereditary characteristics (i.e., not behavioral **CHARACTER**), found in the nucleus of every cell.

A certain number of chromosomes is characteristic of each species. The fruit fly has 8, the potato has 48, the human has 46.

The chromosomes of any plant or animal that reproduce sexually exist in pairs, and are thus diploid, but are called alleles. Thus, in humans there are 46 chromosomes -- or 23 pairs of them.

All cells in the human carry a complete complement of these numbers -- except the sex cells of the spermatozoa or ova, which carry only half of them. Upon the event of "fertilization," these two halves, one from the male and one from the female, will match and fuse to format the new progeny, and which will then have the complete 23 pairs of alleles or the 46 chromosomes.

*

Descriptively put, the genes can roughly be compared to beads, the chromosomes to strings of them.

*

One of the early popular confusions regarding all of this was an unknowing confusion between **GENE** and **CHROMOSOME**. To correct this confusion, if it exists in some readers, we have 46 chromosomes of 23 allele pairs. But, as we will shortly see, these contain many, many more genes, or genetic "packages."

*

The physical existence of chromosomes and genes was hypothesized and predicted in the 1860s by Frederick Miescher and that they would be composed of a substance he named "nuclein." This substance was isolated by him in 1869.

But it wasn't until the late 1950s that the far-reaching importance of this "substance" began to be understood as not only the material of which the gene is composed, but as the actual **CARRIER** of the hereditary characteristics (or traits).

Miescher's "nuclein" (or nucleic acid) was found to exist as two types, and which have been named DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) and RNA (ribonucleic acid.)

In most organisms, as is the case with the human organism, the two nucleic acids occur in combination with proteins, the combined substances being called nucleoproteins.

Now Get The Following...

So far as understood, the "hereditary information" is encoded into the combined substances, and which

"information" apparently utilizes the same substances to re-encode itself AND to synthesize additional nucleoproteins.

Further, the chemical and physical properties of DNA suit it for both replication and transfer of information.

Each DNA molecule is a long two-stranded chain. The chains are made up of subunits called nucleotides, each containing a sugar (deoxyribose), a phosphate group, and one of four nitrogenous bases, adenine, guanine, thymine, and cytosine. These are identified by the letters A, G, T, and C respectively.

The "information" carried by the genes is coded in sequences of these nucleotides, which correspond to sequences of amino acids in the polypeptide chains of proteins.

*

The A, G, T, and C contents of the subunits called nucleotides are sometimes referred to as genetic "markers" -- and the total of which apparently comprise the "genetic code" or the "human blueprint," and "filling in the map of human nature."

Like all else in genetics, the "markers" exist in diploid base pairs, one half from the male, the other from the female. It is their "sequencing" that determines everything, or almost everything about what we do or do not genetically inherit.

*

There are 3 MILLION of these base pairs (or markers), the sum of which is referred to as the GENOME -- and the complete mapping of which is called the Human Genome Project (HGP).

It is these base pairs that make genetic identification possible, and genetic engineering a rather sure thing -- the latter because the functions of the base pairs can be blocked or enhanced, or removed and replaced, by what is delicately referred to as "genetic therapy."

*

In the United States, the ambitious Human Genome Project needing twenty years to complete was voted and funded by Congress in 1988, and thus got underway.

Problems arose, however, among the decision-makers and internal rivalry among the genetic "camps" involved. The costs of the project were objected to, although those costs were considerably less than the budget for Project Apollo to the moon, and the HGP would clearly furnish more sheer data than the moon landing for scientists and philosophers and sociologists to reflect upon.

Umbrage was also heaped on the project by the vested interests of certain inner sanctums I'll not specify because it might be too volcanic to do so. But, after all, there would be, in the following order of importance, economic, religious, philosophical, and real or imagined moral and ethical factors to consider.

*

Thus, the American genome project collapsed at a couple of points during the early 1990s -- but was hastily put back together again when it became known that the energetic Japanese had begun their own genome project about five years before the Americans had.

Even so, having lost time, and having started late, the American effort stands no chance of winning the race for the genome MAP -- the most basic human blueprint and the doorway to . . .???

Extrapolations and Implications

Before getting into the genome implications relative to the superpowers, one factor certainly needs to be emphasized: A species that, with hands-on, can directly micromanage its own genome will be considerably different from the one that can do no such thing.

*

After all, there IS a difference between selecting genetic materials in the laboratory and "selecting" them by random copulation, even if the copulation is achieved among those who believe themselves to be the best or better people.

*

The whole of this is no longer a science fiction fantasy that might come true five hundred generations into the future. It is something that is less than one-half a generation away from NOW.

Versions of Genome Micromanagement

For those who have something of a grasp of the Larger Picture involved, there can be little doubt that there will be four versions of genome micromanagement at the outset -- the American, the European, the Japanese, and the Chinese versions.

*

At the outset, the American version will almost certainly be conceived as a new, and very expensive, economic opportunity to sell (cures for diseases, for example) to those who can afford to buy. In other words, genome consumerism -- a new market to be brought into the short-sighted, capitalistic syndrome.

*

I'm not sure how the early responses regarding the European version will manifest, but in general I'll bet on genetic enhancement of what we Americans refer to as "brains." As contrasted to American

preferences for economic-power trusts, Europeans have always opted for brain-power trusts, including the British.

*

China has always been more or less inscrutable, at least to Western thinking in general -- so I'll forego jump-guessing this one.

*

Japan will have the opening and first cutting edge regarding genome micromanagement. Unlike China, Japan is not so much a mystery as it is a wonder. In size, Japan fits neatly into the state of California with room left over. Yet, after World War II, it took but forty years for the Japanese to become a world economic power, and which today owns an outright 8 per cent plus of the American economy. This feat, as the Japanese openly state, was achieved by focusing on long-range planning, not on the immediate gratification of short-term gains. I would guess that the Japanese will go for the overall superhuman that can be increasingly perfected over long periods of time. In other words, they will go for an outright "evolutionary step," as it might be put.

The Superpowers and Gene Micromanagement

If you have struggled through this essay to this point, and if your "mind" feels tired, and if your realities have started to blink out, well, join the crowd which includes my humble self. But to get to the end of this essay, we must proceed.

*

The advent of the superhuman has been foreshadowed in movieland fiction -- in chop-chop karate thrillers, space epics, the meeting of Earthlings with ultra-achieved Other "cultures," Psi intrigues, and in wonderful tales where overadequate muscle meets overpowerful androids resulting from laboratory micromanagement, either earth-based or space-based.

All of the foreshadowing has two factors in common:

- (1) the downgrading of natural human efficiency in the face of superpower efficiency, no matter what kind it consists of; and
- (2) the calling forth, in the natural human, of factors necessary to meet and cope with the "invading" superpowers.

In this sense, the MESSAGE of these foreshadowings is the conflict, but the TEXT beneath is that the superpowers pre-exist in the natural human or they could not, as undeveloped potentials, be called forth into potential realization.

*

The overt and hidden essences and meanings must now be overlaid onto the potentials of genome micromanagement -- and which, via selective genetic engineering, will be "called forth" by direct microsurgical intervention in DNA sequencing.

THIS, however, will NOT be "genetic therapy," but genetic re-creating that jump-starts and re-routes the rather slow "evolutionary process" into deliberate designer modifications. In other words, PRECISE DNA sequencing as contrasted to rather fortuitous and random sequencing via sexual drives or love combinations.

*

In other words, the future as of NOW is in the hands and minds of geneticists, and this can be said pure and simple.

Geneticists

Since this IS the case, or will increasingly become the case, it is worthwhile having a look at PRESENT geneticists.

These, it might well be said, exist in a purely physical realm where DNA splicing and removal and re-sequencing are interpreted via the physical outcomes of doing so. Here we must remember that genetics came to involve physical structure in a direct quantitative way, while the qualitative biomind factors were left to psychologists, sociologists and psychiatrists to cope with.

*

But there can be little doubt that DNA re-sequencing that leads to high QUALITY performance and efficiency will be recognized as the start-up of the superhuman population.

Nonetheless, and as regards the current state of the genetic "art," geneticists will have to look for quantitative physical structure -- since presently they are ill-prepared to do much else.

The meaning here is that those superpowers of the human biomind that can be seen to emerge from or because of some kind of genetic physical structure will be the first to be "enhanced" via DNA re-sequencing.

Sensory Receptors

The two fields of neurobiology and genetic DNA-sequencing recognition have not quite yet gotten "married." But they are destined for this nuptial state.

Via the electron microscope and other advanced technologies, neurobiologists (and bio-physicists) have recognized that the entire genetic physical body is laden with all sorts of sensory receptors, down to and including the skeletal framework. But since each specimen is DNA-sequenced differently in slight or

gross ways, the distribution of those receptors is also patterned differently in each genetic specimen. Except in genetic family lines in which specific superpower faculties are transferred to progeny in higher-than-average qualitative ways.

A specific example is now necessary. I will select the example of dowzers, and whom are dowzers because they are more sensitive to magnetism and magnetic fluctuations.

Neurobiologists have confirmed that the palms and soles of the feet in all specimens of our species possess sensory receptors for detecting "magnetics." The difference between the able dowser and the non-able one is that the able ones possess more of such receptors, and are thus much more sensitive and aware of magnetism and magnetic fluctuations.

Thus are dowzers produced, and which dowzers tend to "run in families." MEANING: there is DNA-sequencing regarding less or more sensory magnetic receptors on the palms and soles.

It will certainly be possible to locate and identify the DNA-sequencing patterns by examining the DNA profiles of able dowzers, especially those with a given familial lineage along those lines.

*

Since DNA nucleotides can be artificially synthesized, the DNA-sequencing responsible for "growing" sensors magnetic receptors can be altered and enhanced by genetic micro-engineering. ERGO: super-dowzers.

This genetic trait (or character, or whatever) is known, for example, to run in Amerindian shamanistic family lines. Those that possess the relevant magnetic sensors can hold up their palms -- and detect a small campfire or a human or animal body concealed in a forest twenty miles away. THIS has been demonstrated to moi several times in New Mexico, Arizona and lower Utah. There is no trickery or "magic" involved -- only DNA-sequencing. It is also confirmed that certain "point men" in Viet Nam were successful point men because they could magnetically sense metal (such as mines) concealed in earth or jungle.

*

I would now like to go into qualia receptors -- which account for several, but not all, forms of clairvoyance. But space does not permit.

The New Face of the Superpowers and Their Genetic Enhancement

There is much more to be said (or speculated) along these lines. But the goal was to show that the "search for psychic and/or paranormal powers" is in process of gravitating to genetics -- and to geneticists.

But it now needs to be pointed up that if the geneticists were to research psychic or paranormal powers, they would NOT do so. As mentioned, by far and large geneticists dwell in a material universe filled with the physical matter of biological structure and processes. Psychical and parapsychological research

is anyway filled with box canyons, endless detours backing up into fruitless theories, and, not the least, hobgoblins of the so-called "non-material."

*

But examining sensory receptors physically present on and within the bio-body is clearly another matter -- a PHYSICAL, structural matter, and hence a matter of genetic interest. In this sense, and in the sense of mapping the ENTIRE genome, geneticists cannot refuse to consider the meaningful interest of the "subtle" receptors, and cannot avoid identifying their particular DNA-sequencing.

*

But in undertaking this promising task, the geneticists will NOT at all need to incorporate parapsychological or psychical workings. After all, the researchers of those two fields often insisted there was no biological basis for the psychic "abilities." And, as someone's ironic last laugh, the modern sciences AGREED.

One of the meanings here is that the genetic inquiry into the DNA-sequencing of the superpowers of the human BIO-mind WILL NOT incorporate the theories or the nomenclature of Psi or parapsychology.

*

There are at least two reasons for this exclusion:

- (1) The psychic-parapsychological theories and nomenclature will only clutter the effort with imprecise definitions and the ambiguities typical of most of the terminology.
- (2) But there is a better reason: geneticists DO NOT NEED psychical and parapsychological research concepts or their nomenclature.

You see, the superpowers will be a matter of PHYSICAL sensory receptors -- not of illusive (and undependable) psychological episodes or events. Indeed, neurobiologists, etc., have already discovered many different kinds of sensory receptors -- as well as a number of receptors for which no function is recognizable so far. Also, certain DNA-sequencing has been discovered for which no functional correlation is recognizable.

When I became aware of this shift-in-nomenclature problem, I attempted to prepare at least a partial codex for it. I presented this codex at an invited lecture at the United Nations in March 1994, and placed the lecture as an essay in this present database in September 1996. I direct your attention to that essay, entitled: ON-GOING SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY OF SENSORY RECEPTORS WHICH ACCOUNT FOR MANY SUBTLE PERCEPTIONS.

*

Anyhow, and to sum up, think GENOME DNA SEQUENCING -- no longer think PSYCHIC, PARANORMAL or PARAPSYCHOLOGY.

And, by the way, ready or not, welcome to the Age of Superpower DNA Enhancement. Oh, Yes: I almost forgot. Don't expect to find media reports on achieving DNA-enhanced superpowers -- for all of this will be kept TOPMOST-TOP SECRET, and require seven levels of need-to-know above that.

SO, BAMBINI, THERE IT IS...

...believe it or not.

TOWARD ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (23Feb97)

PART 3: THE NATURE OF PERCEPTION

As discussed, however imperfectly, in the Introductory materials to this series of essays, it was discovered that consensus realities and their broadly-shared concepts are sources of the greatest deterrents and distortion regarding the superpower faculties.

*

The principal reason seems to be that certain concepts are misconceptions or are absent -- and in either case the mental information processing grids of the individual so affected respond as if they have viruses in them.

The result can consist of anything imaginable -- from the highest, most vaporous kinds of illusion down to and including complete closure or black-out of the cognitive processes.

*

There is the added complexity that viruses can mutate with wild frequency, or become immune to conceptocides in the way cockroaches can do.

So the best way to deal with them is not to rationalize in their presence, not to try to correct them in anyway, but by the simple cave-man tactic of pounding them to death with the proverbial club of increased and more exact understanding.

*

If this tactic is successful, one is somewhat likely to experience Metanoia shifts -- Metanoia to be extensively treated in a following essay.

*

In any event, when the misconceptions or absence of correct ones are cloned into the think-processes of everyone, anyone, the misconceptions , etc. act as viruses that either confuse or misdirect various kinds of information in ways that seem entirely appropriate, logical, rational, correct and so forth. If something like this is not possible, then the think-systems are caused to shut down. In familiar terms, this is often expressed as "my mind is drawing a blank" or "I haven't the foggiest notion of what is meant."

*

Since most consensus reality information is simplified and generalized with regard to larger and larger consensus realities, the confusions and misdirections are not usually noticed.

*

It isn't just that misconceptions come into existence or that some of them are inadequate. Perhaps the biggest of the central problems is that they are "understood" as if they ARE adequate and well conceived.

In this state of false understanding, they are then cloned into the think processes of others where they function like information viruses.

Most people will abandon false understandings if and when they realize their falseness. But this seems to be linked in some direct proportion to whatever complexity is involved.

*

Having realized something about the deterrent nature of conceptualizations, it then seemed necessary to isolate those most fundamental with regard to the superpower faculties, and then inspect how they were understood.

Various lists of nomenclature were produced as a result.

*

For example, certain fashionable terms were found to be oxymorons, but which are none-the-less understood as if they make real sense -- PRE-cognition, and POST-cognition, for instance.

Another kind of list contained terms drawn from theories, not from direct evidence, but which terms became broadly utilized as if they represented direct evidence, not theory -- TELEPATHY and PSYCHO-KINESIS being two of these.

(NOTE: A number of terms that fall into these two categories will be dissected in essays ahead.)

*

Then, and as we have already seen, there were terms extremely ambiguous regarding their definitions, but broadly utilized anyway -- presumably not because anyone really understands them, but simply because they are verbal currency which fit into and reflect the major consensus realities everyone seems to have cloned. An "everyone is using it, so it must be OK" kind of thing.

*

Finally, there was a list of terms taken as reflecting extremely obvious and self-evident truths, so much so that everyone utilizes them with a cast-in-cement conviction of their correctness and their utterly unchallengeable reality as well.

What these particular terms refer to and conceptualize is completely taken for granted, and all of them underpin consensus realities extending far outside of the much smaller ones typical of superpower phenomena.

This is to say that such terms are broadly based in overall cultural usage in that they are closely associated with "basic images" of the human being is.

*

Even though their meanings are taken completely for granted and thus hardly ever inspected, two of these particular terms are entirely troublesome -- so much so that unless they are properly defined and understood they will derail any and all cognitive approaches to the superpower faculties.

The second of these terms will be considered elsewhere. The first will now be examined.

Perception

That term is PERCEPTION -- and everyone, absolutely everyone takes it for granted that they understand perfectly well what it means.

Right? Well, if anything is understood about perception, it is only the via consensus reality format of it.

*

IT MUST BE EMPHASIZED THAT VERY FEW OF THE FACTORS DISCUSSED BELOW HAVE ORIGINATED FROM MY OWN STRESSED BRAIN -- WITH THE EXCEPTION OF WHAT CONSTITUTES MY ATTEMPTS AT SARDONIC HUMOR.

*

Most people utilize the concept-term PERCEPTION as if they comprehend what it means and refers to,

and most people will say they do understand it.

But if you ASK a few people what it means, well, now occurs a pause, sometimes followed by: "Well, let's see . . . (a hiatus of verbiage) " .

Sometimes someone will respond: "It means what I perceive, that's perception." Or: "It's what I see."

Others might say: "OK. I guess I'd better look it up."

*

Looking it up might not get you anywhere -- except back into the general consensus reality regarding what perception is thought to consist of.

But something now has to do with where you want get to, want to achieve. And so something must be distinguished here.

*

That our species has perceptions is not the issue, for it IS self-evident that we have them -- unless they are dysfunctional, at which time we are blind or oblivious in this or that regard. And here it should be admitted that certain misconceptions can "blind" us to any number of things. If, for example, we think that psychic perception is BASED in perception, then this will blind us regarding any realization that it is NOT.

*

In any event, it is obvious that living organisms that depend for survival on acuity of certain gross perceptions would not survive unless they had them. Just try to imagine a living organism with no perceptual faculties, and zippo, almost certain extinction.

*

In other words, PERCEPTION is so fundamental to our species that it is practically synonymous with FUNCTIONAL LIFE itself -- and that life, or at least the living of it, becomes increasingly dysfunctional as the perceptual faculties themselves become (or are).

And since perception is so fundamental, we think that perception must be the answer to everything.

*

This remains a convincing truism -- until the question arises why we DO NOT perceive something when enough evidence is present to indicate that we should. Regarding this I refer back to the Patagonian thing narrated in Part 1 {INSERT LINK HERE}.

*

In the contexts of all of the foregoing, then, it would appear that without perception we are nothing. And so the CONCEPTS regarding perception may be the most fundamental ones upon which ALL other concepts are extended from. This, unless and until one comes to learn and accept that there is more to perception -- at which time it becomes apparent that perception is NOT perception, but something entirely different.

*

In any event, such certainly IS the case regarding the whole of psychical and parapsychological research in which perception holds center stage, and as is also the case regarding creative, inventive and problem-identification activity.

If you DELETE the concept-term of PERCEPTION from psychical research and parapsychology, their entire cognitive edifices will go poof, having instantly vaporized.

*

If you delete perception in any kind of wholesale way, there also go the arts, science, certainly any hope of diplomacy or any other kind of information transfer, and there goes any contact with the past or the future.

About the only thing remaining will be one's immediate appetites, and even these won't be perceived for very long.

*

Thus, perception is a f-----g serious issue. And this is the reason why I will lean completely on published scientific documents, omitting entirely my own perception of perception.

*

If perception is not what is generally thought, it thus follows that a simple definition of PERCEPTION is not only not sufficient or meaningful, but that it will act as a virus, as all simplified information packages usually do.

To establish that our species does have perceptions and let it go at that is nowhere enough -- and, in demonstrable fact, might be dangerous.

And in any event, anyone hoping to "develop" access to their superpower faculties and activate them doesn't stand one chance in Hell of doing so in the absence of very refined comprehensions of the nature of perception.

In this sense, Superpower Development 101 WILL necessarily consist of learning everything known about perception, of which there is quite a lot -- but hardly any of which can be stuffed into an over-simplified format.

*

The research involving collecting together what has been known, what is known, and what is yet to be known about perception has been excruciating and taken a great deal of effort.

But in the researching one occasionally runs across various condensed statements such as: "You ARE your perceptions...", "What thine perceptions are so shall ye be...", and so forth, until one can get the approximate idea that one's perceptions maketh one, and that one's non-perceptions non-maketh one.

*

The enduring axioms "I think, therefore I am" or "As I think therefore I have been and will be" are not quite on the mark. You see, thinking takes place after perceptions do, and so what more matters is the quantity AND the quality of how many perceptions one has or doesn't have in activational status. And it is this which makes one into an I AM entity.

*

This becomes somewhat understandable by jumping the gun a little here.

The only information our systems can make perceptions out of is the information ADMITTED into those systems. If our information transferring systems are somehow barriered against admitting certain kinds of information, then that information will not be perceived.

*

In converting all of the above considerations to the issue of the superpowers of the human biomind, all of them in the primal or first instance of their activity are some kind of information-dealing faculties -- as are ALL of the biomind's powers per se. All other attributes must then be drawn from these information-dealing faculties, for if those didn't exist, then neither would the attributes.

It must then follow that if certain of the superpower faculties are inactive, then all of their possible attributes and extensions will also be inactive.

And perception is an attribute of the information-dealing systems, and in no case is a primal or first instance of anything.

All Perception is Indirect Perception

Among the first of the gargantuan problems to wrestle with is that it is commonly thought and accepted that there is a direct connection between the perceiver and what is perceived.

And indeed, one can often hear people saying something along the lines of "Well, I had direct perception of it, and so I know what I saw."

*

No one who has cloned this idea can be blamed for having done so. It is a cultural artifact (in the modern West at least), and no effort is taken to correct it, at least as regards public consumption. On the other hand, what perception actually consists of IS more or less known in scientific realms devoted to studying it. But this knowledge is more or less sequestered to certain kinds of specialists some of which I'll discuss after the working parts of this essay have been completed.

*

In English, the concept of "direct" perception seems to go somewhere back in time to a point that seems unidentifiable.

However, most modern definitions do not specify that perception is direct. Such is implied, or assumed, or taken for granted.

For example, the original 1828 Noah Webster's gives for TO PERCEIVE:

"To have knowledge or receive impressions of external objects through the medium or instrumentality of the senses or bodily organs."

"To know: to understand: to observe."

"To be effected by; to receive impressions from [something]."

All of which, of course, are referred to as PERCEPTION(S) -- but without any reference as to how the perceptions come about.

*

In English, the general concept of perception has not changed very much since 1828 -- even though accumulating evidence and knowledge since then has established that the general concept is complete nonsense. For example, to merely observe or receive impressions does not automatically equate with knowledge or understanding.

*

The pre-1828 actual etymology in English of TO PERCEIVE and PERCEPTION has not been established very well.

The approximate dates of the earliest noted uses in English of these two terms are the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries -- but which seems a bit late for such fundamental conceptualizing nomenclature. If we carefully inspect the earliest recorded etymological basis, we can find not one, but two major concepts regarding what we today have collapsed into just one, and which is entirely misconceived.

*

One the one hand, there was a similar archaic term, PERCEANT (apparently derived from Old French

PERCER (to pierce)) which meant penetrating, keen, piercing -- the "keen" motif implying some kind of penetrating/piercing/discriminative faculties.

On the other hand, the two terms PERCEANT and PERCER are later thought to have been derived from the Latin PER + CAPERE -, PER meaning "by or through," CAPERE meaning to take -- ending up with "to take by or through" (something?).

*

However, to "penetrate-pierce keenly" and to "take [in?] by or through" are two entirely different concepts, the first being an active-like out-flowing, the second being a passive-like in-flowing.

*

Now, the standard definition of A PERCEPTION is an attainment of awareness or understanding, while the most used definition of TO PERCEIVE is to become aware of through the senses. And so some dreaded complexities arise, whether we like them or not.

*

First off, in common parlance, one can hear others saying that he or she (or IT if it be a pet or animal) "has piercing perceptions." On the other hand, sometimes people say that others are "a victim of their perceptions" -- with the proviso, of course, that oneself is not such a victim either of one's perceptions or lack of them.

*

Furthermore, awareness of and understanding are really two different things -- for one can be aware of something and not understand it at all, or understand something in the complete absence of awareness about what is being "understood."

*

But in spite of this essential confusion regarding awareness and understanding, both the active out-going and the passive in-taking formats of perception imply direct routes between the perceiver and what is being perceived.

The active out-going format also implies a "search, discover, and pierce" activity. The passive take-in-through (the senses) format implies a "sit back and receive" activity.

As these two concepts stand, then, a direct link out to or receiving into is implied.

*

In any event, if we persist in utilizing the same word after realizing there may be THREE kinds of perception states or conditions, we should enumerate the three as general types of it.

1. Passive, in-flowing perception
2. Active, out-going perception
3. Not much of either

And if the existence of the third type above is admitted and plotted on the standard Bell curve, it might turn out that the majority of the so-called "normal" are made up of this type. You see, having perceptions either of type 1 or 2 might mean that one perceived too much, or perceives what others do not. And in either case, one would tend to depart from the "normal."

*

In this sense, then, we would be obliged to posit the existence of at least two types of superpower faculties which function differently:

1. The passive PERCAPERE type where the experiencer simply in-takes perceptions (this type would consist of a one-way flow into one).
2. The active PERCEANT type where the experiencer out-goes in the way of piercing and keenly obtaining perceptions of -- and then, of course, along a return route of some kind of in-flowing regarding what has been pierced and keenly obtained.

*

To digress for just a moment, in this regard, the processes of Controlled Remote Viewing (CRV) are of the active PERCEANT type as distinguished from the passive PERCAPERE type. When the essential downfall of CRV occurred about 1988-89, it did so because of the failure to maintain the two seminal distinctions -- i.e., by retreating back into the dominant concept of perception as only in-flowing. But the reasons for the failure to maintain the distinctions are very easy to account for. You see, the conceptual consensus reality regarding perception is that it consists only of in-flow "of impressions." (I'll unfold ahead and in other essays the humorous and comic aspects of this failure.)

*

Meanwhile, back in the main theme of this essay, it's worth pointing up that since in-flow of perceptions IS the prevailing conceptual reality, when anyone submits to "psychic" or "RV" tutoring, one naturally anticipates that their passive in-flow perceptions will be enhanced. If one reads a book about how to become more psychic, one will unknowingly expect to read about in-flowing perceptions. And to be sure that is what the book will deal with. You see, psychics RECEIVE perceptions.

*

It's also worth noting that those "psychics" who say they "receive information or pictures" must be the passive type of PERCAPERE perceptionists. So if they are any good at their "craft," then their perceptual systems must be well-rigged along the passive receiving end of perceiving. However, a "psychic" asked, for example, to locate a missing person or a dead body hidden probably would have to be well-rigged regarding the active out-going PERCEANT type, i.e., the "pierce, search and keenly-find thing." Functional examples of this type seem a rarity, and which may be why not many have emerged to aid law enforcement activities. Some do exist, however.

*

In any event, one can now see that all perceptions may not equal all perceptions, since there are at least two different kinds of them, with more to follow. In this sense, then, a very important distinction begins to appear on the horizon of the over-generalizing concept of perception: how, or in which manner, the perceptions come about or result.

Is Perception a Thing In Itself, or Is It the Result of Processes that Make It Possible?

Obviously, perceptions of any kind do NOT just come about and that's the end of that story. Functions and processes are involved, and it is the nature and character of these which is almost totally missing within the general concept of what perception consists.

*

The most prevalent consensus reality concerning perception is basically modeled upon concepts regarding what eyesight was once thought to consist of -- and still is in most over-simplified reality formats.

The seventeenth-century French mathematician and philosopher, Rene Descartes, seems to have been the first to put in print the idea that the eye acts as a lens that focuses on the elements of the external world and directly projects them to a kind of projection screen somewhere at the back of the brain where they are "seen" as reflections of what is out there.

In this concept, then, a direct, one-to-one relationship between outer and inner images was thought to be the case -- and what is "seen" via this one-to-one relationship was thought of as "perception."

*

The first noted uses of "perception," however, are dated during the twelfth century and used in forms meaning "receiving, collecting rents." So a perception back then referred to rents, or to anything received. "Perception" also referred to receiving of the Eucharist or sacred elements. It wasn't until about 1611 that the term had become converted into meaning a perceiving, apprehension, understanding. But even then, a perception also meant "perception of profits."

*

The inner core meaning of perception, then, has focused on receiving, and in general consensus realities to this day we "receive perceptions" however else PERCEPTION may or may not be defined. And perception IS defined in quite a number of ways -- which ultimately leads to ambiguity as with all words that have an increasing number of meanings, some of which may be the opposite of others.

*

In that eye-perception has been the dominant model for perception during the modern period, it's worthwhile walking step-by-step through its so-called "mechanics" or "mechanisms." "Functions" would be a far better term as we shall see ahead.

*

To begin with, it is commonly thought that the eye sees images of the objects they scan or focus upon. However, the eye itself does not form images. Rather it is composed of a collection of extremely tiny light-sensitive parts, called rods and cones, etc., that detect various kinds of light reflecting off of various kinds of objects and things. Taken altogether, these can be called "photosensors." What the light-sensitive parts are thus "seeing" is not an image but interactions between the objects and the light they are reflecting. The interactions of the reflecting light are known as "interference patterns."

*

So what is actually going on, as **step 1**, is that interference patterns of light bouncing off of objects are taking place, and is these patterns that are picked up by the light-sensitive parts of the eye -- and which at this point should be referred to as a "light interference pattern detector." So, the light-sensitive parts of the eye are also light interference patterns.

That reflecting light patterns are the essential ingredient becomes quite clear if you step into a completely darkened room and close the door behind you. Zippo! No interference patterns, no "eye vision."

*

As **step 2**, the light-sensitive parts of the eye are not actually "parts," but at least a hundred million light-sensitive cells, each of which, or teams of which, are precisely geared only with regard to this or that

particular kind of light within the light-interference patterns.

This is to say that the patterns themselves have now been broken down into a hundred million separate light segments or aspects. Another way of putting this is that the light has now been broken down and divided up into a vast number of extremely minuscule "dots."

*

As **step 3**, EACH of the dots is immediately converted into a particular kind of electrical signal pattern, a hundred million of them.

*

As **step 4**, all of these minuscule electrical signals are transmitted in a rapid but hyper-organized way via a complicated system of "relay" cells to another complicated set of relay cells alongside the brain-stem. A complicated set of nomenclature for these relay-transmitting cells has been developed. But basically they belong to the ganglion system of cells, each of which, or sets of which, are interested solely in specific signals. Some of these have to do only with dividing differences of contrasts of light and shade; others have to do with dividing the signals into further categories of color.

*

As **step 5**, at this point each of the signal dots have been "cued" as to where they belong and interface among all of the signals.

*

As **step 6**, the whole of this is now forwarded or transmitted to the cells of the cortex lining the surface of the back parts of the brain -- i.e., transmitted to the back of your "head." The sectors of the cortex having to do only with "vision" are referred to as the visual cortex -- even though what we refer to as vision doesn't exactly take place among them.

*

Even though the mass of signals have arrived at the visual cortex, "vision" does not yet take place. If all this is complex enough so far, what now takes place gets really complex.

*

As **step 7**, the more "simple" cells "respond" to particular simple features of the incoming signals, at which point the signals begin to take on what we refer to as information. Some of the cells respond to straight lines, curves, given kinds of angles, or a dividing line between areas of light and darkness.

*

If these have more complex or more specific relationships arrangements, more "complex" counterparts to the "simple" cells are required. The complex cells respond, for example, to given shapes of given colors. Other specializing complex cells are interested in whether no motion is involved or if motion is involved. Some of the complex cells only respond to motion moving to the left; others only to motion moving to the right. Others have to do with up/down motion. And on and on and on. Some cells are interested only in what is signaled is dead or alive.

However, even though the "information" is somewhat organized into "bits" at this point, "image" or "image-perception" does not yet occur.

*

As **step 8**, the whole of the output of the simple and complex cells is forwarded to MEMORY STORAGE where, apparently, the bits are compared to bits stored in memory. This process goes on until the incoming bits find a "match" in memory storage, or a "match" that is nearest to/similar to the incoming bits. When compatible bits are located and compared to the incoming bits, what is called "recognition" now begins to take place.

*

As matches are found, and as **step 9**, what apparently is somewhat akin to a hologram begins to form, in which all of the incoming bits compatible with memory storage bits are now...

Reconstructed or Fabricated...

into, as **step 10**, the "image" that is now formed or projected into the hologram -- and which in our modern epoch is referred to as "mental image picture."

*

If all goes well enough from step 1 through step 10, then we have what we mistakenly call "eye vision" -- but which, beyond any scientific doubt now, is an interiorly reconstructed "hologram" of some kind -- "hologram" being the best term to date. The holograms that don't completely form up (for any number of reasons) are what we call "impressions" in order to distinguish them from an "image."

*

But there IS one factor that makes it seem there is a one-to-one relationship between the actual object

being "seen" and the holographic reconstruction of it.

This factor is the utterly mind-boggling speed that incorporates steps 1 through 10. Although the speed of the "recognition" sometimes varies in minuscule ways, the whole of all this takes place within nanoseconds or even in fractions of them.

*

Now, there remain some enormous complexities. The entirety of what happens via steps 1 through 10 is scientifically understood, mapped and predictable.

At least two important factors are yet missing.

*

1. In spite of the enormous research funds to discover what it is, no one knows what MEMORY is or where it is "stored."
2. Not known either is where the reconstructed holograms form, and why they do.

*

What IS known, though, is that everything we "perceive," absolutely everything, is "information" that has been reconstructed into formats recognizable only against memory storage.

And what is also known is that step 10 is the LAST step in this processes, not the second step. And whether concerning eye vision or not, everything that manifests in our heads takes place because of all ten steps, whether concerning our ideas, imagination, illusions, concepts, "understanding," and ALL other perceptual whatnot.

*

When, then, a psychic (or anyone) says they are receiving impressions or images, nothing of the kind is the case. They may indeed be receiving "signals." But the impressions or perceptual images are reconstructions based on (a) the signals that can be matched with (b) similar signals already in memory storage.

If the matches are only partial, then an "impression" results.

If the matches can fit together easy enough, then a perception-image or thought-idea results.

If no matches occur, then whatever the incoming information consists of, it simply drops "out of sight," is not "recognized," or remains invisible not even stimulating fractional conscious awareness. Except regarding that phenomenon we like to call "intuition" -- and intuition is most usually spoken of as "feeling," not perception.

*

It is well worth noting here that "recognize" in its most literal sense actually means to RE cognize

something. RE cognize actually means to RE formulate in "the mind." And in fact this is an entirely suitable definition for a perception -- something that has been re-constructed so as to be re-recognizable and hence cognizable.

A perception, then, is a re-recognizable formulation made possible by a reconstruction of information -- the reconstruction, however, being in accord, and ONLY in accord, with each individual's memory storage.

*

In any event, what we call "perceptions" don't exist as such. What CAN exist, however, are reformulations and reconstructions of information "in our heads" the end-products of which we call perceptions.

*

Well, has the foregoing been complicated enough? Wait until you "perceive" what lies ahead in about or four paragraphs.

The Distrust of Perceptions

Very little of the foregoing has dwindled down into general consensus realities (since it can't really be simplified). But the fact that ALL perceptions are NOT direct ones, but ARE indirect reconstructions in and by "the mind," has been scientifically understood for quite some time. And understood as well by scientific intellectuals and philosophers, even in the two decades just prior to the turn of the twentieth century.

From this understanding emerged the mysterious maxims: "One's perceptions are not to be trusted" or, "Don't put too much faith in your own or anyone's perceptions," etc.

These maxims were, and still are, opposed within more fundamental consensus realities by posing the following question: "Well, if we can't trust our perceptions, then what can we trust?"

Since familiar consensus realities incorporate the majority, and even large parts of unsuspecting subgroups, well, the business about "receiving" perceptions goes on as usual.

More Complexities

In an [earlier essay](#), the Patagonian syndrome was reviewed. The source of this syndrome can now somewhat, but possibly not completely, be explained by referring to steps 8 and 9 of the perception-making processes, these steps having to do with matching incoming information to similar elements in memory storage.

*

The Patagonians literally could not visually see the larger ship anchored out in the harbor. If the elements of the pre-conscious perception-making processes can be trusted, then one can say that the Patagonians had no memory storage regarding the topics of large, ocean-going vessels. The incoming information signals then could not be matched to anything in memory storage, and so the signals themselves could not be formatted into images that could achieve conscious awareness. The shaman remedied this by referring to similar shapes , **etc.**, with which the Patagonians were familiar -- which meant he rerouted the invisible and invisibilizing information through information points already in memory storage. This apparently allowed the information processing systems of the Patagonians to remix and rematch -- and the BEAGLE faded up into view.

*

Whether this constituted a conversion of already installed information processing grids or formatted a completely new one is of interest, but somewhat irrelevant to the larger picture -- as will be discussed in an essay yet to come in this series. It is far more to the point to consider image stocks in memory and how they are acquired.

Image Stocks In Memory

The general prevailing idea regarding perception is that everyone is capable of "seeing" the same thing, at least relatively speaking.

But the evidence is very good regarding two factors that are always pertinent:

1. What is in stock in memory is very likely to consist of a "dictionary of possibilities" or "slide library" intimately associated not with one's mind potentials, but with one's conceptualizing LANGUAGE basis. As the little-known French philosopher and student of perception puts it: ". . . it is from an electrical pattern taken from this personal slide-library that, with only marginal amendments, eventually appears in your `mind's eye'."
2. On the other hand, what is not in stock in the memory library is quite likely not to have a linguistic nomenclature, but will also result in invisibility of information.

*

Our nomenclature stock is established and maintained by the consensus realities that do so -- with the exception of "street-talk" and fashionable but unofficial ways of referring to something. For example, "vibe sensing," and to "psyche out" someone or something.

These two unofficial nomenclature bits represent quite valid potentials, but usually it isn't realized that the end-products of these also will consist of reconstructions, not direct one-on-one perceptions.

*

Anyhow, to get more directly to the point, we have already reviewed the issue of SNOW. Can you identify ten types of snow?

In English we refer to a camel and know what THAT creature is, a camel, right? Well, we do have in our memory slide-libraries two stored images of a camel. And so when we see one of the creatures or hear a camel mentioned either of the two electrical patterns taken from our slide-library will appear in our minds' eyes.

The first stored image will be of a camel; the second, less official image, will be of "humping" -- whatever that means to any given individual -- because camels have humps and also hump all the time.

*

In the case of Bedouins, however, the sight of or reference to a camel can trigger off any one of dozens of different mental images. These correspond to a consensus reality containing different Arabic words corresponding to different types of camels, their age, size, sex, whether they spit a lot or not, whether their temperaments are agreeable for human usage, what their droppings can be used for, their different kinds of stubbornness, and so forth.

Yet, in English-speaking realities, a camel is a camel, except of course in those sciences which map the distinctions among them.

*

And what of clouds? Can you identify ten types of them? An experienced and learned meteorologist sees as many as he has names for. To most Americans, all Chinese look alike at first, as do Americans to Chinese. These Chinese however can identify as many types of Chinese as there are provinces.

Formatting A Concept-Making/Image-Making Memory Library

In the light of all the foregoing, perception is not perception, but the result or end product of all those non-conscious processes that end up with what we call "perception" -- and the whole of which is not anything direct, but rather a re-experiencing made possible by one central factor. Memory comparisons. And the whole of this is so complex that we will dissect its most important pieces via essays ahead.

Neurobiologists and neuropsychologists are somewhat agreed that there are at least three major kinds of memory formatting, each of which is complex enough, but each of which can be described in general.

1. Universal memory formatting, "universal" meaning present in everyone. This, however, does not

mean intellectual or experiential acquisition. Rather it refers to a type of memory that seems inherent at the species level, is somehow genetically transmitted. It forms the general basis, for example, of general if simple recognition of external factors, all languages, and the inherent pattern in each individual to format a basic memory library in the first place.

It is out of this formatting that our general "perceptions" can be reconstituted and reconstructed so as to take on concept-image formats.

The basic distinction of this memory formatting is that it is NOT acquired after birth. It is inherent at birth.

2. The first level of acquired memory formatting is based on experiencing, on what happens to us after birth, providing the experiencing "stimuli" are strong enough and repeated enough. Experiencing is usually encoded into memory storage as emotions or emotional content, and usually divided into two basic sub-formats: painful and pleasurable.
3. The second level of acquired memory formatting is achieved, if it is, via learning about something indirectly. The first step in this formatting apparently has to do with cloning the language of one's environment, and which means cloning not only the nomenclature but its meanings assigned by the consensus reality involved. If the language basis cloned itself consists only of over-simplifications, then these too will be what is cloned. In any event, whatever IS cloned seems to be entered quite easily into permanent memory storage -- and for better or worse.

*

It is the two levels of acquired memory, largely of and via the emotions and intellect, which can be a help or a hindrance regarding many things and many matters. For they are largely responsible for what is or is not recognized or recognizable.

*

With regard to the central topic of this series of essays, the faculties of the superpowers apparently belong not to any format of acquired memory, but to the general and inherent species memory.

All the evidence in this regard is very strong

One of the most fundamental clues is that the superpowers often spontaneously emerge into activity and then resubmerge regardless of any acquired experience or learning.

*

Two other clues are also available, if time is taken to notice them.

Acquired experiential memory can either reinforce or negate contact with the superpower faculties, depending on how, to what degree, and within whatever consensus reality environment they are experienced.

Acquired learning memory via the intellect can also reinforce or negate them, depending on whether such learning can be conceptually engineered to match the inherent structure of the faculties, or if such learning induces conceptual displacement or cognitive noise regarding the inherent structure, thereby

causing malfunction or cognitive invisibility.

*

In any event, at their most basic levels of activity, all three of the memory formatting categories enumerated above appear to be NOT matters of "perception" in the first, most primary instance. Perception can be the RESULT of all three separately or combined. But, and as the maxim goes, if one works only with and via results, then one has put the cart before the horse. Horses don't push carts.

*

At base, all three of the major categories (there are many other sub-categories) regarding the all-important memory "library" are information processing and information transfer categories. This clearly implies that each specimen born of our species is an information processing being, body, mind, experiencer, receiver, entity, evolutionary product, spirit, soul, idiot, genius, or whatever one wants to IMAGE.

*

Since this is abundantly the case, we will temporary leave behind the bedraggled term "perception" for a while, and turn much needed attention to information theory and information transfer processes and their problem.

(End of Part 3)

TOWARD ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (01Mar97)

PART 4: INFORMATION, INFORMATION THEORY AND INFORMATION TRANSFER

If we think in terms of PERCEPTION, then we are most likely to think in terms of THINGS -- because things are what we perceive and have mental-image pictures of stored in our memory library. The incoming signals through the eye are processed as signals through a number of systems before they end up as thing-images.

It is relatively certain that our "understanding" processes undergo something quite similar, if not identical.

*

When we think in terms of THINGS, then we think in terms of objects, their shapes, sizes, colors, their meaning as an IT. We also think in terms of the distances between objects, their placement with regard to each other.

If we think of subjects or topics, we do so by first converting them into an IT-THING: for example, consider biology. IT is a science, as most know whether they know anyTHING more about IT.

*

The most fundamental basis of most consensus realities consists of IT-THINGS, and the most essential nomenclature utilized is set up to identify it-things. And this is the case even regarding philosophical abstractions, which, too, are it-things -- e.g., IT is an abstraction whatever IT is.

*

The general purpose of the first organized psychical research organizations set up during the 1880s was to witness, inspect, identify, separate and categorize what later came to be called "paranormal" phenomena.

But in order to proceed, the phenomena first had to be given identifiers, and which turned the phenomena into IT-THINGS. "IT is clairvoyance," for example. "IT is levitation," "IT is mediumship," "IT is thought-transference" (a term-concept later replaced by "IT is telepathy"), and finally "IT is psychic" whatever it is.

*

Phenomena are not just phenomena, but different kinds of them, and which need to be differentiated, distinguished and identified one from another. But sometimes this differentiation doesn't work very well if one doesn't really understand what IT is in the first place.

For example, in spite of about 100 years to do so, exceedingly great confusions continue to persist in making differentiation between clairvoyance and telepathy.

*

But generally speaking, differentiation is achieved by making an IT out of different kinds of phenomena and then assigning a nomenclature bit (or byte) in order to talk or write about any of them. When this is accomplished, we can thenceforth "know" what is being referred to because it has been rendered into an IT-IS kind of THING.

*

The first essential goal of organized parapsychology (circa the 1930s) was not only to inspect ESP phenomena, but to do so only within the parameters of recognized and approved scientific methods. Extra-sensory perception (ESP) was an it-identifier of "perceptions" that could not be attributed to any of the five physical senses, and so it could be said those perceptions were external to or outside the physical senses.

*

To test for the presence of ESP in given individuals or subjects, "targets" were utilized, and there came into existence standardized forms of targets (among them the famous Zener cards) which mostly consisted of pictures of geometric shapes or colors. A "target" is always an IT.

The goal of the testing was to determine if the subjects could perceive the "targets" via senses other than the physical five.

The targets, of course, were IT-THINGS - expressed as "It is a circle," "It is a square," or "IT (the target) is the wavy lines."

*

Now, in the "universe" of IT-THINK, there is only one basic way to judge "success" - whether one perceives-sees IT or doesn't see IT.

Thus, the parapsychology ESP subjects either "got the target" or didn't get it." Or, "hit" the target, or "missed" it.

*

As we shall see in later essays, the "hit-miss" paradigm that arose in parapsychology led to some rather dreadful situations regarding comprehension, morale and defeatism.

But nonetheless it was a perfectly logical approach within the contexts of IT-THING-THINK, and which contexts are universal everywhere and in all cultures.

*

The concepts of PERCEPTION are intimately and permanently linked to IT-THINGS, because if you examine any of them very carefully one can only perceive an IT. And even then, as has been reviewed in Part 3, the IT-PERCEPTION is a mental-image reconstruction, the sum of which is of the perceiver, and not exactly of the IT itself.

*

It is worth the time to review a few of the numerous definitions of THING:

a separate and distinct individual quality, fact, idea, concept or entity;

a material or substance of a given kind;

a piece of information or news;

an event, deed, act or circumstance;

a state of affairs in general, or within a specific or implied sphere.

*

The five definitions of THING given above can and do account for almost, but not quite, everything - and which is why we refer to everything AS every-thing. And so our perceptions are geared to perceive, identify, and discriminate among THINGS - and which then emerge in conscious awareness as reconstructed images.

*

There is absolutely nothing wrong with basic IT-THINK, and indeed it permits survival on about a 90 per cent basis - except when there are holes or gaps in it.

*

But IT-IS gaps can be somewhat corrected within the contexts of consensus realities in that IT-IS perception that is consistent with consensus reality is considered proper or successful perception, while perception that is not is considered improper or aberrant-undesirable - or at least non-conforming.

*

In general, however, any gap-difficulties along these lines are sort of smoothed over in that the nomenclature of a given consensus reality is the concepto-nomenclature everyone within it speaks and writes with - and tends to think with, too.

*

Just outside the enormous, collective IT-THINK syndromes of our species is a slightly different THINK format.

This "level" of thinking has to do with RELATIONSHIPS between and among IT-THINGS. Identifying it-things, and identifying them as it-things, only goes so far, although that process is entirely serviceable to a certain degree.

*

One can identify it-things, endlessly so, but only because they become perceptually concrete in some form - even an idea takes on a sort of concrete-ness if it becomes shared and approved of.

*

Relationships among it-things, however, are usually of a far different matter because, in the first instance, they have to be deduced. For example, the relationship between hydrogen atoms and hydrogen bombs is not readily apparent, and thus had to be deduced before it became identifiable.

*

This is to point up that although the arrangement of IT-THINK to IT-THINGS is usually on a one-to-one basis, the arrangement of IT-THINK to relationships among and between IT-THINGS is not on any kind of one-to-one basis - excepting the most gross and familiar samples of it. The reason for this difficulty is that relationships between it-things can be many and varied and include anything from the imaginable to the unimaginable, from the boring to the fantastic.

*

Another difficulty arises because once IT-THINK becomes properly installed it tends to run on automatic with the mind-boggling speed encountered in Part 3 regarding the basic ten-step processes of

perception.

*

DEDUCTIVE-THINK regarding relationships, however, usually never runs on automatic unless the deductions have themselves been pre-reduced to common understanding, at which time those particular deductions have taken on the clothing of IT-THINK.

*

Relationships of it-things to one another can be explicit or implicit, with the explicit ones being easier to identify, this type of thing usually being referred to as logic.

*

Implicit relationships, however, are identified as such because there is very little in the way of objective or explicit cues involved.

Thus, the deducing (detecting) of implicit relationships can escape the deductive processes of almost everyone - with the exception of those who somehow chance to "notice" them.

And those who DO notice them are quite likely to be attributed as intuitives. And, indeed, if it were up to me, I'd itemize the deduction of implicits as the basic and most broadly-shared type of intuition's many other types. And here is a basic clue regarding "enhancing" one's intuition - by first enhancing one's deductive processes regarding implicit relationships.

As it is in our present consensus reality, we reinforce the processes regarding explicit relationships, but pay very little attention to strengthening the much more wide parameters of implicit relationships.

*

One of the more recent definitions of "genius" is that a genius is one "who sees what others cannot." Although this clearly involves a lot of factors, the deducing of implicit relationships probably is fundamental here - since most rely on explicit rather than on implicit deducing.

*

Now to move speedily on.

The relationship, for example, between ESP and perception seems explicit enough, and therefore seems logical -- especially when a long line of "psychics" say "I perceive" thus and so.

They are correct in saying that they do perceive. But what they perceive is in fact whatever has been processed through their perception-making systems, the sum of these processes being the perception. And as we have seen these end products are not at all one-to-one images. And so what they report "seeing" may or may not correspond with the actual facts or conditions of what they have "seen" as perceptions.

*

This is a situation that has not gone unrecognized in parapsychology. In testing for ESP, researchers encounter many more "misses" than "hits" and the frequency of the misses has condensed into the theory of "Psi-missing." It is thought that Psi-missing is somehow related to "avoidance" of the "target," and as such constitutes some kind of unidentified psychological factors.

*

You see, "paraPSYCHOLOGY" is, after all, majorly conceived of as a branch of psychology -- not as a branch of perception study. And when it was understood by the rest of science that "perceptions" mostly consisted of "cognitive" versus physiological factors, perception, too, began to be thought of as predominantly having a psychological basis.

*

In any event, ESP and perception of IT targets are thought to go hand-in-hand, and all explicit and implicit considerations along these lines are shared not only in parapsychology, but throughout science, philosophy, and in our present general consensus realities as well.

*

Furthermore, the web of Psi-Perceptions is linked throughout by the IT-making nomenclature commonly utilized.

If, then, one refers to Psi or ESP, it is automatically understood everywhere that you are referring to special formats of perception that have been assigned IT nomenclature: psychic, clairvoyance, telepathy, intuition, and etc.

It is even commonly understood that "special" refers NOT to perception per se, but to the unusual other-than-sensory ways it is achieved -- if and when it is achieved.

*

Well, this "prevailing paradigm," as it should properly be termed, has actually prevailed for about 100 years, and has been unsuccessfully approached and tested in the light of every angle conceivable. The only thing that has been achieved is to document beyond any shadow of doubt that ESP processes do exist, but whose presence by parapsychological methodologies are found at only very low statistical levels (which will be discussed in a later essay).

*

So, "psychic" perceptions have been tested for from every angle possible -- which is to say, very angle

consistent with the prevailing consensus reality hypotheses that ESP and Perception are interrelated both explicitly and implicitly, so much so that you can't have the one without the other.

*

But what if this consensus reality concept isn't complete enough? In other words, what if it has a "gaping hole" in its interconnecting line-up of conceptualizing -- one of those invisible gaping holes that are not at all obvious because the apparent picture seems complete and logical enough?

*

And what if what is needed to fill this hole has been around for about fifty or more years, but has been excluded because the prevailing concepts are considered sufficient unto themselves? And because if the needed factors were to be included, the entire consensus making nomenclature appropriate to Psi-Perceptions would either explode or be useless and vacated.

*

This would mean that everyone has cloned the wrong stuff, so to speak, and what they have cloned in this regard has been acting as mental information processing viruses all along.

Ye gads! This would imply a radical reality shift - one which, in its first instance, would big-time EMBARRASS those possessed of the cloned viruses - not only in parapsychology, but in science and philosophy as well, to say nothing of the consensus realities involved.

Information

The essential definitions of the verb TO INFORM, and the noun INFORMATION, never have been ambiguous, but quite precise and clear.

*

INFORM is said to have been derived from the Latin verb INFORMARE from IN + FORMA. However, the Latin FORMA was a noun, and even though the preposition of IN is added to it, it still remains a noun. And nouns, of course, refer to and are meant to identify it-things, not activities which verbs indicate.

*

FORMA referred to the shape and structure of something as distinguished from its material or constituent parts.

The preposition IN refers to inclusion of some kind, most usually a spatial inclusion, but also inclusion in something that does not have spatial-material form such as belief, faith, opinion or assumption (i.e., in the faith, only in belief, in his or her opinion or assumption, etc., and of course, IN his or her conception or misconception.)

*

The key concept of FORMA refers to shape and structure, and so INFORM refers to what has structural shape, has taken on structural shape, or been put into structural shape. So, technically speaking INFORM remains a noun with regard to whatever form a form is in, becoming a verb only when referring to an activity which puts something into shape-structure.

*

In English, however, IN + FORM as referring to structural shape has been used only rarely, this meaning having early been replaced with the concept of MESSAGES - meaning that messages convey information, and that information is used to convey messages.

If the above seems mildly confusing, it's because it is. So don't worry too much at this point.

You see, on the receiver's part, the actual message is what one deduces from the words (or "signals") which the sender believed represented the message he or she was trying to send. This "process" takes a good deal of "encoding" on the sender's part and a good deal of "decoding" on the receiver's part. But I digress.

*

Additionally, when we think of something formed we tend to think in terms of FORM only, not that something has PUT whatever it is INTO form or format.

*

I now caution each who chances to read the above to slow down, focus a little, and notice two important factors:

1. that there is a vast and very incompatible raw difference between messages and the structure and shape of something; and
2. when we think of form as form, we tend to think of it as an IT object or subject, not as something which has been brought into or put into form by various shape-making, structure-making processes of some kind.

In other words, something which is formed or has achieved form is the RESULT of whatever has caused it to take on shape-structure.

*

In English, then, the concept of "into form" has been dropped or vacated, and so we tend not to think in terms of how and why something has come into whatever form it has.

But this is somewhat typical of English nomenclature, which tends to IT-identify end products as things in themselves, not as the result of processes - which is to say, formative processes that have to be structural in order to arrive at any given in-formed state.

This is best perceived not via words, but by a diagram. I'll provide one in the context of a more refined essay further on. But anyone can make one for themselves by diagramming how an IT does take on form.

*

To help in enhancing clarity here, when we think of those superpower faculties that result in some kind of clairvoyance, we tend to think the images the clairvoyant "sees" ARE the clairvoyance.

I.e., he or she "sees" things that others don't, and by means other's don't have active - hence the clairvoyant angle. We mistake WHAT the clairvoyant sees as the clairvoyance, and fail to notice that the informative processes which permit the seeing are the real clairvoyance.

*

In other words, into-form-making PROCESSES always precede the resulting images.

Thus, if clairvoyance is possible, the IN + FORM clairvoyance-making processes pre-exist what they yield - for what they yield is what the clairvoyant sees. If the processes are not active, then the clairvoyant will not see anything.

If we compare this to perception-making processes, we know that the perceptions are the sum result of whatever they have been processed through. The superpower faculties apparently "work" in the same exact way.

*

It is interesting, and important, to trace the ENGLISH etymologies of INFORM and INFORMATION. The OXFORD DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE summarizes when and under what conditions English nomenclature can be noted as first in use.

*

With regard to INFORM, the OXFORD identifies the primary ancient Latin sense of INFORMARE (to give form to, shape or fashion), but notes: "The primary sense had undergone various developments in ancient and medieval Latin, and in French, before the word appeared in English."

This is a clever way of saying that when INFORM came into English usage it did not mean putting into a form.)

*

This appearance in English seems to have taken place during the 1300s, but seems more than anything else to have referred to "formative principle, or formative character."

*

Used in this sense, the first ENGLISH uses of INFORM were probably drawn from French rather than directly from Latin.

It is certain that the word INFORMATION is drawn from French, not directly from Latin. Its first usage's in English, again during the 1300s, are exactly those of the French:

"The action of informing [specifically as] forming or molding of the mind or character, training, teaching or instructing; communicating of instructive knowledge."

*

In this sense, then, from French into English, INFORMATION referred to mind-shaping, out of which would emerge "character" - such having been a particularly French preoccupation ever since.

*

After this shift in usage-meaning, in English INFORMATION then appears to have separated into two components, both utilizing the same nomenclature term, INFORMATION.

*

The first component remained the same, almost up until the 1930s when it began to be identified as "mind-programming."

*

The second component had to do with providing evidence, either for or against someone, and usually the latter regarding criminal court cases, heresy examinations and trials.

It would appear that "evidence" found acceptable or logical in the light of certain consensus realities was accepted as "information" - while "evidence" found unacceptable was rejected as something else.

*

INFORMATION was still being thought of in exactly this way among the world's intelligence agencies and systems when I chanced to fall into the government-sponsored "Psi-spy" research project at Stanford Research Institute in 1972.

Also, during that same epoch, the then hopeful and exceedingly well-funded realm of "scientific" futurology (now generally defunct) also had adapted to this same concept of information, and was being tortured by it - which is to say, adapted to the concept that information consists only of whatever is found acceptable, or logical within a given consensus reality.

*

"Consensus reality," however, was considered by futurologists to consist of the majority opinion of "informed specialists" and/or their vote. Since majority opinions can be wrong at least as often as right, one does wonder how futurology ever got off the ground. However, one doesn't need to wonder why it "failed."

*

During the 1600s, and specifically as the result of certain Renaissance activities, a new concept-context regarding INFORMATION was added into this or that drift of meanings. The earliest noted uses of this meaning occurred about 1649, and we find the gist of this meaning more or less unchanged in WEBSTER'S of 1828, the original edition of the first American dictionary of the English language.

In that dictionary this meaning is given as the FIRST meaning of INFORM. And I quote:

"INFORM, verb transitive: - Properly, to give form or shape to, but in this sense NOT USED. [Emphasis added.]

"1. To animate; to give life to; to activate by vital powers.

"2. To instruct; to tell to; to acquaint; to communicate knowledge to; to make known to by word or writing."

"INFORM, verb intransitive: - To give intelligence, as in: 'He might either teach in the same manner, or inform how he had been taught.' And: "To inform against, to communicate facts by way of accusation."

"INFORMATION:

"1. Intelligence via notice, news or advice communicated by word or writing.

"2. Knowledge derived from reading or instruction.

"3. Knowledge derived from the senses or from the operation of the intellectual faculties.

"4. Communication of facts for the purpose of accusation."

*

As of 1828, then, long gone is the concept of IN + FORMA, as is indicated by WEBSTER'S 1828 itself - and not reactivated until the advent of Information Theory, as will be discussed ahead (save to mention

here that information theory cannot survive without that concept.)

*

In WEBSTER'S 1828, the first definition of INFORM - to animate; to give life to; actuate [i.e., activate] by vital powers - reflects the central hypothesis of VITALISM, which we have already encountered. However, the term VITAL-ISM apparently had not evolved as of 1828, since it is not given in that same dictionary. (The concept of an ism itself seems to have surfaced only in about the 1780s.)

*

However, a brief review of this topic is important - because there are significant links between essential vitalism, information, and activation of the superpower faculties. (An individual essay regarding vitalism will be provided within this series of essays.)

*

You see, IF information (intelligence) is accurate enough, it is broadly accepted that it can activate or vitalize activity, and which would be akin to animating or reanimating them. On the other hand, if information (intelligence) is cluttered with information viruses, one would not normally expect activation. Rather, one would anticipate de-activation, or devitalization - and which, if it could happen, would result in all sorts of de-evolutionary stuff.

*

VITALISM was crushed and beat into non-existence about 1920, at which time the consensus realities of philosophical materialism acquired the contexts of science proper and thenceforth prevailed. And any science based in philosophical materialism simply has to be an IT-MAKING science.

*

Prior to that, philosophical vitalism (technically in existence roughly since about 1533 during the Renaissance) and philosophical materialism (technically in existence since about 1845) had been seen as sister sciences.

The advocates of the two philosophical orientations were soon antagonistic to each other. An enormous conflict, now quite forgotten, ensued, lasted for about eighty years, with the materialists being the ultimate victors. Vitalism was snuffed in academia, and references to it were deleted from consensus reality sources which then prevailed as logical and rational.

*

In spite of all the philosophical imbroglios that are brought forth to explain the victory, the actual reason is quite simple.

By 1920, the material sciences had demonstrated they could produce products of enormous, even fabulous economic value. The vitalism sciences did not produce much of economic meaning. Funding therefore went to the material sciences. End of that story.

*

There were two essential definitions regarding vitalistic principles, to which a number of other concepts were derived. Be sure that I am not digressing or drifting here.

1. That the functions of a living organism are due to a vital principle distinct from physical-chemical forces;

2. That the processes of life are not explicable by the laws of physics and chemistry alone - and that life is in some part self-determining and self-informing.

Please read self-informing as IN + FORM, meaning self-making into form.

*

For conceptual clarity, any use of the term VITAL within vitalism's contexts should immediately be replaced with ANIMATING - at least to discriminate between animate and inanimate conditions.

*

In the end, all of the nomenclature that might be associable to vitalism and/or its two essential concepts was stringently, and with something akin to a vengeance, expunged from modernist consensus reality-making literature. Any even glancing reference to those terms was enough to occasion loss of professional standing, potential funding, and etc.

Thus, cutting-edge scientists have to walk gingerly, and talk around such concepts if and when they chance to encounter any possibility of their real existence.

*

In any event, this brief review of the etymological history of INFORM and INFORMATION indicates that only one concept of them prevails, the concept that information is what one reads and learns from. We can note, too, that two important concepts have more or less fallen into disuse and oblivion: IN + FORMA, and INFORM as it relates to animating principles.

And it is in this consensus reality condition that information theory arose.

Information Theory

So, what IS information theory?

And why might it be of fundamental importance with regard to activating (vitalizing) the superpower faculties?

*

Most sources dealing with information theory are somewhat or completely inaccessible (unintelligible) to those who haven't developed the mental information processing grids or nomenclature to deal with it. However, THE NEW COLUMBIA ENCYCLOPEDIA (1975) has a rather neat rendering, at least as regards the early developmental hypotheses.

*

The theory is indicated as a mathematical one, principally formulated as of 1948 by the American scientist Claude E. Shannon, to explain aspects and problem of information and communication ("communication" later being thought of as information-transfer, especially in the psychoenergetic research of the former USSR.)

*

The entry in the encyclopedia is worth quoting in its entirety, and I'll do this first.

I caution you not to get confused if you don't understand parts or all of it.

After quoting it, I'll lift out the signal, easy to conceptualize, part and clarify it with respect to opening new cognitive channels toward activating the superpowers.

*

I never recommend anything, but sometimes I "suggest." If you have any desire at all to approach an activation of any of the superpowers, I suggest you pay serious attention to the quoted materials below, even to the point of memorizing them (i.e., installing them quite firmly in your memory library.)

*

One preliminary note, though. Shannon et. al. seized upon the term ENTROPY and included it in the discursive part of the theory. This is a term properly belonging to thermodynamics, and has otherwise since been defined in a number of different ways. In information theory it means "noise," and so I'll replace "entropy" with noise, indicating that I did so.

Synopsis of the 1948 Information Theory

"In this theory, the term INFORMATION is used in a special sense; it a measure of the freedom of choice with which a message is selected from the set of all possible messages.

"Information is thus distinct from meaning, since it is entirely possible for a string of nonsense words and a meaningful sentence to be equivalent with respect to information content.

"Numerically, information is measured [via the theory] in BITS (short for binary digit; see Binary System.)

"One bit is equivalent to the choice between two equally likely choices. For example, if we know that a coin is to be tossed but are unable to see it as it falls, a message telling whether the coin came up heads or tails gives us one bit of information.

"When there are several equally likely choices, the number of bits is equal to the logarithm of the number of choices taken to the base two. For example, if a message specifies one of sixteen equally likely choices, it is said to contain four bits of information.

"When the various choices are not equally possible, the situation is more complex.

"Interestingly, the mathematical expression for information content closely resembles the expression for ENTROPY in thermodynamics. The greater the information in a message, the lower its randomness, or 'noisiness,' and hence the smaller its entropy [i.e., the smaller its noise content.]

"Often, because of constraints such as grammar [language, and the way it is expressed], a source does not use its full range of choice. A source that uses just 70% of its freedom of choice would be said to have a relative noise ratio [entropy] of 0.7. The redundancy of such a source is defined as 100% minus the relative entropy, or, in this case, 30% [meaning 30% message-signal adulterated by 70% noise].

"The redundancy of English is about 50%; i.e., about half of the elements used in writing or speaking are freely chosen, and the rest are required by the structure of the language.

"A message proceeds along some channel from the source to the receiver. Information theory defines for any given channel a limiting capacity or rate at which it can carry information, expressed in bits per second.

"In general, it is necessary to process, or encode, information from a source before transmitting it through a given channel.

"For example, a human voice must be encoded before it can be transmitted by radio.

"An important theorem of information theory states that if a source with a given entropy feeds information to a channel with a given capacity, and if the noise in the source is less than the channel capacity, a code exists for which the frequency of errors may be reduced as low as desired.

"If the channel capacity is less than the noise source, no such code exists.

"The theory further shows that noise, or random disturbance of the channel, creates uncertainty as to the correspondence between the received signal and the signal transmitted.

"The average uncertainty in the message when the signal is known is called the equivocation.

"It is shown that the net effect of noise is to reduce the information capacity of the channel. However, redundancy in a message, as distinguished from redundancy in a source, makes it more likely that the message can be reconstituted at the receiver without error.

"For example, if something is already known as a certainty, then all messages about it give no information and are 100% redundant, and the information is thus immune to any disturbances of the

channel.

"Using various mathematical means, Shannon was able to define channel capacity for continuous signals, such a music and speech.

"While the theory is not specific in all respects, it proves the existence of optimum coding schemes without showing how to find them. For example, it succeeds remarkably in outlining the engineering requirements of communication systems and the limitations of such systems." *SEE C. E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, THE MATHEMATICAL THEORY OF COMMUNICATION (1949).*

Formats of (or regarding) Information

When we begin to think of what information IS, most of us probably will think it is what we hear or read in some kind of printed or visual format. We think this because this concept "dwells" in consensus realities as such, and we have cloned it quite nicely. And from any number of aspects that concept is serviceable - as far as it goes.

But. By the time "information" reaches a spoken, printed or visual format, it is an end-product of the processes which have organized and produced it in those formats.

Nonetheless, this end-product can act as a "source" of information and we can more or less duplicate it in our own heads.

*

"Duplicate," of course, means reproduce or copy it into our own heads, the ostensible goal being to understand it. In this sense, then, the information we in-put into our heads has been CONVEYED by the spoken, printed or visual format.

After the in-put, however, the "conveyance" of the information continues getting into our heads by being filtered through the mental information processing grids of the recipient. The grids are extensions of the memory library earlier referred to.

*

In THIS processes, the "information" will ultimately reach steps 8 and 9 of the perceptual processes. Meaning that the "information" that finally comes out as understanding will be the sum of the in-put plus whatever the in-put gets filtered through in the case of each individual.

If matches to the in-put "information content" are found in the memory library, THEN a kind of duplication can take place. The duplication is called "understanding."

*

But if matches are not found, then the information content probably will be routed through the nearest similarity in the memory library. In this case, we are now one-step or more removed from duplication (and removed from "complete understanding.")

If no matches are found, then the recipient of the in-put information content will "draw a blank" - for example, regarding twelve types of snow, camels, telepathy or clairvoyance.

*

In other words, INFORMATION is what we understand, even if only in a partial way. If the in-put does not result in "understanding," then it is NOT information.

Information Transfer

The whole of the above, and its obvious problem areas, is what some information theorists refer to as the information transfer process.

One of the central concepts of information theory is that all information is available all of the time. Some of the theorists mitigate this all-inclusive concept by saying that information sources are everywhere.

Others opine that information can be drawn from everything and anything.

*

In the sense of all of the above, the EXISTENCE of information is not in question. What is problematical, in big-time ways, is the TRANSFER of it into a system wherein it can be duplicated, misduplicated, or blanked out.

In the sense of the human, the prevailing consensus reality concepts usually hold that the "system" being referred to is "the mind" and its mental information processes.

*

"The mind," however, when spoken of this way is applicable as a generality to every human specimen, and which is good enough for a theory.

In matters of actual PERFORMANCE, though, the "individual mind" should be substituted for the all-inclusive generality - because even if information does exist everywhere, it is the individual mind that produces duplication, misduplication, or the blanking out, and which in turn result in understanding, misunderstanding, or nothing at all.

*

Please note that the term PERFORMANCE has been emphasized above because it is entirely relevant toward activating the superpowers, "activating" having to do with performance. And here I foreshadow a topic that will require at least two essays among those several more to come.

Information Signals

Information transfers via speech, print or in visual formats, actually contain two MODES or MODULATIONS of information content.

But to get at this, it must FIRST be comprehended that the words of speech or writing/print the images, charts, etc., of the visual formats are NOT the information content itself, but merely symbols and signs for it.

In this sense, the symbols and signs are the OBJECTIVE "carriers" of the information content - which is to say that they are SIGNALS that will stimulate duplication of the content simply because the receivers associate MEANING to the signals - IF the meanings of the signals are shared in common.

If the meanings are not shared among the recipients, then the signals will be "inaccessible" to all those who do not.

*

And here is one of the most apparent bases for language and its concepto-nomenclature - to establish a shared and sharable basis for the sending and receiving of information content.

This is to say that pre-set meanings are encoded into nomenclature and images, and the consensus reality learning networks transfer the encoded meanings into the memory storage of their citizens so that there can be a mutual basis of information transfer and exchange. An intrasocial collective or group is thus formatted regarding transfer of information within it.

*

The best pre-set words or images to effect this information transfer unity are those that have precise meanings encoded into them, since the meaning-information-content can be "recognized" most easily.

*

Any increasing permutations of meanings regarding a given information transfer signal tend to decrease the cohesion of the unity within the collective, and tend to permit distortions of meaning within individuals.

*

One would therefore think that precise and exact meanings for signals would be stringently established by social consensus necessity. And indeed this IS the case where an absolute need to do so is apparent, the "need" being intimately related to performance, and especially where it is found to be dangerous not to be precise.

For example, no one becomes an electrician based only on the general consensus reality that electricity lights up bulbs and turns the toaster on.

A suitable and precise nomenclature has to be evolved and become shared among potential electricians -

or else they can get fried all too easily. Airline pilots can not become one simply because airplanes fly. Arctic people cannot deal with snow simply if it is snow, and Arab Bedouins will be out-maneuvered in the economics of the camel market if they think a camel is a camel.

*

However, within any given social unity where there is no perceived absolute need to INCREASE nomenclature, that kind of effort is not usually undertaken - because the average citizen within the unity, and with regard to average performance within it, can function quite well via a lesser rather than an increase in signal-carrying nomenclature.

And, to begin with, the so-called average citizen probably won't ever "acquire" a nomenclature in terms of quantity that extends beyond his or her recognized need to do so, or beyond what it takes to fit into the consensus reality they desire to fit into (or, sometimes, are trapped within.)

*

So the average citizen within any given consensus reality had no explicit or necessary need to add more specific nomenclature; but there is also a need not to have too little, either.

The way this is apparently resolved is to establish a number of IT-IDENTIFIERS that do not require much further break-apart into it-TYPES, into increasing refinement of comprehensions of types of something, and which would require the increase of nomenclature.

In this way, then, people who do not need to use different types of snow for survival can be content with snow as something that falls in winter and needs to be shoveled when it interferes with traffic or might crush the roof in. So, among such people, SNOW is snow. It is a perfectly good information signal, and the need for any increasingly refined differentiation beyond that probably has to do only with amounts of it.

*

So, among such people "SNOW" is a "clean" and "clear" signal regarding information transfer, whereas among the Arctic peoples barely fifty years ago it would have been as "noisy" as Times Square at New Year's Eve.

In much the same way, people who don't realize that different types of clairvoyance exist will not have any need to identify them - meaning that the single use of this one nomenclature signal is perceived by them to be sufficient.

But not to anyone who wants to learn how to be clairvoyant. The best instructors of clairvoyance I am familiar with have to begin, as they do, by breaking the single concept apart, at least into "aspects" of clairvoyance.

*

So, here we now approach the concept of "clear" and "noisy" signals, this concept revolving around

whether or not the carrier (word or image) of a signal is a precise, thus a clean one, or whether it induces noise into the signal load.

*

And it is at this point that the essential problems of information transfer integrate with the basic information theory offered up by Shannon in 1948, the basic problem regarding information transfer OF ANY KIND having to do with the ratio between "signal" and "noise."
Please note that in preparation for this series of essays, an [earlier essay](#) dealing exclusively with the SIGNAL-TO-NOISE RATIO has been available in this database for several months. [That essay](#) can now be appended to **this** series' essays as [Part 4A](#).

Information Noise

As stipulated within information theory by Shannon, a message (information content) proceeds along some channel from the source to the receiver.
In line with our interests, information is in-put via some kind of "channel" to the receiver, who then out-put it in terms of information encoded into concept-nomenclature for further information transfer.
But the in-put itself is an information transfer from "a source" wherever or whatever it might consist of.

*

We are thus dealing with TWO information transfers:
(a) the in-put transfer, and
(b) the out-put transfer.

Between (a) and (b), however, is "a channel," and after (b) is concluded another "channel" is necessary to further accomplish an information transfer.

*

So we can think in terms of the in-put channel and the out-put channel, the in-put channel having to do with reception of the information, the out-put one having to do with what we call "communication."

*

In the human sense of all of this, the out-put transfer (the "communicating") must first be encoded into concepto-nomenclature that can be transferred to others simply because their mental information processing equipment is already encoded to receive and duplicate it.
All of this seems clear enough, doesn't it.

*

However, there is one serious glitch. You see, the in-put transfer ALSO has to be processed INTO the same mental information processing equipment in order that it CAN be "received."

*

If that mental information processing equipment (which now has to do DOUBLE duty regarding in-put AND out-put) is not pre-formatted with some exactness regarding both quantity and quality of the in-put, then the "channel capacity" will be LESS than it needs to transfer the full information load into the receiver system.

If this is the case, then the out-put transfer will be only a partial one, or perhaps hardly anything at all. If it would be the case that the in-put and out-put channel cannot MATCH any of the signal, then the signal will disappear into the blanked out thing.

*

In basic information theory, anything that hampers, distorts, confuses, obliterates the signal is referred to as "noise."

In this sense, if the noise "in" the channel is less than the signal, then a code exists (or can be established) for which the frequency of errors (noise) may be reduced as low as desired.

If the "noise" in the channel is greater than the signal, then the signal may not be identified; it can still exist in the channel, although so embedded in the noise that it cannot register, be picked up, or identified.

*

In the sense we are interested, the human sense, it turns out that human mental information processes ending up in "perception" can produce not only signal-laden but noise-laden conceptualizations and mental image pictures with hardly any way to discriminate which is which.

Where Does Information Processing Noise Come From?

In answer to this question, the daring among us will assume that the noise originates in our own heads - and which is usually the case.

But a deeper inspection of noise sources reveals that what's in our heads and which contributes to the noise may not be innately present to begin with.

*

A better part of the noise sources in our mental information processes is ACQUIRED - usually by the enculturization processes that make us fit in our given consensus realities.

This understanding is rather broadly accepted in some echelons of human inquiry, especially if the consensus reality social processes drift into mind-programming rather than overall efficient education.

*

But there is another far more powerful, but far more LESS obvious, noise source, and it is one we all adapt to in order to learn to communicate.

Language itself.

*

As Shannon pointed up in his information theory (and much to the shock of many at the time) that one is "constrained" to utilize language - and with language comes the concepto-nomenclature that becomes lodged, by necessity, into our memory library.

I'll paraphrase how Shannon put it.

*

Regarding English, some fifty per cent of the concept-nomenclature we lean upon is required by the structure [and familiar usage] of the language. The other 50 per cent is open to free choice of concepts and nomenclature.

Shannon's implication was that if the language-determined part was inhabited with noise-making redundancies, then any adaptation to the language would induce these into mental information processes of ALL those who utilized it.

So, you see, we are not at each individual level "guilty" of faulty information processing - at least 50 per cent of the time.

*

But whatever their source, even the 50 per cent presence of noise-making viruses can easily decrease or prevent performance ever activating.

*

As it turns out, although noise-making redundancies can be identified in every area of human endeavor, some are more prone to a larger percentage than others, especially those that have become adapted to ambiguity. Dare I mention politics and over-bloated administrations? Or the present conditions of the "fine" arts? Or the parameters of "love," "hate," "sex?" Of course, I'll not mention the realms of "psychic phenomena" - since everyone knows what they are.

*

In any event, it might be said that where over-simplification and ambiguity prevail, so too do noise-making redundancies - all of which bury the signal within the noise, no matter how fashionable is the noise.

It's somewhat worth mentioning, generally speaking anyway, an area of human endeavor thickly populated with noise-making redundancies tends to be "volcanic" in nature. Such areas can exist peacefully within their own parameters, stabilized by their own consensus realities. But if intruded upon, or if THEY intrude upon, things begin to heat up.

*

The topics of information and information transfers will be picked up again in additional essays. It is now desirable to devote Part 5 to a correlation of what has been discussed in Parts 1 - 4. In Part 6, we'll discuss not only the noise-making redundancies embedded and perpetuated within ambiguities, but their utterly destructive viral effect on clean, clear "signals." Ambiguous concepts induce structure-lessness, hence they wreck any signal-awareness of STRUCTURE, and without knowledge of the structure of anything very little else can ever be known about it. As we shall see in subsequent essays, STRUCTURE is the IN + FORM, or the format, of something - and as such is what needs to be worked with or within, not against.

*

In any event, any real attempt to activate any of the superpowers must encompass the reality that signal-to-noise ratios are intimately involved. Thus, the presence in any system of disinformation or misinformation can act as if it is infected with viruses.

(End of Part 4).

TEACHING AND LEARNING REGARDING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (15Aug97)

INTRODUCTORY

This essay is the first of a series in which the various topics of teaching, training and learning will be discussed regarding their relationship to various identifiable elements of the superpowers.

*

In getting into these topics, it must frankly be stated up front that new ideas and concepts will need to be introduced -- these new concepts, of course, being presented for whatever they may be worth as knowledge develops in the future.

About the only thing that can more or less be said for sure is that past concepts have not been sufficient regarding either identifying the nature of the superpowers, or sufficient as enabling ways and means for teaching and learning.

*

However, in approaching the new, the old must be examined in a preliminary way and as informative background -- if only to help illustrate why the new should be searched for and incorporated.

At this point, I have been intimately involved in these matters for nearly three decades -- and throughout this time experience has shown that comprehension regarding the superpowers is benefited by larger rather than lesser amounts of background knowledge and information.

Experience has also shown that people like to get quickly to the racetrack and get on with the race. However, if one can't find the racetrack . . . or the racetrack found is the wrong one, one in which illusory rather than real races are run . . . or the racetrack is merely a facade in a Hollywood lot with nothing behind it except imagination . . . well?

*

For example, the superpowers have been thought of as "powers of mind." However, the powers of mind models (or facades) have produced no significant increase in the population of achieved "psychics." If, then, I were to say (as I will at some point ahead) that some full part of the superpowers constitute

problems not of mind but of aesthetics, then no one would even begin to comprehend what is meant in the absence of any background orientation to help point the way.

*

From the outset here, the essential definition of the superpowers within the scope of this database should constantly be carried in mind -- largely because that definition is germane as to why, in the past, fruitful approaches to teaching-learning of the superpowers have been so difficult to discover.

*

As used in this database, the term SUPERPOWERS refers to those processes or functions of the human biomind systems that transcend the "normal laws" of time and space, and matter and energy. This definition has been expanded upon in other essays already installed in this database.

*

To help bring some advance clarity, anyone who has investigated teaching and learning probably realizes that the processes involved are easiest if whatever is being taught and learned focuses on something tangible and identifiable. In such a case, teacher and learner can literally look at whatever is involved. Thus, agreements can be reached, and information accepted and understood about the tangible.

*

At a slightly more complicated level, teaching and learning can take place regarding ideas. But if ideas don't necessarily or somehow refer back to tangibles, then difficulties can arise. There is also a distinction between ideas that are required to end up DOING something, and ideas that are not required to do anything except be talked about. There is also a distinction between ideas that are correct, or at least applicable, and ideas that are not correct and are applicable only to those who think they are correct.

*

In any event, it is possible to say that anything that can be included in the realm of matter, energy, space and time is also thought of as tangible, at least more or less. Thus, methodological teaching-learning approaches are facilitated because the tangible is at least thought of being THERE.

*

By comparison, the superpowers wheel and deal in the intangible -- or at least in what is considered within the present realms of knowledge as transcending the tangible.

*

Now, the usual approach to teaching-learning the intangible is to seize upon the methods utilized in teaching-learning the tangible -- because the latter are familiar in the historic sense.

In other words, it is tangibly possible to teach a learner how to bake a tangible cake and have some expectation of succeeding. All one really needs is a list of the elements and procedures regarding backing the cake, and the formulation of a procedural recipe regarding what to do and how to combine the elements.

*

There have been very many attempts to teach and increase superpower functioning by teaching via methods best fitted to teaching and learning how to deal with the tangible.

However, human societies (at least in their modern forms) are. But human society is not yet overloaded with powerful superpsychics. Indeed, many stipulate that the superpowers CANNOT be taught, especially among materialists and parapsychologists who have had no luck at all along these lines. However, in other quarters expectations remain high in some quarters even so.

This factoid more or less indicates that the mere superimposition of teaching-learning methods appropriate to the tangible don't really work as advertised and hoped when it comes to the intangible. And so it might rationally be supposed that the superpowers have to be approached quite differently than cake-making-via-recipe processes and procedures.

*

There are two implications here, the first being that the "normal laws" of time, space, energy and matter (all being relevant to the tangible formats of these) cannot be used with any great efficiency to define what the superpowers consist of.

Second, it is true that various social groupings have established nomenclature bytes to specify some of the phenomena that result or down-load from the superpowers.

*

For example, PRECOGNITION refers to "seeing the future," and which implies at least transcending time and matter. MATTER is tangible, and TIME is derivable only via some movable or motional aspects of tangible matter.

Thus (and please consider with some attention what now follows), when classes are set up to teach precognition, what it usually taught are concepts regarding how to transcend matter and time, these being tangible -- and then the major concept focuses only on visualizing doing the transcending of those two tangible components.

Various statistical studies of such teaching-learning (IF they are undertaken) show very little in the way of increasing future-seeing. This failure easily leads to the concept that precognition cannot be taught. It is worth noting in this regard that some statistical studies along these lines have been undertaken in

parapsychology. But a far greater number of them have been undertaken in that now somewhat defunct discipline called FUTUROLOGY -- because at a certain point futurologists were exceedingly interested in whether the "psychic component" could be added into making futurology more effective. In any event, if we refer back to the concept of PRECOGNITION, it can become apparent that the active term is COGNITION -- and so someone might chance upon the idea that teaching how to increase the scope of cognition per se might be worthwhile.

After all, it is understood of COGNITION that people can suffer cognitions only with regard to their "cognitive capacities." These capacities are understood as being bounded within the LIMITS of an individual's knowledge, understanding, or familiarity -- with the exception of DREAMS which frequently exceed the one's cognitive capacities.

*

Meanwhile, the existence of the nomenclature bytes (such as "precognition") makes it SEEM that the superpowers and their down-loaded phenomena are on a par with the normal laws. Even so, having a word for something doesn't automatically mean that we understand important details of whatever it is the word refers to.

For example, many are willing to try to have precognitions. But very few have any real idea of what a COGNITION consists of, or how one of them comes about, or even why they do.

The direct implication here is that few can manage or expand their cognitive basis because of an absence of information or knowledge about that basis. Thus, the statistical rate of successful taught-learned precogniting remains very low overall.

In case a reader might be wondering by now, this is not a matter merely of semantic difficulties.

*

Briefly alluding to other possible examples, we have the terms "telepathy," "out-of-body" and "remote viewing." The first refers to the so-called mind-to-mind thing, the latter to the so-called seeing-at-a-distance thing.

So people think they understand what is being talked about when the terms are used in that the two "minds" have a certain tangibility, and of course distance is a tangible thing. And so some are likely to set up teaching courses regarding how to achieve mind-to-mind contact, how to "get out of your body" (this also a tangible thing), and how to see at a distance.

*

As it is, the terms we utilize are sort of like an old fire arm whose buckshot when fired spreads across a distance in the hope that a piece of the shot would hit something. If this is judged against the notable lack of taught-learned courses, our terms don't seem to hit very much of anything even when fired close up.

*

The second immediate factor to mention is that although we believe we understand what teaching, training and learning mean, very few know anything at all regarding the important fundamental and detailed processes involved. Most know only that teaching and training are supposed to result in learning.

And so if someone says they can teach something, many people sign up, pay the fees, and sally forth under the wide-spread assumption they will learn whatever is being offered as teaching.

*

The expectation behind the assumption exists in the fact that teaching-learning system works best regarding simplistic, non-complex, and easily understood matters -- and which matters can be confirmed within the contexts of tangible physicality. In this simplistic sense, there appears to be a one-to-one relationship between teaching and learning.

*

This direct relationship, however, begins to falter to the degree that information being taught become less simple and more complex. If the degree of complexity increases, one will soon encounter understanding (i.e., "cognitive") levels that are not on par with, or not parallel to what is being taught. When this happens, teaching might still proceed with gusto, but problems regarding learning might be encountered.

*

Eventually, the relationship between teaching-learning becomes ambiguous -- especially when (1) what is being taught and learned DOES NOT result in the activities promised by the teaching; and (2) when confirming evidence cannot be located anywhere regarding what has been learned.

This implies that although just about anything and everything can be proposed as teachable, LEARNING can be confirmed only by outcomes that significantly reduce ambiguities as to whether ANYTHING has been LEARNED via attempts to teach learning. Of course, one might exempt here the teaching and learning of useless things -- and which can include, as we will see ahead, the teaching and learning of ignorance.

TWO IMPORTANT DISTINCTIONS

I am of the opinion that most people already comprehend that the two distinctions I'm about to outline do exist -- but which they can observe others somehow managing to avoid for various reasons.

*

First, on average, the teaching-learning procedures in most societies (especially those of the Western world) seem successful enough. So there arises the assumption that there is a direct relationship between teaching-learning -- and that this relationship holds true in general AND for everything.

*

In actuality, however, there are (1) many different formats of "learning;" and, (2) individuals can be identically taught the same thing, but end up learning it in far different ways, and learning it on a ratio of "not very well" to "exceedingly well."

*

A partial explanation for (2) above is that all humans are not identical in all ways. Rather, they are independent systems which may be similar in many ways, but can be alien to each other in other kinds of ways. And so ahead the more exact nature of these "independent systems" will need to be commented upon in these present essays.

*

In the sense of (2) above, however, the direct relationship of teaching-learning would work best, and also be more obvious, regarding areas in which all humans are most similar -- and are more identical even though they are independent sensing and experiencing systems.

The direct relationship would become less steady, less predictable, regarding areas in which the independent systems ARE different, even though on the simplistic surface they might be recognized as similar.

*

For example, systems of human biobodies are "similar," roughly speaking, anyway.

But each individual system does have differences, as, for example, regarding their mental information processing grids.

Since this latter aspect is beyond argument, it becomes possible to comprehend that all humans probably will not process taught information in the same, or perhaps even similar, ways.

*

With regard to (1) above, it can be seen that the direct relationship of teaching-to-learning is most efficient only where tangible factors are involved -- and in which the necessity of deduction and/or inducing are not all that paramount.

*

In cases where only tangible factors are involved, teaching can become precise enough so as to enable formulas or exact procedures to be learned and followed -- with the result that more or less identical learning DOES occur, and which in turn DOES enable the production of more or less identical activity being derived from this kind of learning.

Thus, there is what can be referred to as the direct relationship of teaching to learning. It is very widespread, and might also be referred to as Model A of Teaching-Learning.

*

This is also the model most seek to superimpose on any prospective teaching-learning procedure -- and which model is easy and simple because it does not involve much in the way of the deduction-induction processes.

*

However, in those teaching-learning efforts that require the functioning of deduction and induction, we can easily say that there is NO direct relationship between teaching and learning -- because intervening in the relationship IS the need for those two twins (deducing and inducing) that are famously and notoriously indirect in the first place.

Thus, THIS kind of thing can be referred to as Model B of Teaching-Learning.

*

For clarity.

MODEL A can more dependably be seen as:

Teaching -> Learning -> that Stands a Good

Chance of Activity => Ability or Product Commensurate With

What Has Been Taught.

MODEL B can be roughly seen as:

Teaching(?) <-> Learning(?) -> that

May or May Not arouse Activity => Ability(?) or Product(?)

Commensurate With(?) What May or May Not

Have Been Taught or Learned.

Please note that the two formulas above are general, possibly inept, and for the following reason. While it is true that TEACHING can be rather straightforward, LEARNING is not and never is. Various elements to be TAUGHT can be organized. But LEARNING is a more complex endeavor -- in that, for one thing, learning can be seen to have occurred only by testing. The two Models above are given ONLY to help illustrate that within different circumstances there are differences in the relationship of teaching to learning. Indeed, there may be dozens of teaching-learning models.

TEACHING-LEARNING "DYNAMICS"

Moving briskly on, now, LEARNING in general is seen and generally accepted as the dynamic product of TEACHING, and this is seen as a FACTUAL relationship -- even though the factual relationship might be based in experiencing, and which then becomes the "teacher."

*

In any event, the general surmise of TEACHING is that information can be organized in ways that lead from basics to increasing detail and complexity, and that if this is done expertly enough, then LEARNING will result in students who subject themselves to those "organized ways."

*

In this sense, teaching is seen as the active measure while learning is seen as the passive something or other into which the active measure is to be duplicated or copied. Thus, one can find a rather largish literature having to do with the dynamics or ways of TEACHING (as will be illustrated in the next essay in this series.) However, although information about the dynamics of learning does exist, the nature of learning dynamics seems to be in its infancy.

*

In any event, the general process of teaching is generally seen as consisting of organizing and transferring information to the learner(s). This sounds simple enough -- and in some cases actually is. The general process of learning is generally seen as in-taking or absorbing the information that is transferred via the teaching. This, too, sounds simple enough. But whether it is or not seems completely to depend on a number of associated factors, the existence of which those who design the teaching of

information transfers cannot altogether predict.

However, this slight difficulty is usually gotten around in that a sufficient minority do learn enough to keep societies working -- at least for a time.

*

But indeed, although information can elegantly be organized in ways that can be assumed to effect the ease and speed of the transfer, it is highly doubtful that the information is in-taken in the SAME organized way, or in-taken in any organized way at all. The broad significance of this will, of course, be discussed throughout these essays.

A STABLE AND NON-STABLE BASIS REGARDING LEARNING PROCESSES

As already mentioned, the general surmise of the teaching-learning relationship is that the learner can duplicate the information being transferred -- and IF the information is transferred and duplicated by the learner, then he or she or it (as in the case of dogs and horses, but not often in the case of cats) will demonstrate phenomena appropriate to what has been taught.

*

This general surmise is somewhat workable if (again) tangible things and matters are the issue -- since both teacher and learner can refer to those matters or things as a STABLE BASIS for what is being taught and learned.

So, we can posit, for hypothetical illustration purposes, the following formula:

TANGIBLE STUFF =

TEACH <-> STABLE BASIS <-> LEARN

In this sense, then, there can be a mutual assurance between teacher and learner that they are dealing with the same stuff -- because it is tangible. The above formula, of course, refers best back to Model A of teaching-learning.

*

However, a contrasting formula also exists as:

INTANGIBLE STUFF =

NON-STABLE BASIS

or

TEACH <-> INVISIBLE BASIS <-> LEARN

THIS contrasting formula can sometimes (but not always) refer best back to Model B of teaching-learning. In any event, those who are perceptive can sense that there is a great gulf or abyss between the information-organizing processes of these two formulas. But I get ahead of myself here.

*

As it is, if a STABLE BASIS is not identifiable in tangible or concrete terms, then the teaching surmise that serves so well for Model A is not entirely, if at all, applicable to the teaching-learning situations characterized by Model B (and its plethora of variants).

THE SUPERPOWER FACULTIES OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

By definition, the superpower faculties involve phenomena that transcend the known laws of the tangible, and do so both as cause and effect, as source and result -- although the RESULTS of superpower phenomena can impact within the tangible.

And so a rather simple but obvious conclusion has to result: that teaching-learning ANYTHING regarding the superpowers does not have much of a tangible, stable basis that both teacher and learner can refer to and rely on as REALITY CHECKS regarding any mutually assurable certainty.

*

It is for this reason that some say, even some parapsychologists, that the superpowers CANNOT be taught -- in that "there is nothing to teach." This skeptical attitude is especially the case if IDEAS of WHAT to teach are erroneous and/or non-existent.

And, in a simplistic, superficial sense, this skepticism may seem true enough -- at least in the minds of those who assume that the intangible is "nothing," or that the non-tangible is something one cannot get hold of.

*

But the meaning here is a somewhat respectable one -- in that it IS generally true that IF a STABLE BASIS of some, or any, kind tends to be absent regarding any teaching, learning, tutoring (or even any

self-learning of the superpower faculties), THEN learning regarding the faculties is open to any number of opinions or beliefs.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

On the surface of these issues, there can be little doubt that teachers and learners are of equal importance. But just beneath the surface the teaching-learning relationship begins to exhibit strategic differences.

*

Although I cannot say it is the first difference, it is normally conceived that teachers are somewhat more important than the learners -- one simple phenomenology of this being that teachers sometimes posture as having more importance. However, if learners did not exist, then there would be no reason for the teachers to exist. But I'll leave it to each reader to sort this out.

*

A second strategic difference might be that while teachers usually have learned how to organize information in preparation for its transfer to learners, the learners usually have no idea of how information, per se, is organized in themselves. The assumption, then, among both teachers and learners is that the learner will receive the information in the way the teachers have organized it, and that therefore the learners will organize it in themselves in the same way. If something along these lines DOES ensue, then both the learners and teachers will be gratified, especially the teachers.

*

However, IF this assumption is transliterated into a more exact representation of its meaning, it means that the learners ARE SUPPOSED to receive the information in the exact formats it is transferred to them. At the very least, if the reception of the information is not all that exact, there is NOT supposed to be a wide latitude of variation or distortion within those having learned. However, whether this happens over all is somewhat speculative, while most certainly there is a ratio involved ranging from little failure to a lot of success -- or a ratio of from a little success to a lot of failure. As it is, though, somewhat more success can be predicted regarding Model A (discussed above) when deployed with respect to tangible, stable bases stuff.

*

Somewhere in all of these matters of relative importances between teaching and learning is the irksome detail regarding how many do learn how much -- and of WHAT they learn if they do. Perhaps some quantitative studies do exist along these lines, but I've not been able to locate them.

On the surface of things, though, it would seem that some few learn a lot while a larger majority learn little, or certainly not enough. But much beyond this observation, the per capita distribution of learners with regard to what they have learned or not learned seems up in the air -- and of little real social or scientific, philosophic or religious interest.

*

In seeking relative similarities and dissimilarities between teachers and learners, it turns out that they have one thing in common.

On average, most teachers have no idea of the mental information processes they have undergone in order to learn what they have, and to organize information so as to transfer it to learners.

*

Likewise, most learners have no idea of the mental information processes they have undergone in order to learn what they have, and especially have no idea at all how to organize their INFORMATION-RECEPTIVE qualities in order to expedite their learning.

*

In this sense, then, although I'll not insist on it, it would seem that whatever does transpire in the way of teaching and learning does so on a rather fortuitous, chancy basis.

Only one thing seems to have a higher ratio of certainty and/or predictability:

Many strive to teach -- and don't necessarily succeed.

Many strive to learn -- and don't necessarily succeed.

*

Failure along these lines is usually interpreted as embarrassing (although I don't really understand why this should be seen as such.) So, somewhat like some aspiring or ostensible psychics, some teachers and learners tend to emphasize their few successes -- while avoiding discussing their failures.

*

If asked to consider various teaching-learning issues -- for example, if either teaching or learning have the greater importance -- most might point up that teaching is the active measure, so it might be considered the most important.

Although I've been able to point out certain factors and factoids in this essay, I don't really know if teaching or learning is more important. But I do know that teachers and learners focus on what is being taught and learned, and that most of them know nothing of the fundamental LEARNING PROCESSES involved.

*

On the one hand, TEACHING PROCESSES are all well and good, of course, and needed. But if LEARNING PROCESSES didn't exist also, then ostensible teachers would have no one to teach anything at all.

So, TEACHERS are somewhat lucky that specimens of our species are freshly born in increasing abundance and all of which need to be taught something or others.

Encountering Disorder and Complicating Factors Without Recognizing Them As Such

Ingo Swann (15Oct97)

At some level of their awareness, almost everyone who knows anything at all about the superpowers realizes that knowledge about them is surrounded by factors that seem to complicate almost every issue that might pertain to them.

One can, of course, read and study a great deal about the superpowers, about their psychic, parapsychological and intuitional correlates -- and do so without necessarily having to delve into the nature and disorder of the complicating factors.

*

However, important distinctions can be drawn between merely reading up on something versus the processes necessary with regard to activating latent powers. It is quite well understood that the reading up on something might not also really activate a latent power -- if only because reading is an activity of the left side of the brain.

*

But even in the reading one might encounter disorder and complicating factors without recognizing them as such -- in which case the complicating factors might be viruses having entered into mental information processes.

Additionally, our species long ago discovered many USES for disorder and cleverly disguised complicating factors. Thus, there is a rather long tradition of installing disorder among or around this or that for purposes best known to those who expect to benefit from the disorder.

*

In our twentieth century time, misinformation might merely consist of innocent factual errors.

But disinformation is defined as deliberately installing misinformation in the guise of factual correctness, and doing so for an envisioned purpose.

However, both information and disinformation result in some kind of disorder.

*

If it might be supposed that cognitive activating of one or other of the superpower sets of faculties might require some kind of systemic functioning relatively free of misinformation, disinformation and disorder, then the nature and dynamics of that trio really ought to achieve the status of worthwhile interest and inspection.

*

One of the beginning points of take-off in this regard has to do with the differences between two easily recognized situations that have been established as historically existing in all fields of human endeavor.

1. The traditional armchair approach to learning, theorizing, and accumulating "knowledge,"
- and
2. Working in the real and actual field of what has been learned in the more or less intellectualized security of the armchair.

*

This, then, is to point up that important distinctions do exist between the armchair approach and entering into the realities of whatever is involved.

*

In the above context, it might be mentioned, for example, that no matter how much one learns via the armchair route, the sum of it is almost certainly to be found as reductive, and smaller, than Life itself.

In this sense, it can be said that Life is a composite of all possible things, known and unknown, recognized and unrecognized.

Armchair approaches, even the most elegant and comprehensive of them, select among all possible things and study them as separate factors among the composite of all possible things.

Thus, just about anything can be honed to gem-like quality within the scope of armchair thinking. But when the gem-like quality is replaced into the environment of all possible things, it can encounter and undergo what, blithely put, are "challenging" factors --

sometimes also known as "reality checks."

*

A major deficit in armchair approaches is that they tend to draw to themselves only what is thought to fit, and either reject what does not fit, or remain altogether unaware of it. But by far and large this is typical of human behavior overall, in that people prefer not to deal with anything indicative of possible or probable discomfort. Many analysts have dubbed this the head-in-the-sand phenomenon.

*

One of the great, but usually unrecognized, mysteries of the superpowers is WHY they are perpetually surrounded by trouble within the larger picture they represent and are part of. In this context, for example, both psychical research and parapsychology have TWO histories.

*

The first history has to do with the efforts at research and what has been discovered thereby. This history is fascinating to those interested in it, and several competent books have emerged detailing it.

It goes almost without saying it that it is via this first history that those interested seek to learn what they can -- not only with regard to what has been discovered, but with expectations that what has been discovered may enable an increase of functioning of their own superpower faculties.

*

The second history is comprised of what has been termed, somewhat superficially, as the "Resistance to Psi." Although the existence of the "resistance" is occasionally noted, any extensive and detailed history of it is functionally absent.

Thus, anyone perchancing to have an interest in the nature, reasons and dynamics of this second history cannot find a concise source that details it.

*

The second history, however, and in the long run, is as important, if not more so, than the first history.

The second history is the story and tale of how and why the first history has been assailed, deterred, and derailed within our present civilization's sociological formats -- resulting in a rather confusing sociological cocoon of disorder that seems to be self-perpetuating.

*

Thus, if anyone should perchance to activate some of their superpower faculties, in the end they can assuredly depend not only on functioning among the possible benefits of the activating, but are going to have to deal with the ongoing, dynamic sociological elements characteristic of the second history.

If, then, one does not have an advance and comprehensive grasp on the nature and dynamics which comprise the assailing second history, then like the armchair traveler venturing into all the possibilities of Life, one might predictably find oneself "challenged" by unrecognized, unsuspected and unknown pitfalls.

*

The central function of this Section 5, then, is to provide a larger overview of what, loosely speaking, comprises the assailing second history.

Some of the factors and elements to be pointed up are obvious, depending how perceptive and experienced one is. But others are not so obvious, and some of them are surprising.

The Superpowers and Their Relationship to Earthside Power Structures

In now reading what follows under the heading just above, this writer can only say that the context is NOT a matter of his fanciful speculating, or of unfounded conspiratorial imagining.

He has in fact been TOLD the context by a number of individuals highly placed with Agencies On High -- and whom thus presumably knew what they were talking about. But as with all the contents of this database, each visitor to this website is invited to consider this context only in the light of what it might suggest.

*

It is well known that organized research since 1882 regarding psychical phenomena and parapsychological experimenting rather consistently has met with organized resistance and skeptical ridicule.

It is also understood that the organizers of the resistance and ridicule have presented supportive reasons and justifications that seem logical and reasonable.

But there is more to this overall situation than the mere mix of Psi research and discovery versus mere resistance and ridicule. This is to say that there is a principal reason why the controversial mix exists in the first place.

This principal reason is easily understandable -- once it is delineated and given cognitive

substance.

*

My own interests in the Psi phenomena began very early. As this interest expanded, within my pursuit of reading it was possible to discover the existence of various resistive attitudes toward Psi.

Like most, I assumed these resistive attitudes were formulated at the individual level by those who merely felt that Psi did not fit into their philosophical or scientific realities.

*

As many writers had pointed up (both in the pro and anti Psi camps), the chief factor here was that the so-called non-material aspects of Psi could not be made to fit with the philosophical and scientific contexts of Materialism.

I felt that this "conflict" was self-evident -- even understandable. But I, as well as most Psi researchers, felt that if parapsychology continued accumulating facts via confirmed experimentation and discovery, then the facts would automatically shift the picture more in favor of Psi.

*

It was quite easy to accept this explanation in an unquestioning way, since THIS was what the explanation was said to consist of in many sensible statements and publications. And, I think, this is still the major prevailing explanation today.

*

But even so, a slightly noticeable mystery remained.

Even when researchers and parapsychologists did present good evidence incorporated by scientific procedures otherwise accepted in all echelons of science and philosophy, the good parapsychology evidence was NOT accepted anyway.

In fact, it was derailed AS scientific evidence -- usually by means that equated, by any consideration, to rather dirty counterpropaganda tactics.

*

The whole of this equated to unfair treatment. So when by fortuitous chance I had opportunities (beginning in 1971) to function as a Psi test subject, I was doubly enthusiastic about the Work.

I was soon to discover, however, the Work consisted of two situations.

The first situation consisted of the lab work and experiments with many leading

parapsychologists of the time, and most of which went reasonably well.

The second part, however, consisted of how the Work was responded to in the larger domains of Life, specifically with emphasis on all possible domains of human activity -- otherwise known as the "open field" of all sociological human activity.

*

This shift of venue, so to speak, from parapsychology-cum-science into the "problem" of general sociological activity tweaked my original interest in the latter.

After preliminary excursions into this "problem," it could be shown that the Resistance emanated, for the most part, from those sociological entities we refer to as mainstream ones -- especially including the hard and soft sciences, the major media, and the manufacturers of text books, encyclopedias and dictionaries.

*

Whereas the so-called "average" citizen was prepared to consider the existence of Psi (as later polls confirmed), the mainstreams were not. In fact, it could be shown that the mainstreams seemed to work overtime to prevent easy access to real and solid Psi evidence.

And if not that, misinformation and disinformation tactics were utilized to make the real evidence appear either as questionable, ambiguous, or threatening to the sanity and welfare of the species.

*

The nature and tactics of this resistance ranged from fatuous and silly to ugly and tragic -- the whole of which led to a most astonishing result.

Via this resistance, mainstream propaganda and spin doctors actually derailed discovery of the sensitivity mechanisms of our species that can account for psychical and parapsychological phenomena.

And this achieved, so it was said, to protect Science from so-called pseudoscience.

*

At this point, it should be mentioned that where the existence and use of TACTICS can be identified, it is logical to suspect the existence of a centralizing STRATAGEM on whose behalf the tactics are deployed.

*

Most dictionaries define STRATAGEM as "an artifice or trick in war for deceiving and

outwitting the enemy." Of course, stratagems are also characteristic of business, competition, politics, and etc., the whole of which can also be referred to as needed or necessary strategy and so forth.

*

In the sense of the resistance to Psi, the tactics could be identified (if only by astute observers), but the locus of the centralizing stratagem remained illusive. Thus, an additional mystery made its appearance. It can be summarized via the following: Since the early, basic, principal, and broadly announced goal of SCIENCE was to investigate and study ALL PHENOMENA, the scientific exclusion of Psi Phenomena actually constitutes a defacement by mainstream scientists, or their minions, of the principal purpose of mainstream science itself.

*

However, this larger overview was not (and still is not) grokked by many, because since 1882 any number of pseudo-logical and pseudo-rational explanations have been put forth -- and accepted as reasonable by the most influential powerholders of the mainstream populations.

*

As but one pseudo-logical example, mainstream science has rejected all connection to Psi research on the grounds, believe it or not, that Psi phenomena are unscientific to begin with -- and thus not a proper topic for science.

*

This paltry excuse has been accepted as rational and logical not only within science proper, but within academe, and by the major media -- WHEN, in fact, EVERYTHING is found in an "unscientific" condition before the mighty organizing powers of science make scientific order of them.

*

By late 1972, I had gotten this far with my "investigations." And at that point I still believed that the fundamental "explanation" had to do only with scientific and philosophical difficulties. I still felt that these difficulties would be cured or ameliorated in the future as discoveries about Psi continued to accumulate.

*

However, and as time would soon tell, I had completely failed to incorporate into my investigations one significant strategic context.

And if certain important analysts at highest levels had not pointed out this overall strategic context, I might have wandered down through the years blissfully unaware of it.

*

Before getting into this significant context, it is worthwhile at this point to reprise the general definition of what the superpower faculties appear to consist of, based on all available evidence.

*

The "superpowers" have been discussed in other essays already placed in this database. But to reprise them for convenience, they appear to consist of those faculties within our species and its specimens that can deal with the kinds of information transcending physical facts, and the "laws" of matter, space, time and energy (as so far understood). The factual existence of the superpowers is determined by noting the spontaneous occurrence of them throughout history.

*

However, spontaneously occurring and deliberate, controlled activation of the superpowers (as might occur via scientific knowledge of them) represent two different matters indeed.

Spontaneous occurrences of the superpowers can be considered merely as transient events in the general web or fabric of human sociological existence.

However, if certain superpower faculties could become activated and enhanced in controlled ways rather than just via spontaneous manifestations, then a number of human affairs considered normalized and controllable would have to undergo adjustments.

*

And so the "arising," so to speak, of enhanced superpower activity would present unfamiliar difficulties -- especially to the average run-of-the-mill power structures that function within the known limits of normal powers.

*

In November, 1972, I was invited to Washington for a sort of covert meeting. During that meeting a top analyst of a familiar intelligence agency in our nation's capital TOLD me (I

paraphrase):

You know, no significant advance in Psi will ever be permitted by those who govern -- because it MIGHT upset or alter all power structures on Earth. Even if you and your colleagues at Stanford Research Institute succeed, even in part, ways and means behind the popular and open scenes will ultimately follow to erase and discredit the work.

*

I clearly remember being stuck speechless, not only by the shocking statement, but because of my own abysmal ignorance in not recognizing what was immediately made SO OBVIOUS.

I immediately grokked the entire reason behind the "Resistance to Psi," along with all of its ramifications.

*

For clarity here regarding only some of those ramifications, the first and principal one is that IF any of the superpowers could by volitional training be developed for so-called practical applications, then there would be vivid implications for almost all existing Earthside power structures and the way power games are played.

*

In THIS context, as viewed from the heights of existing power structures and power makers, the deliberate cognitive enhancement of the superpowers would be viewed as a rather hideous development -- made doubly frightening upon the possibility that secrets and minds could be "read" and revealed.

At the very least, such enhancement could result in "competitive edges" in a number of human affairs -- such as within capitalistic forays, take-over plans, and transactions.

*

In any event, from the perspective of invested POWER it is certainly understandable that a NEED could easily be perceived for the resistance to the emergence of enhanced superpower proficiency.

It is also easy to see that the perceived NEED for the resistance would trickle down from the most powerful top and infest all echelons of society involving power, who was to succeed in obtaining it, and why and how.

Another ramification concerns what is fondly referred to as "fair competition." Grok it, if you can.

*

Now a factor needs briefly to be pointed up that dwells in consistent invisibility. It is this. Practically everyone can intuit or imagine some kind of practical application for any of the superpower faculties. But at the same time, if there existed any reason to shoot down the superpower faculties, or to prevent their constructive germinating, this is surely the reason.

In a forthcoming essay in this Section 5, I'll review some illuminating aspects of this situation as revealed in the book EXECUTIVE ESP: THE PROVEN LINKS BETWEEN "HUNCHES" AND SUCCESS -- AND HOW BUSINESSMEN EMPLOY ESP ON A PRACTICAL BASIS (Dean, Mihalasky, Ostrander, Schroeder, 1974).

*

The relationship of the superpower enhancement to Earthside sociological and power structures can briefly summarized as having five identifiable aspects. In the past, I read more than one overall assessment of "the implications and threats of Psi," and it is somewhat from these that the five identifiable aspects have been distilled.

1. Our species possesses sentient attributes that are quite extraordinary -- among which are powers and superpowers of various kinds. These exist among all specimens of the species in some kind of innate and potentializable formats -- providing the requisite sensitivity parameters are "open" naturally, or nurtured into "openness" via some kind of tutorial-experiential methods that enlarge sensitivity contact.
- 2.
3. Also innate within our species are the contexts for constructing the various elements and formats usually referred to as "social organizing," ostensibly so that the specimens of the species can survive better as group-collective entities.
- 4.
5. However, the same collective social survival-goals usually turn out to be pyramidal "power structures." The greatest amounts and kinds of power are held by the relatively few power specimens populating the apex -- while the rest of the inhabitants of the pyramidal power structures are presumed to benefit and survive as a result of being led or governed by the power governing, decisioning, or dicta of the few.
- 6.
7. The most solidly accepted basis for acquiring and perpetuating power is very closely related to the physical aspects of everyone's existence. Thus, most formats of large power holdings usually come about by achieving dominion over obvious and subtle aspects of physicality (and/or via the dominion of the surrogate of physicality -- money).

8.

9. In a direct sense, power structures are almost always dependent on stability, predictability, and upon what is visible and tangible to the majority of everyone. Thus, most power-structure arrangements CANNOT permit Psi-determined "wild cards" of any kind, much less encourage them to come into existence. So, while the superpower faculties of our species can be seen as astonishing and marvelous, they also represent "threatening" wild cards to existing power structures.

The Superpowers as "Wild Cards" Within Sociological Power Systems

Considering the five aspects briefly enumerated above, it becomes quite easy to comprehend, at least theoretically speaking, why any REAL development of the superpowers cannot be permitted.

In the bigger power picture, then, the overall response MUST advocate the non-development and non-enhancement of the superpowers.

The General Superpower Problem and the Way It Is "Taken Care Of"

The ONLY problem regarding the superpower faculties is that they exist naturally and as concomitants of our marvelous species.

In this sense, they tend occasionally to emerge spontaneously through each successive generation, and as somewhat highly "developed" in certain individuals -- known, in the twentieth century as "psychics," if they are real ones.

*

Analysts recognize this confirmed, "unfortunate" but natural occurrence. Since, then, the species does possess the superpower faculties, or at least rudiments of them, the (almost) only way to "contain" the superpowers is to make an impenetrable mess around any possible real knowledge of them -- especially as regards any constructive, and hence applicable, formats.

*

And so it is thus, more or less anyway, that we find any accurate comprehending of the superpowers cocooned within various messes of distractions, deterrents, derailments, demolitions, deconstructions, pismires, and droolings.

*

The making and maintenance of the messes is seen as necessary because many adhere to the concept that the introduction into power games of wild cards emanating from real superpower sources would not only put the usual concepts of power at a disadvantage, but also could shift the concepts and balances of power as well.

*

To get a start-up grasp on this, we have only to consider the element of secrecy involved in all power structures.

If, for example, it is believed that all formats of secrecy can be penetrated by superpower "espionage," well, this is surely one reason to PREVENT any attempts to develop any superpower faculties in a predictable and proliferating way. No one really would want to develop any sources from which would flow a river of wild cards.

*

So, the best way to prevent anything of the kind is to pollute the clear river of superpower understanding and infest it with log jams -- in the form of distractions, deterrents, derailments, demolitions, deconstructions and pismires -- all the while disguising these in formats of acceptable logic and reason and various kinds of droolings philosophical or otherwise.

*

It is my personal suspicion, based upon many years of direct experience, that our mainstream social-power structures WILL NEVER permit much in the way of open mainstream supported research and development of real superpower proficiency -- with one possible exception.

*

IF our species would find itself "threatened" by an extraterrestrial something or other which possessed active superpower functions, then OUR species superpowers would have to be developed to attempt to cope with the Spaceside "threat" in this regard.

In such a case, completely hypothetical to be sure, swift mainstream agreement would be reached to develop practical human superpower applications in order to add these to Earthside armaments.

*

A number of loose ends have been left open in this first essay of this section -- because they are better dealt with via substantive contexts to be discussed in subsequent essays of this Section 5.

TEACHING AND LEARNING REGARDING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (17Oct97)

PART 1

ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

It would be wonderful to organize information about LEARNING by following the step-by-step method that can be so effective regarding other areas of information.

Within a superficial approach to learning, or within a cursory glance at what's involved, it might seem that learning is straightforward, and that the steps involved are only one -- and which step consists of STUDY, study of simple stuff first, and then increasingly difficult stuff anon.

*

It is quite surprising how this idea of learning hangs on, and more or less is endlessly preached; surprising in the face of the familiar fact that someone can study something -- and end up not learning much or any of it.

*

When lots of study ends up in minimal learning, educationalists like to introduce matters such as the student's questionable motivation, snarled learning skills, memory retention lapses, early nurturing that was somehow deficient, and etc., until it becomes clear to everyone, including the student, that the fault is with the student for reasons both visible and invisible.

*

It if were not for the fact that one can sometimes encounter someone who HAS learned a good deal, but studied very little, then it might seem that failure to learn is somehow a student's fault.

*

Whether this kind of situation is perceived as important and significant by this or that reader of this essay, I'll simply say, at the risk of making a categorical pronouncement, that it IS important and significant. I'll even offer up three suitable reasons:

1. Study and learning are two different species of processes;
2. Learning is always judged against WHAT is being taught, and if one fails to learn, well, what has been studied might be at fault, not the learner.
3. True learning (so called) is also always judged against what has been taught by a teacher or some teaching system. In other words, true learning requires a teacher. Thus, if someone manages to learn something WITHOUT having been submitted to teaching procedures to learn it, well, he or she is considered as yet among the unwashed and unlearned.

*

Of course, 2 and 3 above may be products only of what is referred to as civilized cultures and societies in which the STATUS of teachers and teaching systems whose monopoly over teaching AND learning need to be protected. So within such civilizing aspects it doesn't really matter what one learns. It only matters that one has been taught it, and thus the actual meaning and value of diplomas and higher sheepskins.

Thus, in such kinds of systems, learning per se is not considered as meaningful -- since one can learn only what is being taught, and if whatever is learned has not been taught then it also is not considered as learning.

*

Also in such kinds systems, one usually can discover the existence of approved and disapproved learning, or tolerated and intolerated learning -- this being a subject I'll expand on here and there ahead while attempting not to drool too much venom.

*

I'm not merely bitching here, but am indicating that learning almost always is seen as an extension of teaching -- and in which context a certain number of students are expendable, or constitute permissible learning failures.

But I'm also hinting that teaching could be considered an extension of learning -- since if the need or desire to learn didn't exist, then there would be no occasion at all for teachers or teaching systems come into existence and flaunt their knowledge, mind-shaping wares, snake oils and other educational whatnot.

*

It has also been necessary to expand a little on 2 and 3 as itemized above, since those two contexts have a great deal to do with 1 as itemized above.

Or, perhaps, it might be said: have a great deal to NOT DO with 1 above.

*

To clarify a little. IF the processes of learning and the processes of teaching are different species of processes, then it might follow that the processes of teaching should be formulated within the light of the processes of learning. IF learning IS the goal.

*

However, IF learning IS NOT the goal, then the processes of teaching need never take into account the processes of learning.

In such a case, no one (including both teachers and learners) need know anything about the processes of learning. So, if someone manages to identify some of the different kinds of learning processes, well, these can be ignored, played down, eradicated, etc. -- or safeguarded from public access by machinations of mind-programming operations.

*

In any event, if we examine some terms and their definitions, we shall be able to note a rather curious thing as a result.

TEACH

Our English term TEACH is taken from a Middle European term, TECHEN, which meant "to show." In English it means "to cause [someone] to know a subject," and "to cause [someone] to know how."

*

Here we immediately, and unfortunately, encounter a gross fundamental difficulty. The difficult, in the most simple words possible, is this: "to know a subject" and "to know how [to do or effect something]" are radically different activities. But both activities are included, and somewhat obfuscated, within the contexts of the same descriptive term.

*

Additionally, most dictionaries defining TEACH somehow manage NOT to refer to the concept of "to cause [someone] to learn."

*

Thus, at first official nomenclature contact with the term TEACH we find as follows:

T E A C H

.

.

to cause

.

.....^.....

...

to know to know how to learn(?)

*

Moving on, then, the term TEACH is usually broken apart into active measure nuances:

INSTRUCT: methodical or formal teaching.

EDUCATE: attempting to bring out latent capabilities.

TRAIN: stresses instruction and drill with a specific end in view.

DISCIPLINE: implies subordination to a master for the sake of controlling.

SCHOOL: implies training or discipline, especially in what is hard to master or to bear.

TUTOR: to teach or guide, usually in a special subject or for a particular purpose.

GUIDE: to provide with guiding information, to direct a person in his or her conduct or course of life, to superintend training or instruction.

*

Thus, including TEACH we can quickly encounter EIGHT categories all relevant to teaching -- and in whose basic definitions the term LEARN is not mentioned.

LEARN

Our English term LEARN is akin to the Old High German LERNEN -- and which apparently meant "to acquire knowing," this later evolving into "to acquire knowledge."

*

Thus, in English, LEARN came to refer to "to gain knowledge or understanding of or skill in by study, instruction, or experience.

LEARN also refers to "memorizing," but beyond that the term is not broken down into more refined categories as is TEACH.

STUDY and STUDENT

Our English term STUDY is taken from the Latin term roughly meaning the same thing, with the exception that the Latin STUDERE either did or did also refer to "contemplation."

In any event, our term STUDY is defined (get this) as "the application of the mental faculties to the acquisition of knowledge; a careful examination or analysis of a phenomenon, development, or question; something attracting close attention or examination; also, the activity or work of a student."

*

Our English term STUDENT is defined as: one who attends a school; one who studies; also an attentive and systematic observer.

Most dictionaries allow the term LEARN to somehow be pendant to a CONCEPT of STUDENT, but that term is not included in most of the formal definitions.

Beyond that, a STUDENT is presumably one who proposes to attempt the application of the mental faculties to the acquisition of knowledge, a careful examination or analyses of something, even if only regarding whatever attracts close attention or examination.

Whatever is involved is then the student's WORK or ACTIVITY.

KNOWLEDGE

(1) Cognizance.

(2) The fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association.

(3) The fact or condition of being aware of something.

(4) The range of one's information or understanding.

(5) The fact or condition of having information, or of being learned.

(6) The sum of what is [was(?) or can be(?)] known and which consists of the body of truth, information, and principles acquired by mankind.

*

I might add that the body of truth, etc., presumably includes what was once known but forgotten, rejected, or avoided.

*

In dragging the reader through the foregoing nomenclature bytes, I have reviewed what would seem to be the major constituents of teaching and learning. Some might assume that these constituents are all that is needed in order to undertake expeditions into teaching and learning.

*

But while I suppose that most of the major constituents of teaching are included (at least regarding superficial formats of teaching), it seems to me that the idea of LEARNING seems to hang about as sort of a vaporous fantasy.

True, people assume that learning will occur because of teaching. But it can be noted that whatever the elements of learning might be, they are rather vague within the contexts of the nomenclature considered above.

*

Anyhow, the nomenclature autopsy is concluded (for now.) And this frees us to move expeditiously on to another matter.

There can be little doubt that teaching and learning are among the most important attributes of our species -- and indeed of almost all social groupings within it.

*

As it is, our species seems to HAVE TO LEARN what it takes to survive.

Which is to say that specimens of our species are not born completely or even partially programmed with broad-band survival knowledge -- a type of knowledge once referred to as NATURAL,

INDWELLING INSTINCTS as regards other life forms.

*

Since the above idea IS the case, it would then seem that the necessity of teaching and learning might have achieved enough conceptual importance to have become included as significant topics within the scope of philosophical inquiry and discussion.

*

I will now refer to THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY compiled under the editorial auspices of Paul Edwards, and published in 1967 by Macmillian Publishing Co. in New York, and by Collier Macmillian Publishers in London.

I have already referred to this encyclopedia in the course of other essays in this database. Although this encyclopedia was published in 1967 (thirty years ago as of this writing,) it represents an excellent compilation of philosophy up until then, and how things were considered.

Additionally, in my own estimation the year 1967 more or less signaled the end of what had been called the Modern Age, and so the encyclopedia serves as a kind of summarization of philosophical thinking as of the end of that Age. Whether anyone will agree with me on this estimation, most certainly after 1967 overall human affairs did depart into directions and necessities so new that former philosophical approaches to things and stuff grew increasingly useless.

For one thing, as human affairs went into the 1970s, interest declined in, of all things, PHILOSOPHY -- with the result that philosophical curricula began to be curtailed, and some institutions of higher learning canceled such courses and departments altogether.

*

Now, PHILOSOPHY was once thought of as "the search for wisdom."

However, when WISDOM proved either too elusive, complicated or inconvenient, the definition was shifted to "a search for truth through logical reasoning rather than factual observation." I invite you to consider this definition with some care and interest.

*

On average, though, one of the central ideas of PHILOSOPHY was to consider the meaning of things, especially if they were important not only to human thinking, but to survival, progress, understanding, and the accumulating of that stuff referred to as "knowledge."

In this sense, then what is NOT included in the 1967 encyclopedia may be as important as what is.

*

The concepts of TEACHING and LEARNING are not found in the encyclopedia as worthy of identified

entries.

In that the concepts of teaching and learning might be included in other entries, one of course consults the encyclopedia's index to discover if this is so.

*

In the Index, one finds only one reference to the topic of TEACHING -- and which reference regards "teaching machines."

*

The topic LEARNING fares a bit better.

First, the Index refers to "Learned Ignorance" as found mentioned in the entry for one Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464), a theologian, philosopher, and mathematician.

Apparently, this Nicholas of Cusa held that "a man is wise only if he is aware of the limits of the mind [his own?] in knowing the truth."

*

This Nicholas of Cusa, having said this, it is then of little wonder that no one has ever heard of him -- largely because his statement is sort of worrisome to the idea that "knowledge is Power," this a much more popular concept.

This Nicholas also wrote DE DOCTA IGNORANCE, a treatise in which he proposed that "Knowledge is learned ignorance." The idea that there may indeed exist doctrines of learning how to be ignorant would clearly be unpopular, all things considered.

*

In any event, the 1967 encyclopedia also mentions "learning" in connection with the entries for Perception, Psychological behaviorism, and something called the "Learning of the Mind School." The term "learning" is also mentioned in connection with the entries for to individuals, one Maine de Biran, and Jean Piaget.

*

So, as it turns out there is no formal entry in the 1967 encyclopedia for teaching or learning. The index mentions teaching in only one context, while learning is mentioned six times (only).

*

Before moving on, it is of some minor interest to discover that the 1967 encyclopedia DOES have an entry for "Laws of Thought." This is worth minor interest in that it might seem that TEACHING and

LEARNING might have some relationship to the Laws of Thought, or vice versa. At least my humble self can't really conceive that teaching and learning somehow DO NOT involve THOUGHT, whether lawful or lawless.

*

In any event, regarding the Laws of Thought, the 1967 encyclopedia indicated that such laws consisted of three principles "frequently discussed from the time of the Greeks until the beginning of the twentieth century [at which time] the term has become obsolete."

The three principles are noted as "the principles of identity, of contradiction, of excluded middle, and occasionally [presumably as a fourth principle] the principle of sufficient reason." Now, "reason" in this instance, refers to the sister of "logic" -- the two otherwise known as logic and reason.

The implication here is that it takes a certain amount or quota of reason to be able to deal with the laws of thought, and so interest in the Laws of Thought became "obsolete" at the beginning of the twentieth century.

*

Earlier above, I have introduced the term KNOWLEDGE.

The 1967 encyclopedia does not have an entry for KNOWLEDGE as a "thing" in its own right. The encyclopedia, however, does have three entries regarding knowledge as:

The Sociology of Knowledge;

The Theory of Knowledge;

Knowledge and Belief.

*

Regarding KNOWLEDGE, at the beginning of the entry KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF we find: "The nature of knowledge has been a central problem in philosophy from the earliest times. . . .

"The problem of knowledge occupies an important place in most major philosophical systems. If philosophy is conceived as an ontological undertaking, as an endeavor to describe the ultimate nature of reality or to say what there really is, it requires a preliminary investigation of the scope and validity of knowledge. Only that can be said to exist which can be known to exist.

"If, on the other hand, philosophy is conceived as a critical inquiry, as a second-order discipline concerned with the claims of various concrete forms of intellectual activity, it must consider the extent to which these activities issue in knowledge."

*

Well, I dare mention that few will consent to a preliminary investigation of the scope and validity of THEIR OWN PERSONAL knowledge -- and so whether knowledge is ontological or a second-order discipline is more or less relevant.

*

Regarding BELIEF, in the entry for KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF we find: "Belief has had less attention [than knowledge] from philosophers. It has generally been taken to be a more or less unproblematic inner state, accessible to introspection. But there has been disagreement about whether it is active or passive."

*

Well, insignificant little Moi might observe that the world turns more on belief than knowledge.

*

As it is, though, the 1967 encyclopedia more or less might agree with my comment above, in that in the KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF entry, THE DEFINITION OF KNOWLEDGE is given, and I quote:

"According to the most widely accepted definition, knowledge is justified true belief."
Ergo, it must follow that "true belief" is "knowledge." And which means that our species, although extant, is lost (or at least quite confused) -- and it is of little wonder that the finer points of teaching and learning have been irrelevant all along.

TRENDING AWAY FROM THE PARAPSYCHOLOGY PARADIGM TOWARD A NEW PARADIGM OF SUPERPOWER PERFORMANCE

Ingo Swann (24Nov97)

NOTE OF EXPLANATION: During the last two years I've received an increase of media requests concerning ESP and related matters. It became apparent that the interests and requests were based in concepts of ESP, Psi and parapsychology that are broadly shared, but are dated and backward looking if viewed in juxtaposition to advances in other science areas.

These other science areas have been in process of providing new facts and information relevant to various human processes that directly increase comprehension of ESP phenomena that have not yielded to resolution in parapsychological terms. This new information is accumulating outside of parapsychology, but is not being incorporated into parapsychology in any significant way. A strange situation has thus resulted. A paradigm shift relevant to "Psi" is taking place outside of parapsychology.

The most probable meaning of this paradigm shift external to parapsychology is that at least some significant part of parapsychology will soon become acknowledged as obsolete, being replaced by some kind of new perspective based on discovery in other scientific fields.

It has proven difficult to discuss this mostly unrealized paradigm shift with media and other people because a broad reality basis (including appropriate concepts and nomenclature) is still missing. I got tired of trying verbally to discuss this, and therefore began providing short written position statements as handout materials. I combine and expand these into this larger handout document for the edification of those interested in this somewhat non-visible situation.

NOTHING STAYS THE SAME

Because I'm about 65 per cent conservative I am particularly sensitive to change. There are many things I'd like to see stay as they are, or were. But alas for little me, change is continuous. Change rolls on and on, and also rolls over many things.

With regard to parapsychology and Psi, anyone even somewhat familiar with that research realizes that

it is now about 120 years along. Many might also realize that mainstream science rejected psychic matters from the outset of organized research in about 1882, and that the scientific rejection of Psi is still on-going today.

*

None the less, several vital forms of psychic research formulated external to science proper. Since about 1935, psychic research has collectively been referred to as "parapsychology." Parapsychology has brought into existence concepts, ideas, nomenclature, and frames of reference -- all combined into a sort of parapsychology-speak or lingo. I'll shorten this to "para-speak," and indicate that it is appropriate to parapsychology but not to any other mainstream scientific fields.

THE SOCIO-CULTURAL DIVISION BETWEEN THE MAINSTREAM SCIENCES AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY

In other documents in this database, I have referred to the exclusion of parapsychology from science as the "ghettoization" of Psi and parapsychology. I have also stipulated that the ghettoization is the fault of the mainstream sciences, and that its mandated basis was mounted on philosophical rather than scientific grounds.

*

Because of this, parapsychology and para-speak developed more or less independently of science proper -- with the result that several further and quite subtle separating phenomena ALSO came into existence, but which phenomena were seldom realized, discussed, or acknowledged as existing.

*

As but one of these subtle phenomena, the study of the sociology of science and of scientists and their brotherhoods easily reveals that the brotherhoods forbid the introduction of parapsychology concepts and nomenclature into the main sciences.

This embargo was enforced -- to the degree that mainstream scientists would experience professional damage to their careers if they proposed any cross-over concepts. This embargo is still in effect.

*

Several social affects came about because of this.

(1) The mainstream sciences do refer to psychic phenomena, but only under terms pejorative terms such as superstition, abnormal, hallucinatory, and in psychiatry as illness-like mental phenomena emanating

from deranged or diseased psycho-physical causes.

(2) The mainstream sciences have remained sanitized of any non-pejorative concepts and nomenclature redolent of anything psychic, paranormal, or parapsychological -- and so the language and nomenclature of non-pejorative connotations is para-speak.

(3) The cross-over of para-speak into the mainstream sciences is not permitted -- and so mainstream scientific papers whose contents might touch upon Psi in any way have to be written in a manner that does not suggest a cross-over.

(4) When the public, or anyone, wants to refer to the so-called paranormal in non-pejorative ways, they are obliged to utilize parapsychological concepts and nomenclature.

*

One of the principal fall-outs of this four-part situation is that that the mainstream sciences and parapsychology were and still are viewed as mutually incompatible -- or, at any rate, no cross-over of concepts and nomenclature is permitted by the major sciences.

*

And, as with all mutually incompatible social factors, another very important fall-out has been a DECREASED rate of mutual information-exchange between science proper and parapsychology.

*

Thus, it was, and still is, largely assumed that discovery, if any, about the paranormal (so called) would take place in parapsychology -- meaning external to the main sciences themselves.

The obverse to this was that the main sciences would not make any discoveries pertinent to the parapsychology paranormal -- because the main sciences had neither the desire, commitment nor tradition of working along such lines of scientific inquiry.

*

And so on the surface of these matters, the whole of this has taken on a somewhat non-changing vista -- parapsychology for parapsychologists -- science for scientists -- and neither shall meet at any point. BUT! Nothing ever stays the same, AND all things do change.

SOURCES OF CHANGE VIS-A-VIS MAINSTREAM SCIENCE AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY

Whatever one might elect to think of them, the main sciences ARE vital sciences, capable of on-going discovery. They have their ups and downs, their stagnating periods, their blind spots. But over time they do accumulate data and information, and also undergo their own paradigm shifts.

In my own possibly wobbly estimation, the rate of discovery in the main sciences since the 1950s has been large and accelerated -- so much so that the implications of the discoveries probably cannot be adequately digested in many areas.

Additionally, many of the implications lay outside of established frames of reference, not only scientific frames of reference, but social and cultural ones as well.

*

If we permit ourselves to think about this escalating accumulation of mainstream scientific knowledge it is almost impossible to think that those sciences would not somehow trip across discoveries that are entirely applicable to the so-called "parapsychology" processes of our species, somehow applicable to the central hypotheses of parapsychology.

*

Considering, however, the stalwart and long-enforced separation of parapsychology from the main sciences, we can well imagine certain professional difficulties arising in linking mainstream discovery to the forbidden parapsychology.

*

If, however, the linking of mainstream science discovery to parapsychology vistas was to be made, then there is little doubt that parapsychology WOULD HAVE TO CHANGE -- if for no other reason than the main sciences are gargantuan compared to the exceedingly small fraction of effort of which parapsychology is representative.

*

It is not entirely out of the question that Modern Parapsychology, as a ghettoized field (small) could vanish if discoveries pertinent to the "parapsychology" realms of human functioning were seen as such within the main sciences -- and, as I suppose it needs to be said, were ADMITTED as such.

*

I will give one possible example. In parapsychology, the perceptual forms of Psi (telepathy, clairvoyance, etc.) are seen as some kind of particular mind-psychological formats -- which is to say, seen as problems of mental perception.

Through the decades, a great deal of research has been undertaken to establish what kind of parapsychomental phenomenology and/or criteria cause, trigger, bring about, or accompany those forms of Psi.

I personally conclude that a great deal of progress has been made along these lines, but that parapsychologists jettison a great deal of it because it can't be seen as directly applicable to the central hypothesis that Psi is a function of the human para-mind.

So, in general, it is said that the accumulated parapsychological results are "not very robust" and are not amenable to "the repetitive experiment." Thus, in it's parapsychological context, Psi remains "elusive" -- while within parapsychology itself theories about it are exceedingly inconsistent.

*

Continuing with my one possible example. One notable aspect of parapsychology's Psi perceptual phenomena is that whatever their para-mental source or cause, those phenomena clearly also involve matters of information transfer, information acquisition, and information processing.

Thus, while the para-mental hypothesis certainly cannot be discounted, what if the more vivid and more easily dealt with Psi-perceptual problem consists of information processes?

*

Psi as mind and Psi as information, however, are two completely different arenas of expertise -- while the small field of parapsychology is not very thickly populated with information theorists.

*

However, the field of Information Theory and Applications is exceedingly Big Time in the main sciences. In that VERY mainstream field, the existence of receptors, transducers, the signal-to-noise ratio, and etc., are clearly understood -- and all of which are exceedingly relevant to information acquisition, etc.

*

In yet another VERY mainstream field, that of neurobiology, it has been discovered that the human systems are themselves composed of receptors, transducers, signal-to-noise decoders, and etc., and some of which seem to account for Psi-like information acquisition.

*

In other words, and in some special aspects, neither the field of information theory or the field of neurobiology has anything to do with parapsychology.

But discoveries in those two fields are speedily encroaching upon parapsychology "territory." And in some cases, it is only the dissimilarity of the NOMENCLATURE that is keeping them apart so far.

*

And, indeed, it is only if one doesn't know about advances in information theory and neurobiology that one can remain content (and ill-informed) to discuss Psi phenomena ONLY WITHIN the circumference of parapsychology itself.

*

According to usual logic, if parapsychology was going to undergo a paradigm change, one would suppose that it would come about because of advances in parapsychology itself. That has not happened. However, when the main sciences learn more about Psi phenomena than parapsychologists have or can, then parapsychology will become part of a paradigm change that might roll over it altogether.

*

There are many aspects that now need to be discussed, and many of which have already been entered into discussion in this database.

One of these is that certain phenomena occur as a paradigm shift comes into existence and gains momentum.

One of the first of these phenomena is that widely used words (terminology) that packed power within the retiring paradigm begin to lose that power as the contours of the new paradigm begin to take on form.

Sometimes it doesn't take much time at all for very popular terms to end up on the trash pile of forgotten nomenclature. Not only do the mind-sets that used the terms disappear, but the terms themselves fall out of usage and vanish.

*

This type of change represents much more than whether terms are "in" or "out," or "politically whatever." Terminology represents a kind of knowledge package. Or, put another way, knowledge is structured in a particular way within a paradigm -- and the term signifies not only what it means itself, but the way the knowledge package is structured.

When, then, advances or discoveries make it necessary to restructure knowledge packages, well, the old terms cannot be utilized any longer since they represent the former knowledge package.

All knowledge packages are characterized by key words -- these being terms that are direct intellectual extensions of the knowledge package. And the knowledge package is in turn a particular format within which knowledge is structured in a particular way.

*

In any event, terms fall out of usage and disappear because the way knowledge is structured undergoes change -- usually because new discoveries require that former knowledge packages be restructured into new formats so as to incorporate the new knowledge.

When this process becomes so all-encompassing, it can result in a complete paradigm shift -- and in this

case, of course, the old knowledge usually gets relegated to the trash pile of forgotten knowledge formats.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE CONCEPT OF EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION (ESP)

The term EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION is clearly the major key word within the parapsychology conceptual contexts of the twentieth century.

The common use of that term (as ESP) is so wide-spread that it is difficult to imagine that it might disappear. But indeed, it is hardly utilized today except by an hype-word within an uninformed media and by certain parapsychologists whose basis for conceptualizing is out-dated and inefficient.

The major reason why the usage of ESP is on its way into historical oblivion is that very much overall is in process of being discovered about all kinds of human functioning. The general knowledge packages prevalent during the 1930s (when Dr. J. B. Rhine introduced the term ESP) are long gone. Many new knowledge structures have been erected. While phenomena similar to what ESP once meant can be treated in those new structures, the phenomena cannot be referred to as EXTRA-sensory.

The principal reason here is that the hard sciences have discovered subtle SENSORY receptors that were not known to exist when the term ESP came into vogue.

*

A great deal can be said and written about ESP. But even so, not very much was actually known about it. One of the results was that parapsychology, which studies Psi and ESP, was often referred to as the "elusive science," since ESP discovery and knowledge have remained elusive.

This elusiveness probably accounts for why methods designed to teach and enhance ESP don't work very well. After all, it is difficult to teach something about which not much is known. Indeed, if such methods DID work well, then our planet would already have become populated with highly achieved psychics.

*

The comments just above have been necessary so that a particular question can be asked. Organized research into various ESP phenomena has been in existence for about 130 years by now -- with the result that the research is more notable for elusiveness than for discovery.

The question, then, is why is this the case, why is this the outcome after so many decades?

*

Between 1973 and 1985, I was part of a well-funded and serious effort to examine human potentials directly associated with ESP. The plight of parapsychology was already recognized as early as 1973 -- so much so that some observers felt it moribund or dead in the water. Why this was so needed to be examined and accounted for if possible, and so a multidisciplinary inquiry was mounted to which numerous professional experts contributed.

*

Among other factors brought to light was the discovery that not only was parapsychology an elusive science, it was also an isolated science. It was also incorporated (or trapped) within its own infra-social parameters. Those parameters did not interact, or were not permitted to interact, with the much larger global-sociological segments of science and philosophy. Further, parapsychology could be seen as an introverting paradigm of and unto itself with its own special functions -- such as nomenclature, concepts, theories and behavior patterns.

*

There can be no doubt at all that the basis for this self-isolating paradigm emerged from the early rejection of Psi research -- a rejection that was ardently prosecuted and maintained by science proper. It was certainly the intent of the early researchers to integrate Psi phenomena into science proper. And this integrating project is still on-going in contemporary parapsychology today. It was science proper that did not want that integrating to take place.

*

The long-term result of this was that parapsychology and psychic research were alienated from the scientific mainstreams, and as such had to, or at least did, establish its own paradigm approach to ESP phenomena. This paradigm was formulated roughly after World War I, and was concretized during the 1950s -- with not a great deal of change since then regarding basic and fundamental premises and concepts.

*

Over the long-term, this alienation meant that routes of information exchange did not form between the isolated parapsychology paradigm and the greater and far larger other scientific fields. This obviously meant that science proper did not access developments occurring in parapsychology. But it also meant that parapsychology did not itself access and integrate developments in the other sciences. This is to say that vital information exchange links between on-going science and isolated parapsychology has not really been established.

*

As but one example, somewhat amusing. Although ESP is the acronym for extra-sensory perception, parapsychology does not study perception per se. That kind of research is the fold of perceptual researchers in the proper sciences, but which do not study extrasensory forms of perception. So, parapsychology studies the ES part, but not the P part, while other sciences study the P part, but not the ES part.

In other words, while perception is an element common both to parapsychology and the mainstream sciences of perception, there are no direct routes of information integration between the two.

*

The extent of this little difficulty is actually quite gross. For one thing, the two fields, isolated and barricaded from each other, have evolved different nomenclature and theories for a number of phenomena that are identical in both fields.

*

Additionally, science proper probably has made more discovery relevant to extra-sensory perception than parapsychology has.

*

However, proper science does not permit the introduction of terms redolent of ESP. And so it is difficult for the average person to realize, for example, that when neurobiologists talk of "bio-magnetic receptors" they are actually talking about a functional biological basis for dowsing, while dowsing itself is thought to be a form of ESP.

*

But the going here gets even a little rougher. Most of the major structural ideas and concepts that continue to govern parapsychology thinking were formulated before, say, 1955. And one of those major concepts was the idea that only five physical senses existed, an idea that was more or less held in common agreement by everyone. So, one of the dominant ideas in parapsychology regarding ESP is that ESP does not have a biological basis in any of the five major physical senses -- and so it was necessary to coin the term extra-sensory perception, referring to perceptions that did not have a physical, biological basis. And so this is why ESP was called "extra-sensory" -- or outside of the normal senses. And, as well, this was why ESP was considered as originating from some cause or source independent of the material aspects of the human biobody.

*

It is now important to state that although parapsychologists HAVE presented significant and copious

evidence that the human biomind can deal in information acquisition and transfer, they have done so within the contexts of the information being EXTRA-SENSORY -- that is, outside of, or independent of, the capacities of the human sensing systems.

This is to say that although it can be shown that the information acquisition and transfer exist, the fact of the existence does not at the same time prove the theory of EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION, or that the acquisition and transfer involve extra-sensory biomind equipment.

*

Indeed, the idea of EXTRA-SENSORY perception was only minimally permissible back in the days when sciences were convinced (erroneously) that the human systems possessed only five physical senses. However, it is known that the human systems have very many more than a mere five physical senses, the many more being physical as well.

In this lately developmental sense, then, it can be observed that the concept of extra-sensory perception probably was oxymoronic all along. In any event, many earlier parapsychologists (and a whole lot of scientists) objected to ESP on the grounds that ESP WAS an oxymoron.

*

I'm not quite sure yet what the replacement concepts for ESP will be, but it is quite certain that such replacement concepts WILL come into existence, as they already are. The evolving concepts will almost certainly focus on the concept of subtle, multiple and recombinant receptors. Some ideas about these replacement concepts will be discussed in a future essay.

ELEMENTS OF A TENTATIVE CONCLUSION

New, and more efficient, knowledge structures cannot become visible if their information is filtered through old knowledge structures -- simply because the old is structured in ways that usually prohibit recognition (or acceptance) of new information.

It is, I think, rather well established via countless psychological studies that knowledge structures can access only what they can recognize -- and that what ever else is present but can't be recognized is rejected, deflected, resisted or merely dumped.

*

The average media or public awareness of the astonishing elements of the human biomind continues to consider those elements only via the limited and out-moded parapsychology formats.

*

The main sciences have made copious discoveries regarding increasingly refined elements of overall human processes.

Many of these discoveries are entirely applicable to mysteries and problems of extended biomind perceptions and functions. This can only mean that a paradigm shift is in the offing, or is already taking place -- even though media and the lay person is not aware of the shift.

One really should start thinking in terms of biomind receptors rather than in terms of ESP. The paradigm shift currently underway will be fleshed out in subsequent essays.

Contaminants and "Noise"

Ingo Swann (12Dec97)

The central purpose of this Section 5 is to address the possibility that certain sociological situations keep knowledge about the superpowers as perpetually degraded, inadequate, and even undiscovered.

Since individuals, knowingly or unknowingly, may participate or be dragged into the sociological situations, it's worthwhile to attempt to examine whatever aspects one can manage to identify.

*

The chief, or bigger picture, sociological situation may consist of the one that has been briefly summarized in the Introductory as the relationship of the superpowers to Earthside power structures.

*

One can accept or reject this possible bigger picture reason. But either way, it can easily be shown that knowledge about the superpowers clearly suffers within the descriptive contexts of the terms selected for the heading of this Section.

*

Furthermore, it can also easily be pointed up that just about all human activities are accompanied by their share of distractions, deterrents, derailments, etc., and that many human activities end up becoming pismires personified.

Organized research into creativity, for example, usually suffers from derailments and deconstructions. Research addressing the enormously important topics of human sentience and sensitivity are almost non-existent.

*

If one accepts the existence of "human nature," then it can be adduced that the descriptive

terms of this Section are inherent in human nature fabric -- and the workings of which are delightfully seized upon and elaborated in espionage, political and sociological thrillers, and in soap opera formats.

But even without the context of human nature, the descriptive elements of this Section's title are anyway everywhere redundant and thickly scattered throughout human history.

*

In any event, any potential aspirant wishing to activate his or her latent superpower faculties might as well get ready to deal with the superpower preventives -- if only to be able to recognize them when encountered. After all, if one interprets disinformation as information, then one might have only oneself to blame when one finds oneself in some contaminating kind of pismire the disinformation has led one into.

*

In order to approach the two central topics (Contaminants and Noise) of this present essay, it seems necessary to start at some distance and then drawing closer to them.

Two Major Pathways to Learning

The first and preferred pathway of learning how to understand and develop something is to consult all information about it -- and then to more or less duplicate the information in one's mental information processing grids.

An extension of this first pathway is to make new discoveries if existing information and knowledge proves to be insufficient, inefficient or non-existent.

This first pathway is usually very workable, and the history of our species developmental aspects is quite firmly and broadly based on it.

*

When, however, one has given the first pathway a good workout and found that what one thought one would achieve by doing so has not in fact been achieved, then one might realize two things:

That the goal may have been illusory all along; or

That the first and preferred pathway is cluttered with accumulated junk, garbage, bullshit, and misinformation.

*

If this is the case, then one may be obliged to launch upon a second pathway regarding

learning and developing whatever is involved.

Briefly put, the second pathway consists of divesting the first pathway of the accumulated junk, garbage, bullshit and misinformation.

*

The divesting process, however, can be very complicated in that it is often difficult to tell the difference, for example, between fact and bullshit, or between information and disinformation.

And indeed, if accepted social forces are perpetuating disinformation as real and valid information, then the ways and means of recognizing the disinformation can themselves be very difficult to discover.

*

However, there is a salient fact that can be emphasized. It can easily be shown that understanding and developmental approaches normally do not speed onward to success if the learning pathways are littered with bullshit and disinformation.

And this is especially the case where the goal to be reached is really meaningful -- especially if the goal has connotations of power.

*

Since any of the superpower enhancing methods are suggestive of power, one can perhaps intuit the multitudes of strata of bullshit and misinformation superpower aspirants might expect to encounter.

But even if this power thing is NOT the problem, superpower aspirants will encounter bullshit and misinformation anyway -- if only because many specimens of our species like to entertain and dazzle everyone with bullshit -- and which can easily be elevated to an art form.

The Real Reality of the Superpower Preventitives

Many seem to feel that bullshit and disinformation go away if and when they are seen through. In this regard, they are seen as kind of impermanent, and therefore of lesser importance, than what is permanent. In this sense, they do not deserve clinical examination or research.

However, bullshit and misinformation, etc., are not merely subsidiary factors, or tangential elements, that have accumulated by mere chance, ignorance, stupidity, or blindness.

Rather, the factors and elements represent a combined, interacting series of phenomena

resulting in a Situation that has breadth, depth and dimensions in its own right.

Avoidance of the Second Learning Pathway

Generally speaking, it has been my experience that most people avoid a consideration of the second pathway because it can be seen as consisting of "negative" factors many don't want to get dirtied by.

In the sense of that avoidance, then, the desired pathway is the first one. It is thus pursued under the generally shared conviction that if one focuses principally on the "positive," then the "negative" will automatically become eliminated at some point.

There was a once popular song called, if I remember correctly: Accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative.

*

Also, in my childhood people were fond of quoting the three monkey thing: See no evil, hear no evil, do no evil. So I used to ask: if one never sees or hears evil, then how is one supposed to recognize it?

*

Likewise, I fail to see how one can "eliminate the negative" if one cannot recognize what it consists of, where it's at, and what it's doing.

Thus, the so-called sweetness-and-light-only thing, i.e., where ONLY the positive is pursued, is somewhat silly even if temporarily comforting.

*

So, the generally shared conviction of pursuing the positive, ignoring the negative, is somewhat philosophical and idealizing in vaporous kinds of ways, and some aspects of it can be compared to the creature with its head buried in a hole in the ground -- or in a pismire.

*

There is one principal reason why this generally shared positivistic conviction may be vaporous and empty of any long-term constructive merit.

Our species, as fabulous as it is in many ways, demonstrates a quite long RECORDED history of being completely willing to deal in information AND misinformation/ disinformation -- as well as in lies, cheating, trickery, obfuscating and worse.

*

Thus, while our species and its variety of societies have set up and instituted centers of information collection and teaching, it can also be shown that methodologies for establishing misinformation and conducting disinformation have become equally institutionalized.

And along these lines, a significant but little noticed aspect can be pointed up: That the public is invited to partake of the "knowledge" made available through centers of education;

The same public, however, is excluded from partaking in studies and methodologies of how to misinform and disinform.

*

This is to say, then, that we can view the junk, garbage, bullshit and misinformation stuff via two ways:

That the stuff might have accumulated merely by unfortuitous chance; or

That the stuff might have been more or less deliberately set up, effected, and thence cleverly managed.

*

In this sense, then, misinformation stuff that arises merely from stupidity, ignorance, etc., can be corrected by attempts to cure whatever is involved, or by making new discoveries.

*

If, however, the bullshit, junk and misinformation has achieved its destructive or contaminating factors by deliberate disinformation, then the contours of the resulting Situation become meaningful in quite different ways -- especially when it comes to trying to recognize and cure them.

*

The purpose of this Section 5, however, is not to bitch and moan about the existence of bullshit, & etc., or to luxuriate one's imaginative faculties in the dramas of conspiracy aesthetics.

The purpose is to try to give some dimensions to the second pathway of discovering what PREVENTS progress, understanding and development.

Those dimensions not only constitute a legitimate topic for discussion, but a necessary one with respect to the superpower faculties.

The nature and potential superpower activity of our species has clearly been surrounded

with bullshit, infested with deterrents, junk thinking and contaminants, and limelighted with bad mainstream press and propaganda.

*

It is now helpful to discuss some of the most identifiable sociological inhibitors of the superpowers from TWO larger picture angles. This is to say that the same inhibitors will be discussed from two separate points of view -- as CONTAMINANTS and then as NOISE.

Contaminants Regarding the Superpowers

The terms used for the somewhat overblown heading of this Section represent a variety of factors that act as eroding contaminants with regard to achieving better understanding of and contact with the superpower faculties.

In large part, these contaminants are more active in sociological contexts than in individual or personal activity -- unless one has knowingly or unknowingly chanced to have duplicated them in one's mental grids.

If one has duplicated them, then one can say that one's grids are infested or contaminated with them.

But since individuals can knowingly and unknowingly be influenced by social processes, any distinctive boundaries between self and social-shaping forces are often hard to detect.

*

The superior goal in this regard is NOT to complain and blame anyone or anything as the source of cause of the bullshit or disinformation.

The superior goal is to recognize the existence and dysfunctional nature of whatever is involved.

*

Putting this another way, if one thinks that the goal is to cure and prevent bullshit, then one is laboring under a rather first class illusion. You see, Bullshit HAPPENS -- because it IS a full part of our dazzling species.

The superior goal, then, is to somehow avoid stepping in it.

*

As will unfold ahead in the few essays that will ultimately comprise this section, the contaminating factors range from silly to gruesome. But this is to say, they produce silly

to gruesome effects within those affected by them.

*

Within the two sentences above, there is a distinction that is difficult to articulate. In an attempt to articulate, we can say that social forces exist, and that some of them range from silly to gruesome.

From these forces we can expect at least two basic kinds of situations to emerge:

1. If we are UNAWARE that the contaminating social forces exist as such, then the probability might be high that they will become incorporated into individual information grids. The reason for this is that we DO program our thinking patterns to conform to our social environments in order to fit our behavior and activity into them.
2. If we are AWARE that the social forces ARE contaminants, whether silly or gruesome, then because of the awareness they may not affect us directly -- unless one is of the scumbaggy types that want to utilize the contaminants for one reason or another.

*

In any event, it has been shown, and broadly accepted, that awareness of contaminants acts to put some kind of perceptive or psychological DISTANCE between us and the contaminants.

But even so, the contaminants still exist in the social environment, and we may occasionally have to deal with them as such.

This is to say, then, that perceiving or knowing that the contaminants exist serves at least as a partial protective measure against being sucked into the dynamics of the contaminating factors in a wholesale and completely unknowing ways.

Sources of the Superpower Contaminants

It is tempting to try to point up the major sources or causes of contaminating factors in relationship to processes of thinking, perception and analysis. But very little in the way or organized research has taken place along those lines. So it is difficult to refer to documents containing the needed data and theoretical or factual discussions.

Here is yet another knowledge vacuum -- one that exists possibly because most of us believe that how we think is not the result of our mental information processing grids having become contaminated.

But one indeed can accept that the contaminants exist, that they are undesirable, but that they are often also USEFUL for various purposes.

*

However, in the past it has often been observed that Human Nature is comprised of both positive and negative aspects. Additionally many past human nature researchers considered that while the social and informational contexts might change, that the basic rudiments of human nature did not.

For example, greed remained greed, lust remained lust, the urges for power remained as such -- and did so throughout generations and whatever changes that societal, religious, economic, philosophic or scientific factors brought about.

*

In any event, wherefore and why the contaminants and preventives exist is an interesting matter. But there is another interesting matter: i.e., how they function within individuals and in their societies.

One way of defining how they function is to call them viruses of mind -- a topic that occasionally will be addressed in this database.

Meanwhile, a quite large perspective on mind viruses can be found in a book entitled VIRUS OF THE MIND (1997), written by Richard Brodie, the original author of Microsoft Word, one of the world's best-selling computer programs.

Identifying the Major Contaminants

The terms utilized in the title of this Section Five have been selected because their meanings are not dependent on social perspectives that come and go.

This is to say that the meanings of the terms are time and culture transcending and can be applied as regards the past and the future as well as any given present.

In this sense, then, the process dynamics of deterrents and demolitions are just as much a part of basic human nature as are the dynamics of gossip.

*

The terms have also been selected because, for example, HOW TO IMPLEMENT deterrents has been studied and the functional dynamic process of deterring are thus well known. Much the same can also be said for the other selected terms.

Of course, we will add other concept terms in essays ahead -- such as "pissing contests."

*

The accepted, and quite understandable, definition of CONTAMINATE refers to factors

"that soil, stain, or infect by contact or association."

The term also refers to "making unfit for use by introduction of unwholesome, undesirable, erroneous or inappropriate elements."

*

Three synonyms are usually given for CONTAMINATE:

TAINT -- implies that corruption and decay have begun to take effect;

POLLUTE -- stresses the loss of purity, clarity, and cleanness through contamination;

DEFILE -- implies a deliberate effort of befouling of what ought to be clear and pure, and suggests a violation or desecration.

*

CONTAMINATE itself is an incorporation of the meanings of the three synonyms, but specifically refers to intrusion of or contact with an OUTSIDE source as the cause.

*

These meanings are certainly functional ones. Admittedly, they are usually linked only to PHYSICAL phenomena. But they can just as well be comprehensively linked to the five terms brought together as the title of this Section. For example, most people realize that one form of thinking or information etc., can contaminate another form of thinking or information, etc.

Employed Active Measures of Contaminating

- **DISTRACT:** to cause to turn aside from.
- **DETER:** to cause to turn aside from, to discourage, or to prevent from acting (as by fear or by misdirecting).
- **DERAIL:** to cause to run off the rails, to throw off course.
- **DEMOLISH:** to tear down or to destroy completely, so as to make vanish.
- **DECONSTRUCT:** also to tear down, but by the methods of undoing and devaluating so that sense or function is terminated or lost.
- **PISMIRE:** formally refers to urine + ant, i.e., ant piss, pungently smelling of formic acid; this term was adapted some time ago to refer to certain types of thinking that are PISIFORM in nature, PISIFORM referring to something the size of a pea.
- **DROOL:** refers to DRIVEL, in turn meaning nonsense; but also meaning saliva leaking from mouth.

Critical Implications

Although some of the early researchers of human nature in the past (c. 1500-1920) managed to construct convincing "maps" of its major attributes, to my knowledge no one ever found out how to change any of the attributes in our species as a whole.

The sum of human nature wisdom has always held that human nature is not very readily changed -- and therefore the wisdom part consists of knowing as much about human nature as one can and thereafter ALWAYS utilizing the knowledge in consideration of anything.

*

The dynamics of distractions, deterrents and demolitions, for example, will never "go away" or even be permanently eradicated or corrected -- because they are useful, perpetually useful.

This is to say that they are not merely defects of misguided thinking, but functional attributes within human nature when it comes to competitiveness -- and which attribute is one of the most clearly defined human nature attributes of our species as a whole.

*

Indeed, throughout recorded history there is hardly a human societal activity that is not laced through and through with competitiveness -- and its major functional armaments including tricksterism, cheating and deceit.

*

The overall meaning being attempted here is that the elements and factors of contaminants are probably permanently with us -- whether we like it or not.

Even if they were extensively studied and researched, few would really want them to be obliterated -- because their functions and dynamics are useful in all sorts of competitive arenas.

*

However, the idea that the dynamics of contaminants should be ignored because they are here to stay and won't go away is foolish -- except if one is a confirmed "sweetness and light" type (sweetness and light being one type of distracting drooling).

All of this might be expressed another way: "shit happens" -- and somewhat to avoid having it drop on one, or gum up one's thinking processes, it's perhaps the better part of wisdom to at least be able to identify contaminants.

After all, contaminants ignored will contaminate. With contaminants perceived and identified, there is at least the possibility of seeing through them.

*

And indeed, it can be shown that one of the secrets of achieving power of any kind is to see through contaminants. Thus, what we today call "empowerment" is somewhat related to developing skills with regard not only to seeing through contaminants, but to perceiving their functioning dynamics.

*

In this light, it can clearly be understood that if one's cognitive routes to one's own superpower faculties are cluttered with unrecognized contaminants, then one should not be surprised that one's superpower faculties might fail to activate.

*

By way of analogy here, if one's radar or sonar scanning systems, or one's computer hardware and software, are cluttered with unrecognized contaminants, the one will have to be content with products that are a mix of contaminated functioning. This is more or less in keeping with the very ancient adage that what goes in also comes out -- at some point, anyway.

*

Even if one manages to activate a superpower faculty in the midst of unrecognized contaminants, the combined, the frustrating mixed result might not be very spectacular -- IF there is a result.

There are two essential, or principal aspects of these critical implications. The first of these is easy enough to articulate.

It has to do with the first and second pathways, as already mentioned, that can lead to fuller understanding and development of the superpower faculties.

*

The first pathway, the preferred one, has to do with obtaining information and knowledge about the superpowers, with the expectation that if such is taken on board then proficiency and efficiency regarding the superpowers will result.

But! One aspect of this first pathway few realize exist is that one also has to learn how to negotiate one's way through all of the information and knowledge available.

This is to say that if the REAL, so to speak, information and knowledge is not negotiated through in some proper way, then it is unlikely that any crucial alignment will take place within the mental information processing grids of individuals, groups, or societies.

*

If and when one realizes that it is necessary to enter into the second, less preferred pathway, in order to discover what deterrents consist of, one is then faced with the same problem of negotiating one's way through the deterrents. But to achieve anything of the kind, one first has to find out and recognize what the deterrents consist of.

*

All of this is the same as saying that one cannot negotiate one's way through anything unless one can learn to identify what it is that one is supposed to negotiate through. Thus, for example, if one is obliged, for some reason or another, to negotiate one's way through a MESS, one can no longer treat the mess AS a mess. One has to break it apart, break it down, into its recognizable constituent elements -- this in order to perceive how to negotiate through it.

*

And here, rather inadvertently it seems, is revealed the most efficient and workable way to institute, apply and manage misinformation and disinformation: i.e., to make such a mess of something (such as the superpowers) that few will ever be able to negotiate their way through it.

Contaminants as "Noise" -- "Noise" as Contaminating -- Contaminants and "Noise" as Virus of Mind

Having said this much, it is now necessary to attempt to distill and clarify what, for example, correct and incorrect information add up to regarding the superpowers. This is best done via a kind of chart:

| "SIGNAL" | "NOISE" |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Correct Information -- versus | Incorrect Information |
| Information -- versus | Misinformation |
| Truth / Facts -- versus | Lies / Deceit |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Valid Directions -- versus | Invalid Directions |
| Uncontaminated -- versus | Contaminated |

All of the above equate to...

SIGNAL versus NOISE

*

Thus, regarding the first, and more enthusiastic pathway of learning, one hopes to get onboard and negotiate one's way through SIGNALS.

Regarding the second, and less enthusiastic pathway of learning, one hopes to negotiate one's way through NOISE, so as to be able to identify and circumvent it -- or, with something akin to high hopes, eradicate it.

The Signal-To-Noise Ratio

Perusers of this website will already have come across an [essential essay on the Signal-To-Noise Ratio](#) already placed herein some time ago.

But for easy reference here, NOISE refers to whatever distorts, interferes with, or obscures "SIGNALS." In giving definitions of NOISE, most dictionaries indicate "an unwanted signal in an electronic communication system, or whatever is spread by rumor or false report."

For our purposes here, NOISE and contaminants are roughly the same if the results of them are taken into consideration.

*

SIGNAL refers to a detectable quality or impulse by which messages or information can be transmitted efficiently, clearly or unimpeded, or to whatever constitutes a characteristic feature of something.

*

In its original sense, the concept of the Signal-To-Noise Ratio admittedly is drawn from problems of electrical engineering.

But the Ratio has also, and quite appropriately, been extended as entirely workable into

the realms of information theory and communications.

But even so, the Ratio is easily taken into other areas of activity themselves characterized by topics, subjects, or environments that possess constituents of information, misinformation and disinformation.

*

In the largest sense, then, we might be talking of humanity, of our species -- certainly of its sociological patterns, and of the competitiveness which might be the chief hallmark of ours species, with the ability to think coming second.

*

In computer lingo, the Noise part of the Ratio is often the principal constituent of GIGO -- i.e., garbage in, garbage out.

*

The point of possible enlightenment being led up to by all of the foregoing is that a noisy information and sensing system, whatever it is, probably will produce noise. And so if we now consider that the superpower faculties are SENTIENT systems that deal with identifying certain signals among billions of all possible signals, then we can grasp the concept that if the superpower faculties might not function well if inundated by or overwhelmed with noise.

*

This is then to say that if one wishes to activate one's superpower faculties, one is ALSO equally obliged to learn to identify signal AND noise. And so it can be considered, hypothetically at least, that the superpowers constitute an arena of human functioning where noise is just as important as signal. Therefore, if one wishes to attempt to activate their superpowers, from the ground up one must become just as much a noise expert as a signal expert.

*

In this regard, now somewhat obvious perhaps, one cannot hope to get very far regarding the superpowers by following only the first, and most preferred pathway. You see, and somewhat metaphorically speaking, the superpower faculties "inhabit" both the signal and noise universes.

*

Indeed, the aligning of KNOWN knowledge and information so that others can benefit from it is the dominant basis of most Earthside educational formats. If new discoveries come about, then these are incorporated into the prior existing knowledge base.

When, then, people want to learn something about the superpowers and how to develop them, they usually attempt to utilize the first and preferred learning pathway either as self-learning or taught learning.

*

However, something enlightening can be said about the first and preferred pathway: That it works and succeeds best with regard to whatever falls into any kind of physical parameters, or with regard to human activities which in large part involve physical aspects. The principal reason why the first pathway works best regarding physicality is that physical stuff, being the stubborn stuff that it is, sooner or later provides its own reality checks.

Physical stuff is also suggestive of its own rules and laws, and which scientists set about to discover some time ago. But even if the average person doesn't grok the laws and rules of physicality, they can nevertheless learn a lot merely by trial and error -- and which is what most scientists have learned from, too.

*

Now, there are quite a number of human activities regarding which outside physical variables do not provide easily accessible reality checks.

One of those activities is THINKING per se. And thinking is perhaps the biggest of the big time activities of our species after competitiveness.

If there is not some outside variable, usually physical, against which human thinking can experience some kind of reality check, then the human thinker has to attempt to self-identify such reality checks.

*

And with this we come up to a rather amusing situation, but one of large dimensions and import, that needs some discussion. This discussion, however, will be postponed until after certain other topics have been addressed.

The following essay in this Section will attempt to deal with the topic of power structures within contaminants and noise.

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (01Mar98)

PART 5: SENTIENCY AND SENSITIVITY

During the last twenty-eight years, one of the questions most commonly asked of me had to do with what people might read or study that would help them develop their "psychic powers."

If I was in a sardonic mood at the time, I'd point up that a great deal has been written, and most of which is very interesting. None the less, the undeveloped psychic powers, in any activating sense, have stubbornly remained more or less undeveloped.

In other words, the great heap of the whole that has been written and studied has not yet resulted in the world becoming thickly populated with developed superpsychics.

AN ADMITTEDLY FRUSTRATING ISSUE

If one observes this frustrating issue as calmly as possible, it would appear that there is some subtle difference between reading and studying about the powers on the one hand, and the actual, real-time activation of the powers on the other.

That one can read and study (even undergo some kind of training) and still not have their superpowers activated can easily be interpreted as evidence that the powers don't exist in the first place.

IN-PUT OF INFORMATION/OUT-PUT OF PROFICIENCY

People automatically expect to positively benefit from what they read and study. Indeed, the way that teaching and learning have been institutionalized in the modern West leads one to assume as much.

One of the most central computations of Western styles of teaching and learning is based on providing the intellect with organized formats of information, usually in step-by-step ways -- after which various states of competency can be expected to manifest.

In other words, the Western styles of teaching and learning postulate that there is a direct and automatic relationship between in-take of organized information and out-put of competency and efficacy.

There can be little doubt that this in-put/out-put schematic DOES yield high results in very many areas of endeavor -- so much so that it is taken for granted that it will work regarding all things.

But one verifiable fact about this schematic is that it works best where some kind of rote learning is involved. It doesn't work very well, or not at all, where, for example, creative development is involved.

One of the major, but subtle, constituents of rote learning is that the in-put proceeds via organized in step-by-step ways that do not require the in-put information to be recombined. Indeed, the efficiency of rote learning can easily suffer if it is messed about.

One of the major, but subtle, constituents of creative learning is that the elements of all in-put information need to be recombined -- to the degree that if not then creative manifestations might be very minimal.

In other words, creative learning involves high mobility of recombinant factors -- whereas rote learning generally does not.

There is no intended attempt here to imply anything negative about rote learning. The intent is simply to indicate that two different areas of learning activity do exist. In fact, an important third category of learning also exists -- but which will be addressed in other forthcoming essays.

RECOMBINANT INFORMATION

RECOMBINANT is a term principally arising out of genetic studies, and refers to "the formation of new combinations of genes via cross-overs through fertilization."

In the sense of information theory, then, recombinant refers to the formation of new combinations of information via cross-overs through what may best be called "inspiration."

An important characteristic of rote learning is that all information specifically meaningful to the learning is identified and included in the teaching-learning package. This is to say that rote-learning is pre-packaged, and does not require cross-overs. In fact, the efficiency of the rote learning completely depends upon this.

The chief characteristic of creative teaching and learning is two-fold: it breaks apart various categories of pre-packaged information in order to recombine the manifold elements; and it also recombines those elements with cross-over information best acquired by original deduction and/or "intuitive insight."

But there is a quite large problem involved with creative learning.

This has to do NOT with what information IS available to be reintegrated into new formulations.

Rather it has to do with the absence of information whose participation is needed to help in cross-over fertilizations -- and thus to achieve effective levels of functioning.

For example, if it chanced in genetic recombining that the genes responsible for eyes, ears or genitals somehow drop out of the cross-over fertilizing process, then the resulting product will not "develop" those important organs.

It can easily be said that activation of any of the superpowers falls into the creative type of teaching and learning. But it could benefit even from the pre-packaged rote type of learning -- IF that type included all that was needed to aid in effective cross-overs of recombinant information.

THIS database is somewhat filled with categories of information that are nowhere included in the typical rote-learning concepts of "psychic empowerment."

The function of this particular essay is to introduce yet another set of information that has fallen into absence not only with regard to the substance of this database, but with regard to just about any kind of awareness and thinking.

SENTIENCY & SENSITIVITY

This information has to do with SENTIENCY from which various levels of SENSITIVITY are dependent. The concept of sentiency has, as it might be said, more than almost completely vanished within all modernist contexts. Indeed, there is no rote learning package regarding "psychic development" that even mentions the term.

But it can surely be said that if one wishes to develop any of their superpower faculties, it must be taken

for granted that unless one expands or extends their sentiency thresholds not much is going to happen.

To be effective, however, the vital topic of sentiency needs to be entered into rather obliquely at first.

"DOORS" OF SENTIENCY

The development or enhancement of any human faculty appears to be almost completely dependent on two primary factors.

It is somewhat difficult to articulate the more exact nature and elements of the two factors -- largely because of a lack of concepts and terminology that would be precise enough to reduce ambiguity and induce clarity.

However, we can utilize the device of a metaphor to help arouse at least a general, if still quite gross, recognition of the two primary factors.

Thus, the two factors might approximately be described by leaning on the metaphor having to do with "doors" of perception, and which indirectly carries a four-fold connotation:

- (1) whether the doors are open;
- (2) whether the doors are shut;
- (3) what opens the doors;
- (4) what keeps them shut.

However, although this "doors of perception" metaphor is suggestive, it has something of a passive quality -- if compared with another useful metaphor: that of a sentient dynamo.

This additional metaphor again can carry four-fold connotation, to wit:

- (1) whether the sentient dynamo is on line and working;
- (2) whether it is off line and closed down;

(3) whether it has been kept well-oiled and in good working order;

(4) whether it has been shut down, allowed to rust, or has been wrecked by any number of wrecking possibilities.

In the sense of these metaphors combined, the two primary factors that can lead to development and enhancement of human faculties concern whether whatever is involved is: (1) open and active; or (2) closed and shut down.

However, these two metaphors, although useful, still don't quite incorporate two additional nuances that are entirely meaningful. These nuances have to do with how the faculties (whatever they are) have been treated within larger-picture sociological scenarios, circumstances or environments people find themselves.

SOCIETAL VECTORS

In the sense of such larger-picture situations, one will always encounter the phenomena of tolerance-intolerance, and the phenomena of constructivity and destructivity.

In the sense of all of the above combined, the two primary factors regarding development or enhancement of any given human faculty can roughly be identified as:

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| The human faculty: | The human faculty: |
| Constructively dealt with. | Destructively dealt with. |
| Open. | Shut. |

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| On line, producing | Off line, closed down. |
| Tolerated. | Not tolerated. |

Here we now see two line-ups which seem easily recognizable as the traditional dichotomies of:

good vs. bad

pro vs. con

positive vs. negative

THE VANISHMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF SENTIENCY

One of the most fundamental constituents of our species is that it is a sentient one.

Indeed, the existence of our sentience precedes any and all concepts that become possible because of it -- such as awareness, consciousness, sensitivities of all kinds, perception, and last, but not least, powers of ANY kind.

None of these can exist in the absence of the fundamental foundations of sentience.

If this is understood, then it is rather mystifying to find that discussions regarding sentience and its awesome potentials are so minimized as to be nil in such important studies as science, philosophy, religion, creativity, and empowerment.

By far and large, this can only mean that the vital issue of sentience has been plunged into such intolerance that it figures not at all within anything -- to the degree that it is not even **RECOGNIZABLE** as the vital topic that it obviously is.

Sensitivities of all kinds download from species-generic sentience. But sensitivities can be "contained," as it were, by societal strictures -- meaning social systems can determine what sensitivities are permissible or not permissible. This is to say, that the extent and functioning of sensitivities, both quantitatively and qualitatively are linked to various social perspectives.

But sentiency, as a species-wide generic phenomenology, can, by THAT its very nature, easily prove to be trans-societal, trans-cultural, and trans everything else as well.

That this observation might at first seem odd is to be expected -- but only because the topic of sentiency has never been opened up, while various social maneuvers have closed down any approaches to it. Thus, although the term can be found in dictionaries, it is not in common parlance -- except in some science fiction movies.

As a result, inhabitants of various societies might feel they have sensitivities. But that they are also a sentient life-unit can be quite alien within their thinking processes, and within any rote-learning or creative enhancing activities.

SENSITIVITY

However, since various formats of SENSITIVITY are experienced far and wide, it is useful at this point to refresh the major WESTERN definitions in order to clear the way to a consideration of SENTIENCY.

SENSITIVITY:

Receptive to sense impressions;

Subject to excitation by external agents;

Readily fluctuating;

Capable of indicating or reacting to minute differences or qualities;

Readily affected or changed by various agents, or by exposure or proximity to external factors" -- such as, for example, social tolerance and intolerance.

If the above definitions of SENSITIVITY are correlated with various human faculties and activities, we can plot the faculties along a spectrum ranging from less sensitive to hyper-sensitive.

And so we can begin to spot, hypothetically, two general kinds of human faculties that are identifiable,

so to speak, by their internal apportionment and need of sensitivity.

This is to say, then, that those human faculties requiring the LEAST amount of sensitivity will probably develop and survive come Hell or High Water. Thus, in each society there will be found, so to speak, a sensitivity norm which can be treated with the aplomb of tolerance -- because it IS the norm.

It would be somewhat recognizable, then, that those human faculties needing the least quotients of sensitivity skills are those that tend to be most precisely well-developed among our astonishing species.

However, if we move along the spectrum or scale of faculties needing increasing sensitivity, we can begin to enumerate faculties that are dependent upon a high-signature of sensitivity.

It would be unarguable that the better functioning of such sensitivity-oriented faculties depend on increasing quotients of sensitivity skills.

Thus, as we move along the spectrum of human faculties, we can begin to recognize faculties that need higher or larger sensitivity development and support.

PANORAMIC SENSITIVITY

Finally, we can encounter faculties that absolutely need what might be called "panoramic sensitivity" if they are to function AT ALL.

And among such panoramic sensitivity faculties we would itemize the superpower faculties -- almost all of which are understood to be not only hyper-sensitive, but omni-sensitive.

But the ideas of panoramic, hyper- and omni-sensitivity draw increasingly close the extremely wide scope of our species-generic sensitivity.

Indeed, it can be assumed that most of the superpower faculties are those particular faculties somehow DESIGNED for omni- and panoramic sensitivity.

THE LACK OF RESEARCH REGARDING THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF SENTIENCY

A rather exhaustive search for documented modern research into the nature and functions of sentience reveals something akin to a vacuum -- a research vacuum apparently so ingeniously engineered that hardly anyone notices it.

Some work along these lines was attempted during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth. This seminal work, however, was not pursued much past 1932. And so it can be said that our sentient species does not, as it might, research the nature and extent of its sentience or the many fabulous echelons and combinations of them at the individual sensitivity levels.

We might grasp around for an explanation of this vacuum. One explanation might be that various increases of applied and functional sentience have to do with increases in power.

If this explanation is a viable one, even in some small aspect, then the knocking down or wrecking of sentience development in others is seen as a way to eliminate them as power competitors of one kind or another.

In this possible light, the best way to decrease or suppress increases of applied sentience, would be to surround the topic with as much ignorance and ambiguity as possible.

SENTIENCY AND SENSITIVITY AS "SMART SYSTEMS"

In this essay, the concepts of SENTIENCY and SENSITIVITY have, by direct implication, been attached to the so-called "paranormal powers" of our species.

But the assignation of them as "paranormal powers" serves mostly to relegate them into those social auspices that are very nervous when it comes to the "paranormal," and which social auspices are usually very concerned and jittery within anything smelling of power and its "potentials."

In any event, it can prove very useful to re-designate paranormal powers as smart systems.

Of itself, the concept of smart systems is usually nerve-wracking to this or that societal status quo, but at least we have the advantage of FINALLY perceiving what primary sentiency and secondary sensitivities are all about. Clearly, the existence of sentient and sensitivity systems within our species would, in the species master plan, not be designed to make us more stupid.

Much to the reverse, it can be said achievement of stupidity is much more the goal of social systems reductive of the sentient and sensitivity systems. By far and large, stupidity is most often achieved by social systems than by given individuals.

DEFILEMENT OF COMPREHENSION BY NOMENCLATURE

It is useful to examine a bit of nomenclature at this point. The concept of PARANORMAL POWERS is quite sociologically useful -- because it identifies two topics that can be justified as of sociological concern and condemnation and can easily be rejected.

However, societal concerns would be very hard put, even embarrassed, to condemn smart systems -- since there is rather broad awareness in all social systems that smart system are needed, perhaps even merely to survive.

Thus, sensitivity (or certain kinds of it anyway) are accepted, but probably because sensitivities are almost everywhere -- somewhat like the air we breathe. But hardly anywhere are increases in sensitivity taught or supported by mainstream social vectors.

Super-sentiency is not taught, either. There is no perceived need to do so -- because the topic of sentiency itself has disappeared.

S E N T I E N C Y

Most dictionaries define SENTIENT as: "responsive to or conscious of sense impressions, finely sensitive in perception or feeling." There usually is mention of SENTIENTLY as an adverb. These definitions, it could be submitted, are somewhat minimalizing ones -- considering the panoramic factors involved. The term SENTIENCY does not appear in most dictionaries.

There are no main entries for SENTIENCY in the following important psychical research and parapsychology sources:

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF OCCULTISM & PARAPSYCHOLOGY (1978).

HANDBOOK OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY, Benjamin B. Wolman, Ed. (1977).

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHICAL RESEARCH, Berger & Berger (1991).

A short definition of SENTIENCE is found, however, in the PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY compiled by R. J. Campbell (1981): "Mere sensation, apprehension, or cognition, without accompanying associations or affect."

The DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS compiled and produced by the American Psychiatric Association, also has no entry for SENTIENCY or SENTIENCE.

There is no mention at all of SENTIENCY in the otherwise wonderful and extensive ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY, edited by Paul Edwards, and published by Macmillian Publishing Co. (1967). It seems that most other authoritative encyclopedias follow suit.

Although "psychics" were referred to as "sensitives" before they became referred to as "psychics," there is no reference in the Psi research sources to SENSITIVITY per se -- except as an occasional reference to the "exteriorization of sensitivity" analogous to out-of-body experiencing, psychokinesis, telepathy, etc.

Now, it should be said that no Psi function could possibly exist if such functions were not first built upon, or were not extensions of, some form of sentiency and sensitivity.

Thus, if we dare to consider that special formats of sentiency and

and sensitivity are the horses that pull the cart of Psi and associated perceptions, then we are faced with the somewhat astonishing probability that the cart has been dissected and pulled apart in every possible way.

The horses, however, are thought so unimportant that no one has bothered to study them.

SENTIENCY AND MENTAL INFORMATION PROCESSING GRIDS

Early in this database was placed an essay entitled MENTAL INFORMATION PROCESSING GRIDS -- and within which INFORMATION POINTS were described.

If one is moved to design an information processing grid that might be somewhat functional with regard to the superpowers, the concept of one as a SENTIENT entity could figure as a centrally important information point within the schematic.

All the other phenomena discussed in this database could then be placed in some aspect around this central information point -- and between them all lines could be drawn interconnecting them this way and that.

Humans have a distinct tendency of viewing things through their own inventions. Thus, recognition of the nature of sentiency, and some of its parameters, probably has something in common with sonar, radar, microscopes and telescopes -- and maybe even with the Internet. Such hypothetical possibilities will be elaborated in a forthcoming essay.

(End)

NOTE: If anyone knows of any printed or published sources examining the nature of the sentient being and functions of sentiency, it would be nice to reference them in this database.

Thanks in advance.

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (26Mar98)

PART 6: "REALITY" PROCESSING VS. RECOGNITION

It would be obvious that what people do or do not recognize as real has something to do with:

- Information contained in memory and functioning in mental information processing grids;
- Capacities for observation;
- World views, ranging from tiny to large;
- Blockages or freedoms regarding information acquisition and processing;
- Interest, ranging from none to a great deal;
- Nomenclature available;
- Socially-determined concepts and knowledge;
- Human nature fluctuations, internal and external;
- Tendencies to constructivity and destructivity;
- Types of fear and courage;
- And etc., etc., etc.

Even so, REALTY has an official definition: "the totality of all real things and events; something that is neither derivative nor dependent, but exists necessarily."

"Exists necessarily" turns out to be a kind of philosophical confabulation the meaning of which is that something exists because it does exist -- the "necessarily" meaning that no one can do anything about

what exists because it continues to do so regardless.

What exists simply because it does exist has always been problematical -- in that no one has ever been able to explain why anything exists. Most people are prepared to accept this, and to get on with whatever.

But certain types of thinkers are not, and some of them can even be antagonistic toward accepting what exists because it does exist. Certain of these kinds of thinkers can flagellate their synapses by attempting to organize reality so that explanations can be offered up as to why what exists because it does exist has the meaning it does by virtue of existing in the first place.

This kind of procedure conveniently obfuscates the basic problem of not knowing why anything exists.

This is a sort of generic philosophical process that usually, but not always, requires that certain existing things NOT be considered - - because doing so clutters up the few aspects of existence that are being considered. This is somewhat understandable -- because no one has ever been able to simultaneously cope with the whole of what exists, largely because no one so far has managed to discover the whole of it.

Besides, during their whole lives most people only manage to espy a few really existing things, never the whole shebang of existence. And from these few things they select only those that have promises of benefiting their own existence, and which itself exists because it does exist. This leaves the conundrum of people not being able to explain the why and wherefore of their own existing.

So this whole affair gets quite complicated -- even more so because, generally speaking, humans don't like complicated things, especially if they are too big.

So to resolve this, a rather dependable way emerged at some point back in history. If limits are placed on reality, then one might never really learn a lot. But the complications of the overly large and apparently endless realities are cut back to manageable size.

Thereafter these reduced complexities are quite likely to be referred to as reality. And if general agreement is obtained about these cut-back realities, then they can be utilized, as in a tall building, as steel-like infrastructure I-beam supports for the enormous social edifices that can be erected on them.

The educational processes within the social edifices then set about teaching what is real, so that upcoming citizens can fit properly into the social edifice.

This procedure has proven entirely workable -- and indeed it does work best if no citizen ever self-discovers any reality, but merely goes with the flow of the social infrastructure.

Thus, most people never need to self-discover a reality, and many can get through life quite well without doing so. But such are the social enclosures in this regard that if one accidentally trips across a reality,

one might not be able to recognize it.

After all, there are hardly any schools that teach what a reality should look like AS a reality. There are schools only to teach WHICH reality should be seen or not seen.

In any event, even if all of the above didn't exist because it does exist, reality recognition is an arduous affair. So it's not unusual for one to accept a reality simply because someone else says it is one. This saves one the bother and the struggle of having to spot realities. If the reality gets into print, then it is broadly accepted as real because the print exists because it does.

One of the not entirely unanticipatable outcomes of all this is that realities slip and slide around a lot, often resulting in a moody sense of insecurity as if one can't really figure out what's really going on or what's really happening.

The whole of the foregoing has been rather sardonically elaborated in an attempt to suggest (1) that trying to determine what reality consists of is the realm of spin doctors and usually a messy polemical affair; and (2) that such is not a profitable way to proceed if one wants to get anywhere -- at least in some profound sense.

In any event, if one can't RECOGNIZE realities even if one chances to trip across them, then the whole polemical edifice of trying to determine what they are, what they consist of, is more or less a safari leading to that thickly fog infested land called Nowhere.

IF seen in this light, then the problems attendant upon the nature of recognition ITSELF somewhat take priority over the problems of reality. And this would especially be the case regarding any proposed activation of the superpowers of the human biomind.

Indeed, if one can't recognize what is to be activated, or recognize what perhaps has already been unknowingly activated, then arrival at the misty fogs of Nowhereland draw closer and closer.

In the sense of the foregoing, then, it is somewhat amusing that the modern sciences, philosophies, or psychologies have paid no attention to the phenomena of RECOGNITION.

Since there is somewhat of a vacuum in this regard, there is nothing from them that might resemble a trickle-down effect into the observing-sensing processes of "the masses."

But like all cultural vacuums, this particular one is unnoticed because it is the nature of vacuums not to be noticed -- even though they, too, exist because they do.

In the sense of all of this, then, although the nature of recognition might at first seem far removed with

regard to any desire to activate any of the superpowers, even a brief discussion of the nature of recognition should take its authentic place within all the other factors pertinent to the superpowers.

Indeed, it is possible to hypothetically suggest that recognition might well be among the most CENTRAL CORE factors involved.

RECOGNITION

RECOGNITION is officially defined as "knowledge or feeling that an object has been met before."

However, why recognition is linked only to objects is somewhat of a mystery -- because any simple, raw experiencing of recognition extends into other factors.

So, for the inclusive purposes of this database, this definition can be extended to include not only "objects," but also subjective and qualitative experiencing.

Indeed, recognizing the qualities of objects and subjects goes hand-in-hand with the recognition of objects, and which often cannot be recognized in the absence of their qualities.

As but one example, if the qualitative distinctions between glass and diamonds are not recognized, then the meaning value of both would be somewhat the same.

However, in an ideal or altruistic sense, the official definition is logical. But difficulties arise when it is understood that what has been met before has also been responded to in some way, specifically in that some kind of meaning has been attached to what has been met.

In this sense, if what is recognized is taken to be meaningless, then it is usually consigned to the landfill of the meaningless. In this regard, the human species has a rich tradition of assigning meaninglessness to objects and realities that often turn out to be quite meaningful.

In any event, it is so far possible to recognize that recognition is already composed of not one but two factors, the second consisting of meaning. Indeed, if meaning of something is not recognized, then the something itself may not be recognized.

RECOGNIZE is said to be taken into English from the Latin RE + COGNOSCERE -- the Latin

combination meaning "AGAIN to know." The direct implication is that one cannot know again unless one has known in the first place.

But the use of KNOW in this sense is superlative, when what is actually meant is EXPOSED to, often without KNOWING and which requires making sense out of what one has been exposed to.

Here we have but a hint that recognition is most likely a tricky business -- so tricky that philosophers have elected not to become involved in it.

However, and moving bravely on, it can be said that meaning has to be attributed to things to be recognized -- because in large part the things do not have signs on them itemizing their many possible meanings -- and, in fact, have no signs at all.

In the sense of our species, then, it can be said that meaning-making is a reality phenomenology of our species that exists because it does exist -- while, at the same time, no one has yet understood the whys and wherefores of its existing. The only thing known somewhat for sure is that each specimen born of our species is equipped to be some kind of a meaning-maker.

With regard to the nature of MEANING, here we ARE on traditional philosophical territory.

ENCOUNTERING THE CERTAINTY/UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE

Even well before the modern period, philosophers had somewhat sorted out the fact that two basic kinds of meaning can be established: (1) meanings that increase certainty; and (2) meanings that decrease it.

Both of these meaning criteria can be extended to things, subject's qualities, and experiencing -- and lead to their recognition either which way.

In this sense, it can be postulated that reality, things, etc., are not first recognized for what they ARE, but whether they contribute to certainty or uncertainty.

This is all well and good, of course. But it can be observed that approaches to whatever increases certainty are well laid out and demarcated and achieve social support. However, whereas approaches to whatever increases uncertainty (such as the not yet known) don't achieve much in the way of social support.

RECOGNITION VIA THE BASIC TWO-FOLD MEANING DYNAMIC

The two-fold MEANING dynamic can be very clear here, at least hypothetically speaking.

Exposure to something that is suggestive of an increase in certainty will be responded to via that meaning.

Exposure to something suggestive of an increase in uncertainty will be responded to via that meaning.

As a third category of meaning response, if something is encountered which can not be recognized as fitting into either of the two above categories, it is usually considered to be of questionable, even potentially dangerous, merit -- and is usually shot on the spot.

It would be quite clear in this regard that these two generic kinds of responses are entirely relative to situations and circumstances. But in the larger species-wide picture sense, these two responses have a great deal to do with how realities are recognized and responded to.

In a certain sense at least, it must be assumed that information or data one is exposed to does not equate to recognizable knowledge UNLESS meaning can become attached.

Even modern philosophers have often said that the meaning-less is not knowledge. If this is carried to the social extremes it usually is, the implication is that the meaning-less cannot be recognized as knowledge.

This is rather straightforward so far as it goes. But an attendant implication is that one cannot recognize the meaning-less -- because there is nothing there to recognize. Thus, one can not encounter it AGAIN, or meet with it AGAIN.

This is not completely a matter of obscurant double-talk. It simply means that if one encounters something dubbed as meaning-less, the one will have trouble in recognizing it when one DOES encounter it AGAIN.

Indeed, this concept was one of the earliest officially stated reasons for the philosophical and scientific mainstream rejection of psychic stuff. Even if there was the mere chance that psychic stuff -- such as clairvoyance and telepathy -- really existed, it was meaningless since it had no real uses.

The illogic of this dismissive attitude is obvious, of course, and seems to have been based on a very low

order of imaginary capacities. Behind this, however, can be detected something that appears to have been more than a hint of a certainty that developed Psi would increase the uncertainty of established social orders. The superpowers have always been accompanied by this troubling aspect.

REAL

At this point, briefly touching on REAL can't really be completely avoided -- but only with the continuing proviso that nothing in this database is to be taken as an attempt to established any reality.

But in the sense of this essay, certain things might be recognized as constituting hypothetical approaches to the real.

The modern definition of REAL holds that it is "of or relating to fixed, permanent, or immovable things apparent in fact, and [as we have seen earlier] necessarily existent." This definition really should be extended to include phenomena -- largely because phenomena as well as things exist because they exist.

One of the more interesting aspects of REAL was that it was not introduced into English until the late 1400s (a rather late date, all things considered.)

In the late 1400s, however, the Oxford Dictionary of the English Languages offers says that the early meanings were "indistinct."

It was only in the later 1500s that REAL began to be used more or less as we try to do today.

The term was derived from the Late Christianized Latin RES (meaning thing), but was said to be akin to the very much earlier Sanskrit RAI (not meaning thing, but particular qualitative essence).

Regarding this, then, something like 5,000 years of human history seems to have gotten on without the term REAL as we define it today -- and one wonders how things were managed without this concept.

In any event, we today are irrevocably plugged into this term, because at the bottom line of everything it

is felt necessary to establish the reality of all things -- and very much depends on the success or failure of this idea.

Rather exhausting examination of REAL can ultimately reveal that, like recognition, there appears to be two major categories of THE REAL. For efficiency here, these can best be illustrated by a diagram rather than by verbal exposition.

| | |
|--|--|
| The REAL contingent upon known facts | The REAL contingent upon experiencing |
|--|--|

..

. Whereas both converge .

. on .

. RECOGNIZE .

..... REALIZE

..

TO MAKE REAL OR APPARENTLY REAL

In sense of the above, then, we could say that REAL and REALITY are contingent or relative only to some kind of unfoldment process having to do with recognition, the nature of which is imploded into some kind of culturally-avoided vacuum.

But even so, that our species is multi-tiered regarding recognition of anything and everything can, by now, seem apparent.

Based on this discussion, certainly only hypothetical, two trend-like phenomena can sometimes (but not always) be observed.

1. What is experienced as real by some is sufficient enough to them;
2. What is thought real because of known facts is considered by others to be sufficient for them.

Both of these major categories, however, have significant complications:

1. Real experiencing is often not contingent upon known facts;
2. Factual reality has to undergo change when new facts are brought to light, and so factual reality is itself not contingent upon known facts.

One is then justified in wondering what role "known facts" play regarding anything.

Well, for one thing, they represent the perceived margins between certainty and uncertainty -- and which is the most obvious reason why large segments of social strata place conviction not only IN them but with regard to their necessity.

And it is this that gives recognizable substance to the hearty resistance toward new real facts if they are of such a nature as to radically destabilize old real factual bases.

Thus, it can be seen, if only in vague contours, that the matter of RECOGNITION plays an important role within any approach to activating the superpowers.

However, each aspirant along these lines will have to mull this over within their own reality tents than house their own realities -- some new emphasis being on the dynamics of recognition, a matter regarding which few, if any, have hitherto paid much attention.

(End)