Awareness and Perception
vs
Status of Individual "Realities"

Ingo Swann (02Oct99)

Individual "realities" are easy enough to perceive on their surfaces, so to speak, generally because most people will tell you what they are. But otherwise those "realities" are made up of a number of complex factors.

Thus, any discussion of individual "realities" requires the drawing together of various elements that can, in some general way, be thought of as relevant to the formation of individual realities.

Individual realities are usually seen as meaningful and important by those who hold them. Therefore, the purpose of this essay is NOT in any way to impugn them, but only to point up that they exist, and that they are relevant regarding the status of superpowers at the individual level.

Individual Realities
vs
Margins of Awareness

It can be considered that any functional entrance into the superpower faculties involves various kinds of awarenesses, and which, after having become activated, then download into various formats of perception.

With regard to this, it can unequivocally be understood that without awareness of something, perception of it becomes very dubious indeed.

However, common experience confirms that each person has what is today being called their individual "realities." These are obviously erected out of mixtures of direct experience of what one encounters in life and various kinds of information packages one has taken on board, mentally adapted to, or socially conditioned with, etc.

What is not so obvious about individual realities is that their psychodynamic functioning tends to set margins that contribute to two factors.

The margins, in some psychodynamic way, limit the parameters of awareness and perception to those that fit within the margins; and, conversely, the same margins therefore must somehow psychodynamically exclude, or desensitize, possible other awarenesses and perceptions that do not fit.

Thus, it can be thought, on the one hand, that awareness and perception of something makes it possible to acquire, recognize, and realize information about it.

On the other hand, absence of awareness of the something makes perception of it impossible, and, therefore, any information pertinent to the un-perceived, so to speak, cannot be recognized as such.

The Dynamic Relationship of
Awareness, Perception, and Information

In any event, it would seem that awareness, perception, and information somehow go hand in hand, so much so that if one of this trio is deleted, the other two delete also.

This trio is therefore mutually interactive, and so they altogether constitute some kind of SYSTEM.

Most have some idea of what a system is. But what is not generally realized is that an individual biomind is entirely composed of various kinds of interacting systems that are incorporated into the systemic whole of its life form.

It is thus possible to assume, for hypothetical consideration, that awareness, perception, AND information in-take and out-put, are composed of specializing systems within the greater systemic whole of the biomind.

In this particular essay, awareness, perception, and the status of individual realities are discussed within some of their own contexts. But those contexts are also discussed in preparation for the far larger issues of systems which will appear in essays to follow.

The end goal of this essay, however, is to be able to open discussions in this and subsequent essays regarding the ultra-importance of awareness and perception and their absolutely critical relationship to ANY of the superpower functions.

Preliminary Observations Regarding the Absnce of Awareness Studies With Regard to the Superpowers

In order to adumbrate, or foreshadow, this critical relationship, it can unequivocally be stated that any activation of the superpowers basically involves activation of KINDS of awareness and perception that are appropriate, not to awareness per se, but specifically to the superpowers.

With regard to this, it can be established that interest in the extensive nature of awareness has never been examined within the contexts of modern psychical and parapsychological research.

Furthermore, although the term "perception" is utilized in parapsychology (extra-sensory perception, for example), the "anatomy" of perception has seldom been considered as having much relevance in those two fields.

An in-depth examination of the hundreds of published documents of psychical and parapsychological research will support the two foregoing observations.

However, it can also be pointed up that interest in the nature of awareness has been almost totally, and very curiously, absent within the larger societal pictures involving the conventional modern sciences, all formats of philosophy and sociology, and the several kinds of psychology.

This is surely indicative of a rather voluminous, and perhaps even a somewhat conspiratorial vacuum of knowledge, a topic that has been discussed in earlier essays.

Indeed, the existence of the vacuum can be interpreted as a general societal affect that "wishes" no intimate and extensive knowledge of awareness to come into general existence.

Paradigms of Thinking and Relevance

As a way of getting into the substantive discussions to follow, I partially quote from the introductory discussions found in two documents authored by Ingemar Nilsson of the University of Utrecht.

These two documents constitute Parts 1 and 2 under the title of "The Paradigm of the Rhinean School," and were sequentially published in the EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF

PARAPSYCHOLOGY [Vol. I, No. 1 (1975), and Vol. 1, No. 2 (1976).]

"The Rhinean School" of course refers to the founder of modern parapsychology, Dr. J. B. Rhine, and his methods later followed by other parapsychologists.

In his Part 1, Nilsson succinctly describes the on-going paradigm mind-set of philosophers of science as follows:

"Philosophers of science have so far neglected the field of parapsychology. They tend to view it, together with phrenology and psychoanalysis, as a convenient and pedagogical example of a pseudo-science without acceptable methodological foundations.

"In general, philosophers of science are more familiar with the natural sciences than with the behavioral sciences, and parapsychology ranks much lower in the hierarchy of investigatory disciplines."

For clarity here, Nilsson was pointing up that parapsychology did not figure into the mind-set realities shared in general by philosophers of science - or by any philosophers for that matter.

In his Part 2, he describes that:

"A group of researchers share a similar view of their own activity as investigators, and also of the position of their science in the world of sciences. They have a common conception of how their discipline was born, developed, and what it will look like in the future. They also believe in certain rules for carrying out research.

"Basic to the concept of science is the theory of knowledge, an understanding of the foundations of knowledge. However, there are also normative conceptions of what science should be, what theories should look like, or which criteria one has to use in the search for truth.

"The normative part may be called the model of science. It is a value system. Investigators often look at a superior science and obtain their categories and perspective from it. Since the 17th century, most investigators have used physics as a model, as it is supposed to treat the deepest level of reality.

"In parapsychology there have been a lot of theories and concepts modeled on physics . . . [but] the physical-model-thinking in parapsychology has not led to a better understanding of Psi as a psychological process."

For clarity, Nilsson has indicated that scientists and parapsychologists possess thinking-paradigms drawn from a status model thought to have reality-making certainty based in the past, but which would also lead into the future.

It would be quite probable, then, that whatever fitted with the thinking-paradigm would be endorsed, but that what did not fit would be rejected and excluded.

This is almost the same as saying that scientists and parapsychologists are introverted into the knowledge realities that are commensurate with their fixed ideas and mind-sets (i.e., commensurate with the status of their individual realities.)

In other words, reality is what one thinks it is WITHIN the contexts of whatever information one is utilizing to mind-dynamically construct what are but tailored versions of "reality" - which are built out of versions of information - and which information can consist only of available information.

As it would be, then, non-available information cannot be incorporated into the versions of realities - largely because if it IS unavailable there can be no awareness of it.

Reality-Making at the Individual Level

What Ingemar Nilsson pointed up regarding the reality-making processes of scientists and parapsychologists also is relevant to reality-making at the individual level.

And so it would immediately be obvious, in some partial sense at least, that the overall status of one's reality-making frameworks has something to do with how one conceptualizes the superpowers. That, in turn, will have something to do with any potential progress regarding their activation.

The whole of this is a difficult and sometimes volcanic issue to address, largely because most individuals value their realities, whatever they may be.

I therefore hasten to reiterate that the contents of this essay are not meant to challenge or demean anyone's existing reality frameworks.

That kind of effort is best left to pismire demagogues and enthusiasts who (as discussed in another essay in this Website) get off on chopping down and trashing the realities of others in order to champion their own.

In any event, it is possible to consider that outside of everyone's individual realities there exist great numbers of additive information packages that can be pointed up. And, if seen suitable at the individual level, they might act to expand various margins of awareness and perceptions.

Indeed, there are some good precedents for undertaking this kind of consideration.

For example, in the 6th century BC, the venerable sage Confucius pointed up (in ANALECTS, Vol. 2, Sec. 17) that "Real knowledge is to know the extent of one's ignorance."

At least part of the meaning here is that if real knowledge activates and contributes to empowerment, the extent of one's ignorance could contribute to one's depowerment.

As another example, the somewhat older contemporary of Confucius, the venerable Lao Tsu labored to point up (via the eighty-one chapters of this BOOK OF TAU [TAU TE CHING]) that clear-cut thinking based in the "laws" of real phenomena leads to natural activation of empowerment.

If this would be the case, then non-clear-cut thinking based or trapped in ambiguities would not yield very much regarding empowerment.

Language and Words as Reality-Makers

One of the very subtle factors that seems to have impeded psychical and parapsychological progress is that while the researchers start out examining phenomena, they soon attach a name or term to whatever they think is involved.

This is the "What shall we call it" kind of thing that is functional with regard to whatever is tangible, but it is also adapted as rather standard procedure with regard to phenomena that don't have tangible, physical status.

This procedure is convenient because it gives an IT-thing identity to various of the phenomena as they are perceived by those doing the perceiving.

The researchers can also attach a theory to the phenomena under examination. It is clearly necessary to be able to refer to the intangible phenomena via a specific term or word with respect to exposing the theory to others either in conversation or in written materials.

On average, there doesn't seem to be anything amiss on the surface of this procedure. But two important and entirely subtle factors download from it, both of which thereafter hardly see the light of day.

Those two factors are important because, in combination, they tend to shift awareness and perception AWAY from the phenomena, and redirect attention to the nomenclature words and their definitions. This is significant because any number of words could be assigned to the phenomena.

Thus, the words might differ, but the phenomena would not. However, at the individual and cultural levels, awareness and perception regarding the phenomena can differ because of the words.

The first factor mentioned above is a little difficult to elucidate. But it involves the fact that the nomenclature terms issue forth from within the limits of the particular reality packages of those individuals who engender them. Thus, the sense of the terms originally accords with those particular individual reality packages.

This is apparently okay as far as it goes. But now the sense and meaning of the term somehow needs to be communicated to others - or, more precisely, in-put into the particular reality packages of those others.

At this point, a definition for the term is required so that the sense and meaning can be transferred and shared among the many.

This definition is duly formulated and advanced, and it is thereafter incorporated into, and interpreted within, the particular reality packages of others.

It is somewhere at this point, let us say, that the original phenomena involved can be discussed via the ostensibly shared definitions, and which definitions now give indication of what the original phenomena were thought to consist of by those who originated the term.

But this clearly means that the original phenomena are now being conceptualized and discussed via the definitions offered up to give sharable intellectual substance to the terms or words initiated, in the first place, by this or that researcher or whomever.

This is certainly to say that henceforth any appreciations of the original phenomena are now indirectly being intellectually filtered through the definitions of terms.

If the new term and its definitions catch on, then they are downloaded into broad public usage within which the definitions can easily be mistaken for the original phenomena themselves.

For example, if the term and definitions of TELEPATHY catch on (as they did), then those looking for such phenomena within themselves can easily and only be looking in themselves for what fits the term and its definitions.

This is almost the same as saying that they are looking in their self phenomenology for the definitions as prescribed and set forth by the term telepathy.

A Partial Nomenclature History of
What is Today Being Called "Telepathy"

Our species possesses a long history of individuals somehow being AWARE of others at a distance great enough so as to preclude explanation based in the five physical senses as they are traditionally understood.

During the Renaissance, it was thought (by Paracelsus and others) that this awareness might be roughly explained within the reality-making contexts of "sympathetic vibrations" of living systems acting in some sort of harmony, even at a great distance from each other.

However, influential Post-Renaissance thinkers, tending toward materialistic explanations, did not care for the possible reality of sympathetic vibrations.

The existence of spirit was still real enough, though, as was the concept of the ether (a medium that in the undulatory theory of light permeates all space). So the sympathetic vibration reality-making concept was replaced during the 1700s by the concepts of "etheric intercommunication" and "intercommunication by spirit agency."

Soon after, it seems that the idea of intercommunication led to the concept of "coincidence between two persons' thoughts."

This, in turn, led to the concept of "thought reading," a concept that has never ceased to be of interest and concern, most likely because of the horror that one individual could possibly read (i.e., invade) another's private thoughts.

During the late 1770s, Anton Mesmer (1733-1815) introduced the concepts of "animal magnetism" and of RAPPORT via "magnetic influences" having to do with "empathy." That term was first defined as "the capacity for participating in another's emotions and feelings."

Somewhat later, the term was slightly redefined so as to include "participating in another's ideas."

After Mesmer, although the politically sensitive concept of "thought reading" continued as something of interest, it was replaced in more scientific circles by the less politically sensitive idea of "thought transferrence."

Then, after the term PSYCHIC was coined, roughly in 1872, the reality-making concepts of "psychic rapport," "psychic thought reading," "psychic empathy," and "psychic thought transference" made their appearance.

But also during the early 1880s, concepts of physical brain research had begun flooding through the conventional sciences.

It became possible to suppose that since "thoughts" were involved in, for example, "thought transference," then the brain must somehow be involved.

At the same time, the so-called psychical phenomena had acquired a relatively bad odor within proper mainstream scientific circles, which then considered research of psychical phenomena to constitute pseudo-science.

In response to this, and in order to escape the bad odor, the term TELEPATHY was coined shortly after 1882 by the brilliant psychical researcher F.W.H. Myers.

In one of its original definitions, TELEPATHY was considered as "intercommunication between brain and brain, by other means than that of the ordinary sense-channels."

Near the turn of the century, the idea of TELEPATHY was somewhat redefined to fit with the proven, and thus very acceptable, scientific contexts of radio broadcasting - whereby information could be sent by radio waves across distances and be picked up by radio receivers.

The reality of radio broadcasting was suggestive of a theory by which the supposed reality of telepathy might be explained. The brain of a sending individual was broadcasting radio-like waves across distances to be picked up by the brain of a receiving individual.

It soon turned out, however, that brain scientists professed themselves unable to discover telepathic sending and receiving equipment among the gray cells.

And so, by the 1920s, the idea of "mind-to-mind contact" arose, which made it possible to consider TELEPATHY as consisting of some as yet undiscovered component of the ephemeral MIND (as contrasted to the non-ephemeral physical BRAIN).

It is worth mentioning that the original term TELEPATHY was composed of a contraction of EMPATHY to PATHY, and PATHY was then connected to the Greek prefix TELE meaning distance or across distance: i.e., across distance empathy.

Today, most dictionaries define TELEPATHY as "apparent communication from one mind to another otherwise than through the channels of sense."

Thus, the broadly-shared, reality-making assumption became that telepathy somehow required the use of one's mind - although the precise awarenesses, parts, or functions of that ephemeral organ have hereto not been identified.

The Unrealized Nature of the Superpowers
vs
Individual Realities About Them

Anyone who has some kind of interest in the superpowers of the human biomind usually also wonders how they can activate them within self. This prospect accounts for the "how-to" or "how-can-I" questions most frequently asked.

There are any number of possible ways to attempt to provide answers for those rather understandable questions. Some of those ways might yield some results, but most of them don't seem to lead directly into the profound depths of what is involved.

One reason for the failure is that the superpowers can be thought of in this or that way so that terms such as ESP, intuition, telepathy, and etc. can come into existence. One can then think of the superpowers via the supposed realities of those terms and their conceptualizing definitions. And so various idea-realities consistent with those terms and their definitions come into existence at the group and individual levels.

But one larger overriding situation regarding all of this is that those "realities" are rather temporary in the longer run of things.

Indeed, if one reviews history and different cultures, it can be seen that the superpowers have periodically been considered in this or that way, and that different kinds of concepts and ideas have been advanced for them.

After a while, the various reality-making terms come and go, and even the concepts and ideas themselves vanish through the march of time and history.

It thus transpires that if one thinks of the superpowers within the contexts of one's culture and times, then the terms that have arisen therein will give the reality-making impression that one thinks one exactly understands what is being talked about.

Therefore, during the twentieth century one knew what telepathy was simply because the reality-making term TELEPATHY had been engineered into existence. One also understood, roughly at least, what psychokinesis (PK) was.

When the concept arose regarding out-of-body experiencing (OOBE), a "reality" in this regard settled in. When the term "remote-viewing" made its appearance in 1971, it was thereafter thought that one knew what was involved, simply because the term had emerged and later broadly caught on.

When, in 1872, the term "psychic" was engineered into existence and soon caught on like wild-fire, it was generally supposed that everyone knew what it actually meant - i.e.,

it was supposed that it referred to perceptual abilities that exceeded the limits of the big physical five senses.

The Limited Value
of Reality-Making Terms

Of course, the coming into existence of reality-making terms is necessary in order to have sharable points of reference regarding what is being talked about - or, more precisely, what one thinks is being talked about.

And so the existence of the terms is not an issue here - except to point up that they come and go, become out-dated, while the supposed concepts they represented during their time can prove to have consisted of inadequate or unproven hypotheses.

What is at issue in this regard is that one cannot activate a WORD.

And this will be the case even if it has linguistically and intellectually contributed to conversational or literary reality-making in this or that cultural or historical sense.

It is generally understood that words mean something specific, and unless they do they are otherwise useless.

Thus, the meaning of "reality" depends on what a given society or an individual thinks the meaning is.

The study of meanings is, of course, the central interest of semantics, whose general purpose is "the historical and psychological study and classification of changes in the signification of words or forms viewed as factors in linguistic development."

The English, term SEMANTIC is taken from the Greek SEMANTIKOS (significant), and SEMAINIEN (to signify, to mean).

But the Greek SEMANTIKOS is said to be akin to the Sanskrit DHYATI, which means not only that "he thinks," but also "he thinks what he does think."

In the semantic sense, then, if meanings of words are clear-cut - such as the meaning of the words APPLE or ORANGE - then most people will understand in unison what is being referred to.

But if the meaning of a word is even somewhat ambiguous, then difficulties can arise.

For example, the term PSYCHIC has never achieved a clear-cut definition that can be subscribed to either with unambiguous certainty, or within the unison of many.

Indeed, to ambiguously define that term as "lying outside of the sphere of physical science or knowledge," or to say it equates to the "paranormal," hardly helps to reduce the ambiguity that semantically encapsulates it.

Yet, most people using it seem to understand what it DOES mean. But this rather seems, at the individual level, to fall into the category of "he thinks what he does think" it means.

This is more or less to say that the meanings of terms that have decidedly ambiguous "definitions" are up for grabs. So anyone reading about or discussing something PSYCHIC can suppose its meaning is within the contexts of their own reality-making mechanisms.

The point of the foregoing observations is not to condemn the conversational and literary processes that utilize words.

Rather, the purpose is to begin pointing up that words, as wonderful as they are, can also psychodynamically erect "reality" thresholds, limits, or barriers regarding meaning and awareness - whether clear-cut, ostensible, ambiguous, or decidedly vague or murky to the Nth degree.

Individualized Reality-Making

Within the overall contexts of the modern tradition, the idea of "the individual" is very precious. So we think of ourselves as individuals in ways that are both abstract and concrete depending on whatever situation is involved.

But we are not just individuals in the egalitarian sense.

Rather we are individuals that build versions of reality. And because of this we somehow conceptualize our existence and ourselves within the versions of reality we have somehow taken on board, or imbibed, or have been socially programmed with.

Without much doubt, the major sources of the versions of reality are found within the vicissitudes of social conditioning, both large and small, which in itself is a "reality environment" constructed out of various versions of reality-making.

The human individual being born into one or another of the socially conditioned

environments is, by educational measures, thereafter programmed to function within it.

And so it can be said that one's "life," in general, is a series of processes involved with negotiating one's way within whatever versions of reality one lives within.

The point of the foregoing is not to moan and groan about the existence of various versions of reality, whether achieved via social conditioning or individual enterprise.

Rather, it is that conditioned and invented versions of reality do exist - and that they DO exist IS not just a version of reality, but a real reality, as it were.

Sociologists and semanticists have long recognized that any given version of conditioned, invented, or achieved "reality" is somehow closely integrated with whatever linguistic programming is being utilized within it.

Linguistic programming consists of words, of course. And as already noted, their meanings can range along a scale beginning with the clear-cut and precise, through the ambiguous, and thence to the utterly foggy or sloppy.

Various semanticists have stated, with some firmness and conviction, that the individual is ALWAYS directly linked by language into socially conditioned realities, and vice versa.

This is to say that the LINKS constitute a paradigm, a socio-dynamic pattern, within which individuals are encompassed into some kind of systemic socio-linguistic collective - even if they do manage to retain this or that conviction regarding the importance of their individuality.

To simplify, the individual shares INTO the societal collective "realities" via language, its words, and the meanings attributed to them.

This is almost the same as saying that language plus its word-meanings constitutes a transistorized reality-making system.

The principle function of this system is to TRANSFER assumed or real realities back and forth between the larger reality conditioning environment and the individuals existing with it.

It is worthwhile noting that information-theory scientists suppose that at least 50 per cent of the English language functions that way. So at least 50 per cent of reality-making consciousness at the individual is more or less trapped in, contained in, or limited to the larger reality conditioning environment.

Words With Specific Meanings
vs
Words With Generalizing Meanings

The foregoing may seem complicated lot to work through.

For clarity, it can be established that certain languages have dozens upon dozens of words that pertain to specific dynamic activities of consciousness and powers of awareness.

A large number of those dynamic activities could be thought of within the contexts of the superpowers of the human biomind.

English is not one of those languages, and neither are most of the modernized European Romance languages, including middle and late Latin.

However, by examining the Russian, Sanskrit, African, and early Hebrew languages, one can begin to uncover a great number of terms having direct relevance to expanded awareness and consciousness.

Those terms would thus have great relevance to the superpowers - but for which there are no real conceptual equivalents in the modern Western languages systems.

One can also examine, for example, what remains of ancient Egyptian, and some of the still extant Siberian, Tibetan, and Amerindian languages, and find dozens of terms that clearly refer to some aspect of the superpowers.

For the most part, there are no specific English equivalents for those other-language terms. And so we have either to directly lift them into English, or recast or approximate their meanings in the light of our few generalizing English terms. Doing so has not always been successful, and often totally misleading.

Another option, of course, and the one most conveniently seized upon, is simply to pay no attention to those other-language meanings altogether.

It is meaningful to consider why certain languages, in their evolution, began to include so many terms relative to the superpowers and to forms of dynamic consciousness itself.

One reason is most probable: the REDUCTION of ambiguity, which obviously has something to do with overall linguistic efficiency, since in any language more clear-cut meanings serve better than a proliferation of ambiguous ones.

As a contrasting example, in English we have the terms PSYCHIC and TELEPATHY.

Those terms have never achieved a clear-cut definition.

But they have served quite well as a kind of over-generalizing bag that can get quite bloated with regard to the ambiguous contexts put into it.

Indeed, because of their lack of clear-cut definitions, we can consider that each individual could, if inspired to do so, put their OWN meanings into the psychic bag. And so that bag might take on the implications of a Magritte painting, or the dimensions of an amorphous Salvador Dali extravaganza.

A term that is ambiguously defined might also be thought of as having amorphous status, but ambiguous impact in the reality-making systems of societal conditioning processes. The amorphous ambiguities then download into individuals.

AMORPHOUS means, of course, "having no determinate form; lacking complex bodily organization; lacking division into parts; shapeless; uncrystalized."

In contrast, MORPHOUS means "having a form" that is clear-cut enough to enable recognition as a form.

In an explicit sense, then, any morphological study is undertaken to reduce ambiguities of something so that it can be conceptualized, perceived, identified, and understood in a more clear-cut fashion.

The importance here is that numerous KINDS of telepathy exist. Numerous kinds of so-called "psychic perception" also exist.

But our English definitions of telepathy and psychic are amorphous, or over-generalizing, and hence result in ambiguousness. And that results in sloppy rather than in clear-cut reality-making.

As it is, AMBIGUOUS is derived from a Latin term meaning "to wander about."

In English, its two principal definitions are rendered as:

1. "Doubtful or uncertain, especially because of being obscure or indistinct;" and
2. "Capable of being understood in two or more possible senses or ways."

Thus, there is some kind of non-efficient linkage between whatever is amorphous and whatever is ambiguous - i.e., something that is indistinct (ambiguous) can also be thought of as amorphous (not having definite form).

This linkage might constitute an amorphous ambiguousness, or vice versa, or an indistinct amorphous mess, or something along such lines.

In any event, when we think of people using the same words we do, we also tend to assume that all of them are utilizing the same meanings.

As mentioned earlier, this is probably the case where meanings are clear-cut enough AND are shared as clear-cut.

For example, the word apple refers to the physical apple. This is rather clear-cut, and everyone will probably understand as much. "Apple," therefore refers to a nomenclature morphism, or, so to speak, to morphic thinking patterns.

But the word psychic refers to . . . well, what specifically DOES it refer to, other than an over-generalizing, amorphous something or other, and which results in amorphous thinking patterns.

The Real Existence of Morphous and Amorphous Reality-Making

By virtue of working in the psychical and parapsychological research fields for well over thirty years now, it is this author's direct experience that the research is overly burdened with terms that are not very clear-cut, and most of which rest upon ambiguous and amorphous assumptions or hypotheses.

As Ingemar Nilsson suggested, those terms then flood through the views of parapsychologists who share concepts, and thence download into media usage and public consumption, and so they take on very broadly-shared reality-making substance.

For example, the accepted definitions of TELEPATHY as "mind-to-mind communication" and of PSYCHOKINESIS as mind-over-matter utilize the term MIND.

Most individuals have some kind of idea about what MIND is - but largely because they assume they have one, or because they experience what seems to equate to the generally shared understanding of the word.

Thus, the general concept of mind is broadly sharable on that particular basis.

But if the modern Western definitions of MIND are looked up and studied, then the clear-cut authenticity of the term begins to wobble simply because there are so many definitions of it.

Most relatively competent dictionaries will give at least nine definitions, and some will

give fourteen to seventeen. The Oxford dictionary of the English language gives something like seventy or more if important nuances are considered.

It is possible to think that something that has two or three related meanings might yet resemble something with clear-cut, morphous status.

But if definitions proliferate with what amounts to wild abandon, then the proliferation increases not toward clear-cutness but toward amorphous ambiguity.

And indeed, some researchers of the mind have come to two rather remarkable speculations:

1. That the mind doesn't actually exist as such;
2. That many or most of the attributes assigned to it in theory or hypothesis might better be allocated to some other undiscovered or unacknowledged dynamic system within the overall human make-up.

Two generally ignored tidbits are worth mentioning.

Among all of the definitions of the mind, none encompass the mental nature of either telepathy or psychokinesis, or of any other "psychic" experiencing; and that the original definition of MIND, taken from an early Scandinavian term MYND, referred only to memory, or to recall of memories.

Attempting to Move Beyond Incomplete Realities About the Superpowers

The general point of all of the foregoing has not been to complain and gnash one's teeth over the real existence of ambiguous stuff regarding the superpowers. Indeed, ambiguous realities always have and probably always will exist.

Rather, the effort of this essay has been to point up that if ideas about the superpowers are encompassed in ambiguities, they are at least equally encompassed within a lack or a vacuum of clear-cut references.

Therefore, with regard to the superpowers, it seems necessary on the one hand to admit that the ambiguities exist, but otherwise to not waste much energy in either complaining about them, or getting deliciously lost in their vague amorphous whatever.

Beyond that, the need is to try to locate some clear-cut references that seem logical enough, and which thereby might arouse some sense of real reality.

The Conventional Question of
Who is "Psychic" and Who Is Not

One of the first issues that might be addressed has to do with the traditional overview regarding who is psychic and who is NOT psychic.

Throughout human history, certain individuals have become identifiable within the greater populations as "naturally gifted" in terms of becoming, for example, a shaman, a seer, a medium, a psychic, an intuitive, and so forth.

It is quite natural that a lot of attention has always been directed, one way or another, toward such gifted types, and this much has always been more or less obvious.

But what is not so obvious is that in turning attention toward the gifted, it is turned away from the general masses who are not considered as gifted.

Because of this, a "basic reality" comes about within which psychic powers are seen as belonging to the smaller percentage of gifted folk, but not to the larger percentage of the un-gifted.

It thus follows that a "reality" has emerged in the modernist West based in the idea that if one is not born a gifted psychic, then one cannot really aspire to become one by increasing one's knowledge or by training or tutoring.

Of course, this modern reality flies in the face of many ancient realities. For example, in India it was held that the Sidhis (a Sanskrit word somewhat akin to the notion of the superpowers) COULD be taught by instructive nurturing.

In any event, there is one approved exception to the modern idea that only the gifted can have the superpowers. This exception has to do with the un-gifted suddenly becoming gifted, either temporarily so or permanently.

Indeed, sometimes people fall on their heads, or receive a blow to them, or undergo some kind of traumatic shock, after which they are suddenly in possession of psychic powers they did not have before.

Additionally, some of the naturally un-gifted undergo unusual mystical experiencing, psychological catharses, or altered states - after which they too find themselves at least somewhat in possession of powers otherwise thought to be available only to the naturally gifted or to those whose heads got knocked about.

And so, the idea that only the born-gifted can have psychic capacities doesn't exactly hold as much water as might otherwise be thought.

It is certainly true that if attention is focused on the Psi gifted, then it appears that they are where the action is.

But if one examines, in depth, what the un-gifted experience along the lines of the gifted, then it can statistically be shown that a quite large percentage of the un-gifted occasionally do experience various types of spontaneous Psi events.

If one incorporates the larger scale of what the un-gifted populations also experience occasionally, then one must at least hypothetically consider that there is some kind of much bigger picture behind the smaller one that is focused on the gifted only.

The Concept of Giftedness

As of this writing, the term GIFTED has been politically incorrect for about twenty years, largely because it is not very egalitarian-confirming. The word is taken to imply that all individuals are not equally gifted, in that it distinguishes between those who are and who are not.

Most dictionaries define the adjective GIFTED as "having great natural ability."

But the adjective is of course taken from the noun GIFT - which, in addition to "something given," is principally defined as "a notable capacity or talent."

Synonyms of GIFT are given as FACULTY, APTITUDE, BENT, TALENT, GENIUS, KNACK.

The verb TO GIFT is defined as "to endow with some power, quality, or attribute," but the verb in this sense is mostly used in British English.

From the foregoing dictionary definitions, it can be seen that a gift is most likely not a thing-in-itself. Rather, the gift is at least somewhat composed of its dynamic synonyms - in that it can logically be supposed that various mixes of faculties, aptitudes, bents, talents, genius, and knacks result in the sum called "gifted" or the state of giftedness.

Indeed, the principal definition of FACULTY is given as "ability, power, as a personal capacity," and "a physical or mental power or function."

Beyond this, some dictionaries note that FACULTY refers to "one of the powers of the

mind formerly held by psychologists to form a basis for the explanation of all mental phenomena."

This suggests that the "mind" could actually be a composite of many faculties, each having its own sphere of functioning or operativeness.

In relationship to giftedness, FACULTY "applies to the innate, or sometimes, but less often, acquired ability for a particular accomplishment or function."

In this sense, then, it is possible to consider that giftedness is the sum result of various combinations of innate faculties, aptitudes, bents, talents, genius, and knacks that are in some kind of activated state.

If the combinations of the innate factors are dormant or inactive, then the sum result (giftedness) would not manifest.

But a major question now emerges, and involves a wonderment not regarding in whom the faculties are already active, but in whom are the faculties innate?

Well, the faculties would clearly be innate AND active in naturally gifted psychics.

But the innate factors must also exist within the ostensibly un-gifted - for if they did not then it is almost impossible to see how an inadvertent knock to the head or a transfiguring altered state could activate them.

And indeed, within the populations such factors must innately lurk in them as a whole, for if not, then it is difficult to see how they could occasionally and spontaneously "turn on."

The Gifted/Un-Gifted Paradox
vs
Powers Inherent at the Species Level

To get a better and more encompassing grip on all of this, we have to turn attention to what appears to be innate in our species itself, and which would therefore download into its individual specimens.

This is so easy to do that it is rather surprising that something along such lines has hardly ever been undertaken before.

Let us therefore speculate that our species innately possesses a long sequence of

innate factors, or faculties. We can picture this via the simple diagram that follows, in which each zero refers to a given innate faculty.

Our Species Innate
or Indwelling Faculties

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

There may be hundreds, or even thousands, of such innate faculties. We can hypothesize that most or even all of the innate faculties in some manner do download into each specimen of our species.

But after that, we can suppose that only some of the innate faculties achieve a "turned on" state, and that most of them otherwise remain dormant, inactive, or even blocked by the particular types of social conditioning formats each individual undergoes.

This can be sequentially pictured as follows, where ! equals a turned-on faculty, where * equals a dormant one, and where X equals a socially blocked, forbidden, or desensitized one.

A Speculative Individual Map
of Innate Active and Inactive Faculties

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

XXXX*!!XXXXXX***!!!***XXXXXXXXX*!***XXX***!**

The diagram above is suggestive of fifty innate faculties (although there must be very many more).

Seven of these are active;

Twenty are simply dormant and inactive;

Twenty-three are desensitized or blocked by social programming formats, and which can include ambiguities juxtaposed against what otherwise could broken down into sequences of clear-cut information and knowledge.

As a brief aside, one clue that the diagram above might have real relevance can be distilled from the fact that most people feel they are not living up to their "full potentials."

This appreciation of themselves can only mean they somehow sense that a great number of their potential faculties are not active, or are socially disrupted or blocked.

And indeed, many do blame society or the System, this being a castigation that does have some merit - if two of the basic mechanisms of social programming are understood.

Those two mechanisms consists of methods to condition awareness TOWARD what the society deems necessary and appropriate, and likewise to necessarily condition awareness AWAY from whatever is deemed not appropriate.

For example, if there is a sociological fear that achieved telepaths might be able to invade and "read" the hidden contents of another's mind, then methods to condition awareness AWAY from real telepathic realities would need to be evolved and implemented.

A Brief Consideration of
the Nature of Awareness

One of the central problems regarding any potential activation of the superpowers (or indeed any powers at all) is that they tend to be thought of as things - such as the IT-things called telepathy, intuition, clairvoyance, remote viewing, precognition, retrocognition, and etc.

However, none of these can manifest (or exist) unless awarenesses and perceptions appropriate to them FIRST become activated.

Indeed, if one cannot be aware of whatever, then it is unlikely that one has any chance at all of perceiving it.

Most dictionaries define AWARE as "watchful" and as "having or showing realization, perception, or knowledge." It is the mixture of those three states or qualities that is thought to equate to AWARENESS.

Furthermore, realization, perception, and knowledge are not factors that one is born with, and indeed it is rather broadly understood and accepted that that they can be ACQUIRED, developed, enhanced, and modulated in various kinds of ways and formats.

The synonyms associated with AWARENESS help give some added dimensions to the term: cognizant of, conscious of, sensitive to, alive to, awake to.

The foregoing synonyms, and even the meaning of awareness itself, are somewhat ambiguous unless one important word is incorporated: awareness OF.

It is possible that a general state or condition of awareness might exist.

But in essence, awareness requires something to be aware of, and without that something then awareness per se doesn't quite make sense.

The more correct formulas are awareness of, perception of, realization of, or knowledge of something or other.

It can hypothetically be thought that awareness exists principally in direct relationship TO or OF something. IF awareness of the something is actually achieved, then it simultaneously seems to download into perception of whatever that something consists of.

The perception itself then has the possibility for converting into DEVELOPED cognizance, realization, and/or knowledge in accord with the condition of one's other awareness faculties.

It is certainly quite safe to surmise that if one is not aware of something, then that something remains invisible and cannot be perceived.

It is also somewhat safe to suppose (even if only for hypothetical consideration) that dormant or inactive awareness faculties temporarily turn on when un-gifted individuals suddenly experience some kind of superpower episode.

It is thus possible to think that awareness is not just awareness per se, but awareness with relationship to or of some particular category that can be dealt with as perceptual or cognitive information IF awareness faculties specific to the category are turned on.

Seen in this light, gifted shamans, psychics, intuitives, and etc., would be demonstrating not just the inexplicable giftedness per se, but a fuller spectrum of awareness faculties in some kind of turned on state.

In other words, they would be aware of awareness categories that the un-gifted are not aware of, and thus cannot perceive or cognize.

For comparison between the so-called gifted and the so-called un-gifted, the following diagram can be considered.

Again, the zeros equate to different specializing awareness faculties, the ! equates to their turned on state, * equates to the innate but dormant and inactive state, while X equates to blocking or desensitizing because of social conditioning.

A Suggested Spectrum of
Awareness Faculties

Un-gifted spectrum: OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

XXXXX****!!XXXXX*-X!!********XXXXXXX

Gifted spectrum: OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

!!!!!!!!!!!!!!XXXX***!!!!!!!!!!!!!*******!!!XXXX

An individual might be categorized with regard to the un-gifted spectrum in which most of the awareness categories are turned off, or are inactive, or have been socially desensitized.

But if that same individual chances to undergo some kind of altered state, then more of the awareness faculties might temporarily or permanently turn on or become active.

The two observations above can be restated in a different way.

AWARENESS is not just one thing in itself, but could consist of numerous awareness faculties specifically linked to, and each of which specialize in, different categories of information.

If the sum of the numerous faculties is inactive or turned off, then the sum of the individual's possible awareness thresholds will be deficient relative to the fuller innate spectrum of possible awarenesses.

On the other hand, if the sum of the numerous faculties is active and turned on, then the sum of the individual's possible awareness thresholds will be more efficient relative to the fuller innate spectrum of possible awarenesses.

In any event, if one has somewhat followed one's way through the different lines of hypothetical thought that have wobbled throughout this essay, it might now be seen that they more or less converge onto the concepts and the phenomena of awareness and perception.

Those two concepts are clearly important with regard not only to any potential activation of the superpowers, but with regard to all things one is or is not aware of.

The idea that separate and specific kinds of awareness exist is not new. Indeed, commentary on varieties of possible awarenesses is found in many ancient Asian, African, Middle Eastern, and Amerindian formats.

One of the most remarkable things about awareness-cum-perceptual faculties overall is that they can be more and more activated by nurturing and training. But they can also be decreased or desensitizing by any number of environmental conditions and societal artifices.

Additionally, it would be clear that the threshold, or make-break point, between awareness increase and awareness decrease can become confused and suspended within ambiguous and amorphous contexts.

Status of Individual "Realities"
vs
Information-Carrying Systems

The suggestion that the individual, as a downloaded component of our species, carries vast numbers of awareness faculties may at first seem off the wall.

But there are certain clues regarding this, most of which came to light decades ago in anthropological research and also when "civilized" Western linguists began to compile language dictionaries of so-called "uncivilized" ethnic-aboriginal peoples.

Anthropology, of course, is (or was, anyway) "the scientific study of man in relation to distribution, origin, classification, and relationship of races, physical character, environmental, moral, and social relations and culture."

With regard to the examinations of the pre-modern Eskimo peoples, who lived in the northern lands of snow, it was soon uncovered that their traditions and language incorporated seventeen or more separate and distinct words that referred to different kinds of snow.

With regard to the ancient Arab peoples, it was found that their traditions and languages contained more than twenty-eight terms which referred to different kinds of camels.

To modern English-speaking individuals who usually don't have to identify seventeen different kinds of snow for purposes of survival, snow is simply snow - whether wet, dirty,

inconvenient, or dry.

A camel, of course, is a camel, whether it has one or two humps, the purposes of which are not understood at all by the camel illiterate.

Word Learning vs Awareness Recognition

Words and their definitions are ACQUIRED from sources outside of the individuals who learn them, and of course the whole of this learning involves activation of innate intellectual processes.

Thus, the Eskimo peoples could teach the seventeen words for snow. But those who learned the seventeen words had also to learn to become aware of and recognize in fact each of the seventeen kinds.

It is difficult to consider this kind of learning as only an intellectual process governed from outside sources the word-teaching represented. Indeed, intellectual processes must be supported and take on factual, experiential reality via awareness process that lead, for lack of better English terms, to meaning-recognition.

Further, it is broadly understood that intellectual learning processes generally work by categorizing in-take of information in ways that equate to some kind of sequencing or sorting.

Another way of putting this is that one does not learn very well if the in-take of information remains in a sort of amorphous, helter-skelter mish-mash.

Thus, in order to result in LEARNING, any in-take of information must follow some kind of natural indwelling organizing principles.

Such organizing principles could be thought of as basically inherent in our species.

As such, the organizing principles would be universal to the species, and would be automatically downloaded into each genetic individual in much the same way that each is born already possessing language-organizing and memory-organizing frameworks.

If the foregoing would be the case, then it must follow that those organizing frameworks must have some direct relationship to what we call "awareness-of."

It must then also follow that IF awareness-of remains in a sort of amorphous, helter-skelter condition, then it would not only be useless but also conflictive to the organizing

principles of language, memory, and etc.

Thus, if awareness is to be of useful service and function, then whatever the phenomena of awareness actually consist of must also indwell at the species level along the lines of some kind of natural organizing principles.

The Approximate Nature of Organizing Principles

The most basic definition of TO ORGANIZE is "to arrange or form into a coherent unity or functioning whole."

Implicit, but not clearly indicated in the definition, is the idea of parts, pieces, or segments, etc., that either need to be or can be formed into the coherent unity or functioning whole.

It is thus possible to immediately espy the fact that whatever is or remains ambiguous or amorphous probably cannot undergo formation into either a coherent unity or a functioning whole.

To organize parts or pieces of something into a functioning whole equates to the two well-understood, and clear-cut, principle definitions of SYSTEM:

1. "A regularly interacting or interdependent group of items forming a unified whole;"
2. "A group of interacting bodies [or phenomena] under the influence of related forces."

In relationship to those two definitions, individuals might have their personal realities, but even so they probably have (in the plural) sets and sequences of innate, but inactive awarenesses and faculties.

That this is so can become more clear if one attempts to consider that an individual has one faculty only.

This consideration is, of course, ridiculous in the extreme, in that everyone has a quite large spectrum of faculties visible, and probably has an even large spectrum of faculties invisible because they are inactive or blocked.

Since it is equally obvious that each kind of faculty is assisted and supported by different and specific kinds of awarenesses, it is then to be wondered WHY awareness is formally defined only in a generalizing, per se, simplified, and ambiguous sense.

If spectrums of active and inactive faculties exist in each individual, then it really should be assumed that spectrums of active and inactive awareness "units" also exist in sequential ways that accord with each of the specializing faculties.

The term SPECTRUM refers, of course, to:

1. "An array of the components separated and arranged in the order of some varying characteristic;"
2. "A continuous sequence or range."

It is via these well-accepted definitions that it becomes possible to consider the real existence of arrays of awareness which assist and support arrays of faculties, and which in turn download into arrays of perceptions.

So whatever each of the superpowers might be called in terms of words and assumed definitions definitely recedes into negligible importance.

The only real thing that matters is what one can be, or become, aware OF.

In any event, sequential arrays or multiple ranges of anything clearly are systemic in nature. They are systems, i.e., regularly interacting or interdependent groups of items, parts, arrays, or phenomena forming a unified whole.

For the purposes of this essay, whether the parts, arrays, faculties, awarenesses are active, inactive, or desensitized now remains the only real point of interest regarding the superpowers.

At this point, something now depends on how an individual understands or doesn't understand the nature of systems, and the nature of systemic phenomena.

Therefore, discussions regarding the nature of systems will subsequently be added into this Website, thereby bringing to a close this already over-long essay.

Even so, those having an interest in doing so might patiently work at making lists of what they can be aware of. However, such lists might be undertaken and held privately, largely because some items appearing therein might be disturbing to the status of other individual realities.

(End)

Passive Awareness As Differentiated From Other Possible Kinds of Awareness

Ingo Swann (11Nov99)

Although most realize that awareness does exist, it is generally thought to exist as a sort of overall, undifferentiated thing-in-itself that is not broken down into categories and specific types.

The difficulty arises because the nature of or intrinsic essence of awareness per se and awareness OF something are neither the same thing nor the same activity.

Indeed, if one pauses to consider this, then awareness OF something must be some sort of an extension of awareness itself.

Our Species as a "Smart System"

There may be a number of smaller-picture ways of getting into the substance of this essay. But a possible bigger-picture way might consist of the following concept.

It is possible to think, only for hypothetical speculation to be sure, that our species is designed to be a smart system.

Indeed, we have the "equipment" that suggests as much: i.e., arrays of awareness units, different kinds of perception, intelligence faculties, powers of recognition, deduction, judgment, sensing, sense-making, several ways of setting up communications, and etc.

All of this equipment is innate in each individual. And indeed what happens after birth is totally dependent on the actual pre-existence of those innate factors.

Without the pre-existence of those various equipments, the human might be humanoid in body only, but clearly not all that human regarding anything else.

This is to say, when we think of a "human being," we are obviously thinking of the bio-body PLUS all of its innate equipments - and which are thought of as belonging to the bio-body's "mind," the mental equipment of the body.

As to which of the equipments are more significant than others, it is difficult to give priority status to most of them, but with one exception.

Without the arrays of awarenesses, it seems unlikely that the rest of the equipment would be all that functional or amount to very much.

Based on the hypothetical foregoing, we could then think that each infant born possesses innate arrays of awareness, and all of which, even if somewhat wobbly at first, are none the less set and ready to function.

As it is, though, each babe is not only born into physical-mental life, but also into sets of circumstances majorly characterized by environmental and social influences, as well as by the contours and limits of knowledge packages that pertain to the circumstances as a whole.

Within the world-wide panorama, there are, of course, very many kinds and sets of circumstances that a babe can be born into.

Each of these different socio-cultural sets require the nurturing of certain kinds of awareness units, but, as it might be said, do not require, and may even oppose, the nurturing of other kinds.

Sociologists and psychologists have referred to this selective nurturing and de-nurturing as "social-cultural conditioning."

The idealized, but often rather wobbly, end goal of socio-cultural conditioning is to manufacture mental individuals who will ultimately grow up and take their pre-fitted place within the mental schemes of things as established via the socio-cultural conditioning overviews and their norms.

In any event, babes born with full spectrums of wide-open awareness faculties undergo the effects of the nurturing and de-nurturing.

As time passes, the nurtured awareness units rev up to fuller functioning, while the de-nurtured ones slowly close down into some kind of dormant or non-operative status.

The Construction of Awareness-Information

Patterns in the Maturing Individual

As discussed in previous essays, the exact nature of awareness has not been researched in general, and so likewise scientists and psychologist have not studied the awarenesses of children.

But those who have studied developmental child psychology have suggested that most of the basic categories of information patterns and values the forthcoming adult will ever use have been firmed up by about the age of seven.

At that age, or thereabouts, a rather remarkable, two-fold phenomenon takes place.

On the one hand, the basic categories of information patterns are, so to speak, locked-in and locked-down so as to achieve some kind of permanent status.

And this would seem to include the locking-in of the specializing kinds of awareness units that have been nurtured to go along with and support the basic information patterns.

On the other hand, the locking-down also serves to lock-out all other categories of information that are in dis-conformity with the patterns locked-in.

And as might now be expected, the locking-down would include the locking-out of awareness units that are also in dis-conformity with whatever has been locked in.

It is at this point that all the arrays of awareness units that are not consistent with those that have been nurtured are closed down, or blocked from functioning.

One of the hypothetical fall-outs of this remarkable two-fold phenomenon has a direct impact regarding future in-take and processing of information the individual might thereafter encounter.

The individual will thence process that information within the basic contexts of the information patterns that achieved locked-down status at about the age of seven.

Additionally, the individual has only certain kinds of operative awareness units, all the rest being inoperative by virtue of having been locked-out and demobilized via the processes of de-nurturing and social conditioning.

It is understood that certain additive adjustments to whatever has been locked down can sometimes take place between the age of seven and the onset of puberty.

For example, the growing child can still simultaneously learn different languages with some ease.

Many can also selectively consider different vocations that might inspire their awareness regarding a life commitment.

Sometimes, creativity and creative logic are still amenable to new discovery and information in-takes.

And it is also during this interregnum between childhood and forthcoming adulthood that intelligence factors can surge and alter, and some of the demobilized awareness units can turn on, either fortuitously or unfortuitously.

The point is that awarenesses, and the extent of their activity and operativeness, can very early be modulated by environmental and societal conditioning. Within whose contexts only those awarenesses deemed suitable will be nurtured. Those deemed unsuitable will, of course, undergo long-term demobilization.

It is worth mentioning a special book that deals with children, and which mentions in more detail some of the above topics. This is MAGICAL CHILD by Joseph Chilton Pearce (first published by Dutton in 1977, since having undergone many other editions.)

Of course, the combined works of Jean Piaget (1896-1950) are of seminal importance in this regard. Piaget was a Swiss psychologist and a world-renowned professor of child psychology, who produced at least eleven of important books in that regard.

Awareness Vis-a-vis Autonomy

In order to examine of active and passive types of awareness, it is first necessary to make a slight detour into the meanings of the term AUTONOMY.

The meanings of this term, together with the meanings of the terms AWARENESS and SYSTEMS, altogether constitute one of the most fundamental concepts regarding the start-up of superpower functioning.

The definitions for AUTONOMY and AUTONOMOUS given in most dictionaries are:

1. The quality or state of being self-governed, especially as regards the right of self-government;
2. A self-governed state, nation, or country;
3. Having the right or power of self-government;
4. Undertaken or carried on without outside control;
5. Existing or capable of existing independently;
6. Responding, reacting, or developing independently of the whole, as for example,

in growth.

(NOTE: Please observe that if something is truly autonomous (independent), then the use of the term "reacting" in the 6th definition above is somewhat conceptually misleading in the absence of the term "acting." Indeed, the 4th and 5th definitions given imply that the autonomous does act without reacting to outside control or stimuli, but may also react to those if necessary. So both terms are necessary."

Given these definitions, most would consider that the term "autonomy" principally refers to a self-governing nation, state, or country, or to some otherwise completely independent agency.

As it has transpired, though, and to move expeditiously along, the noble professions of psychiatry and psychology have properly seized upon the term AUTONOMY and converted it to their own use.

Thus, in the lingo of psychiatry, for example, AUTONOMY is defined as follows:

"AUTONOMY: The quality or state of being self- governing. The living organism does not represent merely an inactive element but is, to a large extent, a self-governing entity.

"The biological process, therefore, is not entirely a result of external forces, but is in part governed by specific biological forces which are endogenous.

"The organism possesses a certain degree of freedom; i.e., it acts according to its own inherent nature, which is based on intrinsic forces, and not under the compulsion of outside influences. [PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY, 5th Edition, Robert, J. Campbell, Ed., 1967.)

The term ENDOGENY is defined as "Growth from within or from a deep layer; growing from or on the inside; originating within the body."

The term INTRINSIC of course means: "Belonging to the essential nature or constitution of a thing."

This is a good place to also point up the definitions of INNATE, a term that is frequently used throughout most of the essays in this database.

1. Existing in or belonging to an individual from birth;
2. Belonging to the essential nature of something;
3. Originating in or derived from the mind or the constitution of the intellect rather than from experience [of outer phenomena or factors].

As synonyms, innate, inborn, inbred, congenital, and hereditary "mean not acquired

AFTER birth." (Emphasis added.)

The Probable Roots of the Major Modernist Conception Regarding Awarensss

As discussed in prior essays having to do with the status of awareness research, it can be discovered that hardly anything exists along such lines.

Even so, that awareness exists is taken for granted.

But it seems majorly conceptualized as something like a completely unitary, homogenous, thing-in-itself, having no subdivisible parts, no specializing functions, and no scales or spectrums regarding differentiation of specific internal and external factors.

One possible reason for this major conceptualization has to do with the modernist idea that awareness is acquired AFTER birth as the infant begins to learn to identify differences in the outer environment.

In other words, one LEARNS to become aware, and that thereafter one's awareness is conditioned and shaped by the on-going mix of what one learns and experiences.

It is helpful to briefly trace the history of this concept, which lead to a volcanic debate that erupted and festered during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and was even still on-going during the early decades of the twentieth.

The debate was a serious one, in that it was broadly advertised as having important reality-shaping substance regarding philosophic and scientific issues. That it also had tremendous importance to major societal issues was not so broadly pointed up.

The ferocious debate centered on two questions that were seen as mutually exclusive and conflictive, one of which must be true, the other then being false.

> (a) Was the mind of the human babe born with innate, intrinsic, and already existing faculties, features, and characteristics, and which might even include certain kinds of memory; or

> (b) Was the human babe born a "blank slate" upon which "anything could be written" after its birth.

The eventual up-shot of the debate was that the exponents of (b) "won," and on the surface of all things, that was that.

However, the triumph took several decades to achieve, and it was achieved only by deconstructing the authenticity of many so-called "pre-scientific" knowledge packages. The list of those expunged knowledge packages is quite long. Among other significant topics, it includes, of course, intrinsic functioning of awareness and the superpowers.

With regard to the issue of awareness, then, it could be thought of within the "blank slate" contexts - meaning that the infant was born with a blank slate of generic awareness upon which anything could be written after its birth.

It is worth mentioning here that as the blank-slate idea gradually triumphed within the contexts of scientific and philosophic overviews. The triumph also led, in part, to the proliferation of the many "sociological experiments" for which the late nineteenth and the twentieth century became so famous.

Indeed, if everyone's slates were blank at birth, the sociological contours could be designed and written on them - so as to result in behavioristically ideal societies (or, in ideally mind-controlled ones.")

Further, the blank slates, as such, could be seen as little more than stimulus-response mechanisms, and which would respond to whatever was written on them as stimuli.

If there were any issues of awareness involved, then such awareness existed in the blank slate PASSIVE condition, thus enabling awareness to be written in ways deemed desirable by modern scientists, philosophers, and there resulting sociological enterprises.

The Absence of Autonomy Within
The Modernist Concepts of Awareness

It can now be pointed up that the blank-slate theorem left no room for thinking that the blank slate had anything resembling the quality or state of being self-governing.

Therefore, the blank slates of all individuals of our species could not act according to any of their own inherent, self-governing qualities based on intrinsic forces and qualities.

In other words, the blank slates were entirely under the compulsion of various assemblages of outside influences, while any awarenesses involved would be little more than copies of those influences.

The former, and once extremely powerful, blank-slate concept is today "forgotten" with regard to scientific and philosophic auspices.

None the less, those modernist knowledge packages that once actively incorporated it into their early theoretical structures are still utilizing those knowledge packages. In other words, the words might be gone, but their foundational influences are not.

And so, in the sense of inheriting our own history, that idea has left a subtle sociological residue that entraps many versions of reality within it.

In order to complete the picture briefly outlined above, the blank-slate thing began to come under duress for a number of reasons, but perhaps especially because of the invention (in Germany during the 1930s) of the electron microscope.

After World War II, the new microscopes ultimately allowed for increasing advances in the scientific field of genetics. As a result, the inner, intrinsic workings of genes and chromosomes could begin to be identified.

And from this it became certain that in their self-organizing, self-governing aspects, the genes, chromosomes, and etc., were NOT operating from a blank-slate thing, but indeed seemed to be amazingly aware of what they were all about and what they were doing.

Whereas the blank-slate thing had nullified the concept of self-generating autonomy, that term now had to be quickly resuscitated and put back to work - at least with regard to the biological processes which could no longer be seen as "entirely the result of external forces."

The scientific resuscitation of the term was achieved without much ado, but similar resuscitations of it have not yet really been introduced into philosophy or sociology - or into parapsychological research, for that matter.

Passive Awareness As One Category
of Awareness

The blank-slate idea was never described as passive awareness.

But if the slate was blank, and if behavior-making, awareness-making, and reality-making stuff were to be written on it, then the slate can be thought of being passive in nature.

The idea of the blank slate refers to something within the whole human entity that can in-take and imprint information from external sources in forms of, say, impression-like "inscriptions," and thereby become aware of the meanings of those inscriptions.

This, of course, is the same as saying that awareness is manufactured BECAUSE of the in-take of information from external sources.

However, if this is all there is to awareness, then it is difficult to explain how an individual has an individual personality, an intelligence that often DOES NOT function or specialize only with regard to the passive in-take.

Further, it is difficult to explain how deductions not already encoded in the in-takes of this or that information can be arrived at.

Neither can it be explained how creativity, original inventiveness, or intuition occurs regarding information that has never been passively received and duplicated as in-put from external sources.

And, of course, the existence of the superpowers that transcend matter, energy, space, and time - and as well, can transcend the limits of ALL information - is very difficult to explain based only on previously in-taken forms of passively acquired awareness.

In other words, passive awareness most probably functions only with regard to the sum of what has been earlier acquired by passively being in-taken and imprinted.

At this juncture, it is worthwhile reviewing the major definitions of PASSIVE, of which there are nine:

1. Acted upon by an external agency;
2. Induced by an outside agency;
3. Receptive to outside impressions or influences;
4. Receiving or enduring without resistance;
5. Submissive;
6. Existing without being active or open;
7. Lacking in energy or will;
8. Inert, latent;
9. Non-volitional.

IF awareness consists only of information passively imprinted solely from external sources, then awareness can function only with regard to, and only within the scope and criteria of, what has been induced by virtue of outside agencies.

There are very many implications downloading from this, and each might want to reflect upon what they could consist of.

But one of the more blunt implications is that the construction and support of passive awarenesses scenarios is of enormous value regarding societal power structures whose managers do not very much relish the emergence of any other less amenable kinds of

awarenesses.

Meanwhile, if passive formats of awareness are all there is regarding the contexts of awareness, then it is exceedingly difficult to place ideas of autonomy within those contexts.

Indeed, if such was all there was regarding awareness (i.e., only information-awareness programming from or because of outside agencies), then such awareness would be reacting as a stimulus-response mechanism.

This is to say that awarenesses could be characterized as responding only to information stimuli that have emerged from outside agencies.

In any event, this essay could be more or less wrapped up based on the foregoing. However, the total panoramas of the situations involved are much larger in scope, and so that scope needs briefly to be reviewed.

Autonomy vs Heteronomy

As defined by the PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY earlier referred to, the relationship of autonomy and heteronomy is briefly discussed as follows:

"AUTONOMY essentially means self-government [within the holistic scope of innate and intrinsic forces of the organism.]

"HETERONOMY means government [or influencing] from the outside.

"The autonomy of the organism is not absolute; the self-determination is restricted by outside influences that are heteronomous with relation to the organism.

"Every organismic process is always a resultant of two components - autonomy and heteronomy factors.

"There is no absolute separation between the biological subject and the environment and, therefore, there is no sharp boundary between the experience of self and the outside world. There are only degrees of ego proximity and ego distance.'

"The degrees of ego proximity and ego distance are the symbolic expression of the gradients between autonomy and heteronomy."

The foregoing information is found in a perfectly respectable psychiatric dictionary, and

so at first it seems to carry only psychiatric contexts of little meaning to the individual.

However, whether the individual recognizes it or not, that line up of information also constitutes fundamental importance with regard to designing mind-control technologies - the goal of which is to affect passive stimulus-responsive awarenesses via heteronomous sources outside of them.

The foregoing definitions clearly indicate that it IS professionally understood that the individual is not entirely the stimulus-response effect of in-put external influences that one can become aware of - by experiencing, learning, or teaching.

The individual is also a living organism that, in its inner sense, acts according to its own inherent nature, which "is based on intrinsic forces not under the compulsion of outside influences."

It is now pertinent to relate the essence of the foregoing to the superpowers of the human biomind.

While one might assume that parapsychological research provides the best evidence for the existence of Psi, ESP, telepathy, and so forth, the best evidence for those KINDS of superpowers is derived from what the general populations spontaneously experience.

Statistics acquired during the last twenty years indicated that more than 50 per cent of those interviewed had spontaneously experienced some kind of superpower episode, often more than just once.

A significant aspect of this, which is usually entirely missed, is that most of the experiencers indicated that they could not make sense of the events by referring to the scope of the information contained in their passive awarenesses.

Indeed, the events "came out of nowhere" that was identifiable, but they nevertheless the less usually contained information that was or later proved meaningful to the experiencer.

Very few experiencers questioned the authenticity of their events.

And it was generally understood that they somehow represented kinds of awareness that were neither incorporated into nor emerged out of, as we shall now say, their acquired kinds of passive awarenesses.

But the events represented SOME kind of awarenesses, the origin of which was unknown. The best, even if temporary, understanding here is that:

1. The origin of those spontaneous experiences exists somewhere within the

inherent nature of the individuals; and

2. That the experiences emerge based on inner intrinsic forces not under the compulsion or determination of outside influences.

That the experiences occurred spontaneously clearly must indicate that they emerged from or because of active, volitional awarenesses, and also carried the markers of autonomous energy and will which can be absent regarding passive awarenesses.

Evidence For The Existence of Active Awarenesses

By far and large, most dwell within the information frameworks of their passive awarenesses, and it is indeed within those frameworks that individuals and group realities are formatted - because passive awarenesses are most easily shared.

This statement can be recast as: most dwell within the information frameworks based on passively acquired heteronomous awareness from the outside, and it is therefore that those frameworks format the realities that most individuals and groups can share.

That this is so is not the central issue involved. The central issue is that passive awareness formats are not generally recognized as passive UNTIL they can be contrasted to examples of active autonomous awarenesses.

Evidence For The Existence of Active Awareness Categories

This issue will be only briefly dealt with here, largely because extensive discussions regarding SYSTEMS must first be offered up in order to erect an appropriate information platform for it.

But for the purposes of this essay, a distinction must be made between what appear to be the two chief characteristics that separate passive and active awareness.

These two characteristics can immediately be pointed up by considering that passive awareness is non-volitional. Indeed, the in-take of information from external sources more or less requires a non-volitional-passive state of some kind.

Otherwise the information will not register, imprint, or become formatted, and one

thereafter cannot really say that one is aware of it.

Thus, if it is possible to associate non-volition with passive awarenesses, then the concept of active awareness could be associated with volition.

It is not at all difficult to consider that volition and non-volition are components of powerfulness and powerlessness. At least it is reasonable to think that power is closer to active awarenesses than to passive awarenesses.

In any event, examples of active awarenesses are seldom seen because societal conditioning formats generally direct cognitive attention not toward, but away from them.

In the martial arts, however, various kinds of active awarenesses are accepted not only as real enough, but as essential.

Most of the martial arts learning techniques (those of Aikido, for example) consider important distinctions between passive and active awarenesses.

The gearing up of instant, non-thought-determined reflexes, for example, must derive from active-volitional kinds of awarenesses rather than from passive ones.

Gradients of Awarenesses Ranging From Passive to Active

Earlier in this essay the concepts of autonomy and heteronomy were reviewed, and it was indicated that there are "no sharp boundaries between the self and the outside world."

There are only degrees of ego proximity and ego distance" and which are symbolic of expressions of the gradients between autonomy and the outer world.

This information, found in a completely acceptable dictionary of psychiatric concepts, is entirely fortuitous to the lines of thought encompassed in this essay.

If one can think in terms of "no sharp boundaries" with regard to the distinctions of active autonomous awareness and passive non-autonomous awareness, then one can think that there are gradients ranging between them.

This situation can partially be indicated via the following simple graph where the brackets] [indicate possible gradients between the two major kinds of awarenesses.

Awareness Gradients

ACTIVE]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]<*>[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[PASSIVE

If one now seizes upon the concepts of "ego proximity" and "ego distance," it is hypothetically possible to consider that an "ego" might have more "proximity" to passive awarenesses, and thus more "distance" from active awarenesses.

And likewise with reference to passive realities and active realities.

And perhaps also likewise to superpower functioning and non-superpower functioning - IF it can be established that the superpowers consist of autonomous active forms of awarenesses.

Passive and Active Awarenesses
With Regard to Superpower Functioning

It is obvious by now that I am attempting to attach the superpowers to categories of active autonomous awarenesses.

But the overall situation remains somewhat more complicated - simply because passive awarenesses are of great importance and as such play a very large and vital role in formatting realities of the external worlds.

In order to get briefly into this, let us hypothesize that most depend on information about whatever that is external, and which is in-put or in-taken into passive awareness formats.

After those passive awarenesses achieve some kind of critical fulfillment, one will utilize those passive formats not only to negotiate life in the external worlds, but also to determine the extent and particular formatting of one's acquired knowledge in-put from those external worlds.

Something like this is indeed not only the expected thing to do, but a relevant reality-making activity with respect to external factors.

In other words, one's realities are made because of and in juxtositioning to, external factors of persuasive influence and content. In such a case, one's "ego" can predominantly be in close proximity to the influences and content of the external factors.

However, external factors are translated into limited knowledge packages (sometimes, even false ones), and so those particular external factors do not remain either stable or permanent.

As those external factors do change, those who have passively imprinted on the reality of the former ones suddenly find themselves out of the swim of things. Their ego-proximity to the former external factors is suddenly something akin to the proverbial kite with its grounding string rendered asunder.

With particular regard to the superpowers, modern psychical and parapsychological research has set up the information packages that act as external information sources to interested individuals.

Such individuals then in-take that information into their passive awareness formats, and within which each individual erects some kind of knowledge reality REGARDING the parapsychological VERSIONS of the superpowers. This kind of thing would include, to be sure, the selected nomenclature that goes along with the parapsychological versions.

In this sense, the parapsychology versions and their supposed knowledge contexts now act as external forces and influences that can be in-put or in-taken into the passive awarenesses of interested individuals - and even into the passive awareness layers of the disinterested and the antagonistic skeptics, scientists, philosophers, and whatnot.

Those that accomplish something along such lines can be said to be in close passive proximity to the information put forth from those versions of the superpowers. But, alas! perhaps still quite distant from the more truly active, autonomous nature of the superpowers themselves.

The Single, Most Apparent Reality Regarding the Superpowers

The single visible characteristic that identifies the superpowers is that their phenomena have been historically acknowledged since the age of oral transmission of knowledge began, and definitely since the so-called invention of writing occurred.

It is thus that the superpowers can be thought of as indigenous to our species, and which continue to inhabit it, so to speak, regardless of various cultural attitudes toward them.

The succeeding cultural attitudes, and their accompanying realities, come and go one

after another, down into today. But behold, the superpowers still spontaneously pop up into occasional visibility even during our own modernist period.

If the long history of superpower emergence is studied closely, it would appear that the singlemost central difficulty regarding them was not that they do exist, but what they should be NAMED for purposes of communicating about them.

Various terms in various cultures and their languages therefore made their transitory appearances, and in this sense things seemed to have progressed accordingly - at least in ancient India, Greece, Mesopotamia, Latin Rome, China, most pre-modern cultures, and so forth.

If one examines such on-going shifts of terminology throughout the centuries and within different cultures, one can gradually become aware of two important factors that have direct implications to contemporary conceptualizing of the superpowers.

First, the pre-modern contexts seem to refer, in today's English, to the superpowers as awareness of categories and gradients of INFLUENCES, ENERGIES, and POWERS, to which a name was given for ease of communicating.

Second, the name given, however, was NOT generally mistaken as the influence itself. The authenticity of this observation can easily be determined by reviewing, for example, Amerindian language references, and by becoming familiar with superpower references within Aikido and other martial arts formats.

With respect to the foregoing, the most important aspect was, and is, to expand gradients of awarenesses so as to become aware of the influences and powers themselves.

However, the name is FUNCTIONALLY irrelevant - because all it represents is an intellectual, transitory, external something or another that is convenient for the passive in-take and out-put of linguistic interaction.

Along such lines for example, if one carefully reads through the HISTORIES of the ancient Greek historian Herodotus (484?-425? B.C.), one will come across many examples of superpower activity along the lines of what we today call telepathy, distant viewing, and future-seeing.

But although Herodotus reports quite well on the superpower phenomena and activity involved, nowhere does he prescribe a name for them. Neither does he utilize the term "awareness," although the narratives implicitly point up its undoubted presence among the experients.

Our modern period seems to be the first to invent and assign terms to superpower

phenomena and activity - and THEN, in an intellectually passive sense, to conceptualize and mistake the terms for the phenomena themselves.

A question now to be considered is this: Will the passive awareness in-take trigger the active awareness autonomy of the desired connectivity?

Well, if such triggering did prove successful, then societal powers would be much up in alarm because, for example, of the emergence of highly achieved telepaths.

But two of the several problems involved in this regard are worth pointing up.

First, the term "telepathy" and its definitions only constitute a peculiar modern idiom, which definitely, and as can be expected, does configure passive in-takes of information from external sources - and which therefore can mistakenly be assumed as constituting the telepathic "realities" involved.

Second, the idiom may be incorrect or certainly off center. Therefore, what we today idiomatically call telepathy and mind-to-mind might basically consist of something else, either altogether or at least partially so.

(End)

Systems
vis-a-vis
the Superpowers

Ingo Swann (20Nov99)

Introductory Discussions

Two major concepts regarding the basic nature of the superpowers have dominated Western conventional ideas and thinking patterns during the modernist epoch.

First, the recognized superpowers of the human biomind (such as represented by the terms telepathy, remote-viewing, clairvoyance, intuition, and etc.) are thought of as special individual gifts or special abilities. As a result those abilities are classed apart from abilities that are seen as more common.

Second, it is also generally accepted that the special gifts and abilities function, when they do, via the brain-mind concept.

However, there is an important distinction to be made between (1) the concept of so-called special abilities, and (2) certain common abilities that are suppressed or extinguished by social measures, and hence are rarely seen.

Indeed, certain abilities that are common to our species, but which are suppressed by social measures, would be seen as "special" if they occasionally manifested in certain individuals or under certain circumstances.

Thus, there are two options regarding how to basically think of the superpowers: (1) as special gifts or abilities; and (2) as abilities common to our species, but culturally suppressed by societal measures.

By far and large, thinking patterns of modern parapsychology have identified with the first option above, and also with the brain-mind concept.

As it has turned out, however, work undertaken within the auspices of those two

modernist contexts has not yielded very much with regard to opening up, as it might be put, the information discs regarding the essential nature of the superpowers.

Many "ordinary" people occasionally experience some kind of superpower activity, and this brings into question the validity of the "special ability" idea. It has also proven quite difficult to locate any actual or precise functioning of the superpowers within the brain-mind model as so far conceptualized.

Generally speaking, the foregoing represents a fair, if brief, overview of what has been referred to as Western parapsychology, and which overview has endured, more or less intact, for about century thus far.

Nothing new has really been added into this Western conceptualization, and indeed the mind-set configurations involved with it have shown themselves to be resistant to such additions.

One example of such resistance is that the break-through Soviet and Russian work regarding bio-communications and electromagnetic bio-information has been successfully avoided.

Another examples is that Chinese information regarding certain energy formats that are obviously associated with different kinds of Psi phenomena has likewise not been incorporated into the Western concept.

And the many constituents of the all-important information theory, which itself is a Western product, has not so far dented the Western mind-sets which continue to mull about within the limits of their own concepts.

Additionally, the Western concepts contain a vacuum of information regarding the roles that awarenesses play with regard to the superpowers. Something of the nature of this information vacuum has already been discussed in this database under the general heading of awareness.

But there are other knowledge vacuums in the Western versions of the superpowers.

One of these has to do with the idea that the superpowers function within SYSTEMS that are intrinsic to that functioning.

And so it is the purpose of this set of essays to open up windows of discussion regarding the hypothetical existence of such systems.

Usual Ideas About Systems

It can be found that almost everyone has at hand some kind of idea regarding what a system is.

Thus, although ideas about systems can be quite varied, it seems that the two most familiar ideas about them are:

1. they have something to do with organizing activities to achieve higher proficiency and effectiveness;
2. that they have sociological importance with regard to how societies, and corporate units within them, are managed from the top down.

Be that as it may, although many think of the existence and the presence of systems, few seem to consider their ABSENCE, and what goes on or happens because of their absence.

What goes on is generally referred to as randomness and which itself is a minor form of chaos. Systemization seeks to reduce randomness, so as to achieve better functioning with regard to whatever.

Psychical and parapsychological researchers have produced quite a number of ideas, theories, words, and terms regarding the topics of their interest.

Some of these have come and gone, leaving a sort of historical residue. Some have been short-lived, some have been jockeyed around for prestige purposes. Inside those disciplines, intramural prestige and pismire activities have changed, new directions attempted, and hostilities among parapsychological players have come and gone.

While some systemization has occurred, it has mainly focused on acceptable parameters of experimental design, and the application of statistics regarding the usually minimal appearance of this or that Psi phenomena.

But no systemization of the various kinds of Psi (superpower) phenomena has been undertaken - until the emergence of Rhea White and her wonderful, but arduous attempts to identify the many dozens of varieties of "exceptional human experience (EHEs)." [See her paper contained in Section 3 of this database.]

In large part, the phenomena, theories, ideas, nomenclature, and intramural battles of parapsychology have existed in fluctuating and random states and conditions. Some researchers do not even think that the Psi powers are capable of being considered in any systemic way.

This implies that those who intellectually consider the superpowers via the random parapsychology trajectories must in some sense be mentally duplicating the

randomness, even if unaware of doing so - this because there is no system to mentally duplicate otherwise.

For hypothetical purposes, it is possible that the superpowers become activated only by virtue of various kinds of coordination among many awareness systems.

Indeed, such coordination would be systemic, and therefore would suffer from any unrealized randomness that might become introjected into the desired coordination.

It is thus that any approach toward such activation must include at least some knowledgeable basis not only regarding the nature of systems, but also the nature of randomness.

The Nature and Effects of Randomness

As found in most dictionaries, RANDOM is based in Middle English and Old French words that meant "running a haphazard course." In our contemporary usage, its major definitions are:

1. "Without definite aim, direction, rule, or method;"
2. "Lacking a definite plan, purpose, or pattern."

Synonyms are HAPHAZARD, which refers to "what is done without regard for regularity or fitness or ultimate consequences;"

CASUAL "suggests working or acting without deliberate intention, or purpose;"

DESULTORY "implies a jumping or skipping from one thing to another ungoverned by method or system."

In the absence of systems, things physical, mental, creative, etc., can dwindle down to the point where they become random, haphazard, casual, desultory messes that are non-functional, non-constructive, and etc.

This permits whatever is involved to go to rot, slime, and other odiferous formats of disintegration and ultimate vanishment.

Indeed, DISINTEGRATION has the opposite meaning of INTEGRATION, whose overall sense, somewhat paraphrased here, generally means "to unite, to form into an organizational whole."

One non-paraphrased definition for INTEGRATION is given as:

"Coordination of mental processes into effective functioning, personality, or within the individual's environments."

The foregoing, painfully extracted from dictionaries, more or less implies, on the one hand, that if something is random, or perhaps surrounded by random factors, then it probably will not undergo effective integration.

On the other hand, the same could also imply that if the something itself is not INTRINSICALLY integrated, organized, and systematized, then it is quite likely that it will NOT manifest in ways that would amount to much.

As will be discussed, the term SYSTEM implies integration of the factors that comprise it. It also implies that if the factors do not become systemically incorporated, then they will remain random.

By virtue of the foregoing factors, one can now attempt to transliterate them with regard to the superpowers.

If one dares to presume that the superpowers are very intimately and intrinsically associated with different kinds of awarenesses, then two direct implications are:

1. That the mix of superpower-awarenesses- faculties are somehow innately and intrinsically systemic of and in themselves;
2. That if the systemic mix is cluttered or introjected with non-appropriate random stuff, including inappropriate mental activity and theoretical hypotheses, then the systemic mix will accordingly devolve toward becoming desultory (i.e., non-functional).

Systems Within Systems

Of course it is to be admitted that there are systems within systems within systems, and on and on.

This is suggestive of complexities which the general lust for simplification and over-simplification cannot really accommodate, no matter how powerful and drooling it is.

At another level of consideration, it can be thought that the entire cosmos is systemic in various ways, and that all within it is also somehow fundamentally systemic in nature.

After all, it is difficult to see how something could exist completely independent of its systemic relationship to other somethings. Indeed, some past metaphysical writers have hypothesized that if something is truly independent of all else, then it will go out of existence.

It is true that many do sometimes realize that interconnectedness among things does exist.

But the basic idea of interconnectedness AMONG things is not the same as the more fundamental idea that all things are not only incorporated within, but are reflective of systems.

An Amusing Parapsychology Randomness

In order to give some real-time support to the foregoing discussions, it is necessary to refer to some personal experiences of my own.

To be begin doing so, it is worthwhile mentioning again that the concepts of systems play no central roles within the concepts of modernist parapsychology and psychical research.

Rather, a selection of the more obvious superpower faculties (such as telepathy, clairvoyance, intuition, etc.) are given names. Each name is then thought to be a specific ability, and is thereafter thought to be a thing-in-itself.

The names permit passive awarenesses to differentiate definitions among and between the NAMES - after which everyone can then assume, for example, that intuition and remote-viewing, as NAMED, are truly specific IT-things-in-themselves.

It is, of course, entirely meaningful to differentiate between this and that thing, and so people overall can become quite good at doing so.

But the differentiation leads to specializing formats of awarenesses with regard to each thing that manages to achieve the differentiating within the awareness contexts of each individual.

What does not achieve the status of having been differentiated remains ambiguous, confusing, and possibly even cloaked within assumptions that can be vivid but meaningless.

For a species, such as our own, that has generic qualities of intelligence and arrays of

awareness powers, this differentiating is not all that difficult to accomplish - especially when applied to physical and tangible things.

However, when it comes to intangible factors and aspects of our species and its individually downloaded "units," the processes of differentiating become much more involved and complex.

One way of easing this complexity is to identify the intangible factors as IT-things also, and then to attempt to differentiate among them just as one does with physical and tangible things.

In all fairness, it must be pointed up that psychical, parapsychological, and energetics researchers constitute the only segments of our modernist culture that have attempted an examination of our species intangible factors.

In their attempts they have indeed converted some of the intangible functioning into IT-things, such as telepathy, clairvoyance, ESP, precognition, OOBE, and etc., and some of those workers have recently made an IT-thing of "remote viewing."

Those IT-things, having been identified and given definitions, are thence interpreted as abilities, or suspected abilities. Experiments are then organized to examine and reveal their presence.

Subjects are then located to act as percipients of test-situation targets that will act as stimuli to the given type of intangible functioning.

If the experiment fails, then there is no further problem. But if it should succeed, then some crucial questions immediately arise.

For example, the parapsychologists were experimenting with regard to ESP, and the subject therefore was asked to perceive the target via ESP. The subject succeeded in identifying or "getting" the target.

Now the problems of differentiation arise. For example, did the subject indeed perceive the target via ESP?

Or did the subject get the target by telepathically reading the mind of the person who selected it?

Or did the subject go out-of-body in order to perceive the target?

Or did the subject actually use clairvoyance, or perhaps remote viewing, or perhaps precognition of what the target would be, or perhaps some non-specific generic psychic ability such as Psi?

This somewhat amusing scenario is WELL WITHIN the actual experience of this writer, who acted as a research subject for almost eighteen years in dozens and dozens of different kinds of experiments.

In any event, IF a subject is successful in an experiment, then what seems to have happened is that the subject BECAME AWARE of the target - thus utilizing coordinated KINDS of awareness that otherwise are not active in those in whom, well, they are not active.

If the foregoing can be considered as relevant, the scope of the situation then becomes basically recognizable as a matter of inactive and active awarenesses systems at the individual level.

In the parapsychological sense, the subject who shows some success in experiments is demonstrating certain kinds of active awareness systems existing in addition to those particular awarnesses that are responsive to physical, tangible, IT-things.

Systems Tangible and Intangible

At this point, one might examine the existing and known definitions of SYSTEMS and thereafter assume that one has been sufficiently apprised about them.

However, modernist knowledge packages have established definitions for only a very few general categories of systems, and so it is to those categories that the known definitions apply.

This is to say that our definitions of systems apply to the general category of (1) IT-things that are not only identifiable as being tangible, but which (2) are also verifiable by tangible methods or via logic that utilizes the tangible as a starting point.

The definitions of SYSTEMS are therefore serviceable (and actually quite elegant) regarding the tangible. But they stop short of a number of phenomena that cannot be verified and mapped by methods regarding the tangible.

And so, before dealing with the existing definitions of systems, it is worthwhile looking at what those definitions do not encompass.

However, the reader is alerted to the fact that the pursuit requires entry into matters that have for some time and are presently suspended in various states of confusions typical of randomness - and this even at the highest scientific and philosophic levels.

This is then to say that discussing what is apparently involved might at first seem to add to the confusions rather than ameliorating them.

But before plunging on into various confusions in an effort to ce-confuse them, there is a fundamental aspect that one, if one wishes to do so, can carry in mind.

That fundamental aspect is this: IF awarenesses do exist, then it might logically seem that one of their basic functions would be to differentiate among this and that - DIFFERENTIATE meaning, of course, to recognize differences.

IT-Thing Differentiating

On average, when people refer to a human specimen, they are generally referring to the IT-thing that is named the bio-physical body.

Thus, there is first the bio-body - which then becomes dressed with name, background, various degrees of intelligence, occupation, profession, status, etc., and all of the other IT-identifiers that separate bodies into the final result - a personal individual, and which is indeed named "a person."

If the essential body is thought of in any other way, it is thought of as its parts - its heart, liver, skin, organs, all of which are IT-things as is the body Itself.

About the only reason that the internal organs are thought of as IT-things, and indeed, even thought about AT ALL, is that certain of them occasionally and ultimately malfunction and one has to go to doctor/hospital to have them taken care of.

But on the whole, the body is thought of as THE BODY, with special emphasis on its visible, but superficial, external appearance and condition. As such, each body is a separate one from all others, and so each body appears as "individual."

Getting a little deeper, the bio-physical body is thought of as a physical IT-thing, identified by the IT-thing adjective of "human."

But in thinking of the body as material and physical, the concept that the body is an animate life form somehow gets rather silkily slid by without hardly any notice - this with respect to modernist contexts, anyway.

One of the principal reasons for this is that modernist scientists have experienced a great failure rate with regard to:

1. Determining the actual constituents of the life force; and
2. How so-called inanimate matter manages to undergo a tremendous change-of-state into so- called organic matter.

What is called the physical bio-body is actually NOT composed of physical matter per se. Most exactly put, it is composed of physical inorganic matter somehow seized upon and literally drafted into those changes that end up as physical organic matter.

The modern sciences have so far failed to find any clue, much less explanations, as to how this significant change-of-state from inorganic to organic takes place, or even why it does.

This situation is, of course, quite embarrassing within the overviews of the modern sciences. And the best way to cover up this professional embarrassment is to avoid bringing it to broad attention.

The modern sciences are quite good at examining physical inorganic matter, largely because their underlying philosophy downloads from the self-limiting doctrines of philosophical materialism.

But even so, the materialistic sciences (together with their tremendous funding and enormous societal support) have become quite good within their philosophically imposed limitations.

IF, therefore, the life-force (that is closely associated with organic matter) was even in some minimal sense composed of matter, then the modern sciences would by now have discovered this and already have taken the embarrassing situation somewhat in hand.

The central problem regarding the incapacity of the materialistic sciences to get a grip on the life force and organic matter was that whatever is involved apparently consisted of intangible factors.

Here, then, is the old conflict between the VITALISTS (who were interested in the nature and constituents of the life-force), and the MATERIALISTS (who were interested in the nature and constituents of physical matter.)

Now, one subtle, and seldom recognized, factor of this old conflict needs to be brought into visibility.

Many cutting-edge scientists materialistic scientists capable of larger-picture thinking have never really denied the existence of the intangible per se.

The subtle problem focuses on the fact that the SYSTEMS of the intangible have not been located, identified, and categorized.

Thus, the concept of systems and systematizing would be crucial to any kind of science - because this leads to the possibility that maps of the systems and their interwoven phenomena could be made.

And indeed, one of the major definitions of so-called "anomalous phenomena" refers to the undoubted existence of phenomena which cannot be incorporated into any so-far known system that would thereby "explain" them.

Inorganic vs Organic

One of the fundamental issues that is apparently involved has to do with the unacknowledged problem that downloads from the inorganic-organic division itself.

This unacknowledged problem (one I've never found unambiguously stated) is that the inorganic matter within an organic animated life form is STILL INORGANIC at the level of atoms, the atoms that make up the ORGANIC life form.

Thus, the strict division between inorganic and organic is expressed simply as: Inorganic/ Organic

And it is upon this somewhat formulaic concept that the sciences can duly proceed and maintain their philosophic dignity.

This is to say that inorganic and organic concepts CAN be mounted upon and supported by the doctrines of philosophical materialism; i.e., that both inorganic/organic together and separately are composed of matter.

But with this, yet another inconvenient problem can be encountered - in that organic matter is associated with LIFE, where as inorganic matter is not.

But this is the same as saying that the completely NOT understood principles of LIFE do belong within the formula pointed out above. The inorganic/organic divisioning thus needs to be altered to something like:

Inorganic < > life < > organic

Hence, inorganic is life-force minus, so to speak, while organic is inorganic plus life-force.

Inorganic and Organic vis-a-vis

the Nature of Awrnesses

The purpose of dragging the reader through the foregoing has been to construct some kind of conceptual framework against which an important three-part hypothetical question can be posed regarding the problems of awarenesses:

(a) Do awarenesses belong to the minus-life inorganic?

(b) Do awarenesses belong to the plus-life organic?

(c) Do awarenesses belong to the life force or the life principle?

Systems vis-a-vis IT-Things Incorporated In Them

As a cognitive way of getting further into the topics of this and subsequent essays, it can be supposed, for hypothetical purposes, that things are parts of systems. However, if all attention goes to the parts, then the systemic factors might not ever be noticed.

There are two much over-quoted axiom along such lines, to wit:

(1) If one is in the forest one will see the trees in one's immediate proximity, but will not see the incorporative dimensions or the entire panorama of the forest itself (i.e., the forest's bigger picture.)

(2) If one is outside of the forest, on might see its overall panorama and dimensions, but not see the individual trees themselves.

The Systemic Nature of the Organic

At this point, it might seem that the discussions have meandered afar from the superpowers themselves.

But if for hypothetical considerations it can be thought that although the superpowers have IT-thing definitions, they may also have systemic functioning that has never hereto been attributed to them.

Even so, it would be clear that the superpowers are somehow mixed into, so to speak, the organic nature of the biomind organism.

The conventional definitions of ORGANIC are found in most dictionaries and encyclopedias, and so what is to follow cannot be taken as too off the wall.

If organic matter is composed of inorganic matter, then, as a fundamental simplicity, it would be understood that both are the same thing.

Strictly speaking, then, there is no absolute difference between organic and inorganic matter because both ARE the same thing. And one is therefore obliged to wonder why the term ORGANIC ever came into existence.

Those reasons are implicit in the standard definitions of the term itself.

ORGANIC: "Having systematic coordination of parts, i.e., organized; forming an integral element of a whole."

An ARCHAIC definition is usually given in most dictionaries, to wit: "Instrumental."

INSTRUMENTAL itself is defined as "serving as a means, agent, or tool."

In my trusty Webster's, one runs across the theory of ORGANICISM, and which is described as:

"A theory that life and living processes are the manifestation of an activity possible only because of the autonomous organization of the system rather than because of its individual components."

Well, even in modern times, it is difficult to view organicism as "a theory" since ipso facto evidence on behalf of its real existence is continuously present and even tangible.

The essential elements that stick out of these definitions are the concepts of "systematic," "instrumental," and "autonomous organization of the [instrumental] system."

My Webster's somehow fails to note that the "autonomous organization" IS "the system," or, that "the system" IS "the autonomous organization."

So, system and autonomous organization are the same thing, in some general fundamental sense, anyway.

These definitions don't help us very much with the inorganic-organic confusion - and

which was perpetuated before the invention of electron microscopes, and has not been corrected since.

The element of "system-organized" was accepted as a part of organic matter, but only in the sense that this was thought of as "organic molecules," not inorganic atoms.

It isn't too much to say that atoms were thought of IT-things, the famous inalterable and indestructible "basic building blocks" of matter.

However, since the advent of the electron microscopes, it has been understood that inorganic atoms are NOT "blocks," but highly organized formats of energies in the forms of waves and frequencies that are tight super-packages of varying kinds.

AND, the same electron microscopes revealed that the so-called organic molecules are composed of inorganic atoms. However, the reason for their conversions from inorganic into organic states is not yet revealed by the telescopes.

If the reader is now somewhat confused, not to worry - because indeed so is advancing physics, biology, and chemistry.

In any event, above the deeper level of atomistic confusions, the conventional definitions of inorganic and organic still hold some efficiency.

Thus, even if inorganic atoms are not "blocks" but super-compactions of waves and frequencies (i.e., energies), it is still admitted that the inorganic atoms possess factors "forming an integral element of a whole;" and, as well, "having systematic coordination of parts."

You see, these definitions DO apply to inorganic atoms, but, in essence, the same definitions belong more to the term "organic."

To now INCREASE the confusions already encountered above, the term INORGANIC is defined as "lacking structure, character, or vitality."

As it is, though, electron microscopes revealed that the inorganic does have structure, character, and compacted vitality.

For example, since the 1940s it became abundantly clear that atoms are super-structured and clearly do not lack "character" or "vitality." If that vitality is messed with or released, one is likely to be "atomized" by the released "vitality."

An additional definition for INORGANIC is: "Of, relating to, or dealt with by a branch of chemistry concerned with substances not usually classed as organic" - until, it might be added, the substances are drafted into organic usage.

Well, IF "organic" refers to "forming an integral element of a whole having systematic coordination of parts," and IF these same definitions can apply to inorganic "substance," then we no longer know what inorganic should mean or what organic does mean.

Here we have finally somewhat arrived at the confused nature of the "embarrassment" that does plague the modern sciences behind their placid contentment with materialistic interpretations of everything.

In other words, the distinctions between the inorganic and the organic are in somewhat of a mess.

Even so, while scientific comprehensions of the essential and intrinsic nature of organicism are a mess, it can be seen that the mess itself nevertheless proceeds with continuous reenactments of its SYSTEMS and its systemic nature.

This is to say that even if scientific and philosophic knowledge is a mess in this regard, what we refer to as "life-forms" continue to manifest systemically - and do so seemingly oblivious to the fact that the knowledge packages of the life-forms themselves are in a mess regarding whatever is involved.

Systems

SYSTEM (from the Greek SYSTEMA - to combine so as to cause to stand.)

In modernist English, SYSTEM is defined as:

1. "A regularly interacting of interdependent group of items forming a unified whole."
2. "A group of interacting bodies [or parts] under the influence of related forces."

To clarify: body + parts + systems = whole body.

But body-systemic + infra-systemic parts = whole body systems.

To clarify further: if the systems are deleted from the whole body, then it IS understood that it would promptly begin its fall to total system collapse and thence crash.

If the CONCEPT of whole-body systems is deleted from the CONCEPT of whole body, then the whole-body concept actually falls into wreckage with regard to anything approximating the fuller or more complete MEANING of the corpus carne incarnate.

If the concept of whole-body systems is not combined with the concept of whole-body + parts, THEN one WILL think in terms of whole-body only, or whole-body + parts.

But then one is very likely NOT to think in terms of systems.

It is via the above discussion that we can now enter into even more confusing extensions of the meanings involved.

Bi-body vs Bi-body Systems

We are left with the question of which comes first, the body or the body systems.

We are also reminded that the definition of ORGANIC includes the term SYSTEMATIC - i.e., "having systematic coordination of parts so as to form a integral element of a whole."

Hence the term ORGANISM:

1. "A complex structure of interdependent and subordinate elements [parts] whose relations and properties are largely determined by their function in the whole;"
2. "An individual constituted to carry on the activities of life by means of organs separate in function but mutually dependent."

HOWEVER, it might be noted that an organism is one because of its organization, and if this organization is not systemic, then it will neither be organized nor systemic.

All of the foregoing leads to a question that has to do with organs needed "to carry on the activities of life" - especially with regard to ourselves and our species entire.

One direct, if somewhat brutal, way of entering into considerations relevant to that question is to delete awareness systems from the list of those needed organs - and then to try to imagine what "activities of life" we could carry on with.

(To be continued...)

THE PROOF-PROCESS-APPLICATIONS ASPECTS

OF HUMAN SUPERPOWER RESEARCH

P A R T   O N E

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROCESS DISCOVERY

Ingo Swann [25Jan01]

A number of goals have existed within the fields of psychical and parapsychology research, and they are usually identified and researched as different topics - such as telepathy, clairvoyance, PK and so forth.

This division, however, tends to occlude the nature, substance, and goals of all RESEARCH per se.

If familiarity with what research is in general becomes vague or absent, then it is difficult to consider how research of the different topics stands up against the overall purpose and functions of research per se.

Most dictionaries define RESEARCH as: "Studious inquiry or examination, especially consisting of investigation or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of fact, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories of laws."

Intimately connected with this definition are three interconnected states of all research.

The first, or initial, state has to do with identifying proof, i.e., proof-discovery.

The subsequent state to proof-discovery is process-discovery, which refers to establishing what goes on within what has been proven as existing in fact.

The third state, applications-discovery, downloads from process-discovery, in that it is only after discovering the processes within something that practical applications can be innovated.

Thus, first there is proof, then discovery of process, after which applications become

possible.

For the sake of clarity and consistency, it is worthwhile reiterating the principal definition for PROOF that is given as: "The cogency of evidence that compels acceptance by the mind of a truth or a fact."

The term PROCESS has two working definitions: (1) something going on, and (2) a natural phenomenon marked by gradual changes that lead toward a particular result.

APPLICATION is defined as: (1) the act of putting to use, and (2) a capacity for practical use.

The connections between proof-process-applications are understood very well with regard to the physical sciences as developed in the modern era – so much so that if applications of something cannot be perceived, then it might not be submitted to research at all.

In this sense, researchers must not only plan on establishing proof, but must also be suggestive in advance of applications that could ultimately download from the proof.

The most obvious reason for suggesting applications is that it is the promise of them that attracts investment of support and requisite funding.

For completeness here, it is worth brushing up on the definitions of SCIENCE. There are a number of these, but they are mostly derived in connection with the following:

SCIENCE: "The acquisition of knowledge covering general truths or the operation of general laws, especially as obtained and tested by scientific methods." Although this definition is glamorous and alluring, it is just a tad ambiguous – because it, of course, refers to methods that are held as scientific by whomever at any given time.

In a realist kind of way, it needs to be accepted that scientific methods can, if only behind the scenes of science proper, be manipulated this way and that according to applications that are highly desired, or highly NOT desired.

Just beneath the official definition above, there is another one. This has to do with the proof-process-applications trinity, which, if fulfilled inclusive of the applications part, is most likely to be considered as the best science of all.

Indeed, in the small print of general research, the trinity is the most fundamental and meaningful definition of RESEARCH.

It can now be pointed up that the scope of this essay focuses on discussing human

superpower research with respect to the proof-process-applications trinity, rather than in the contexts of phenomena characterized as PSI.

The trinity has never been given wide exposure in PSI research overall. And so those interested in superpower development may not be familiar with how important it is, and what it can reveal.

In proceding through the following discussions, it will become clear that PSI research is not only top-heavy with proof-oriented research, but is possessed of a vacuum regarding the ultimate scientific clincher – applications.

OVERALL PSI RESEARCH – GLOSS AND FACT

The published documents and literature of the fields of psychical research and parapsychology can give the overall impression that their mutual work moves along in some ultimate kind of constructive way, with only a few research bumps here and there.

This impression, however, constitutes little more than superficial gloss – a deceptively attractive appearance or front - behind which exist various configurations of psycho-political warfare, disruptive agendas, and luxuriant overgrowths of pointless rough-and-tumble infighting characteristic of soap opera drama.

In fairness, it should be said that this kind of interior situation is not unique to psychical and parapsychology research. It also exists in any professional field involving potentials for achievement and status-making – and (surely not the least of it) acquisition of potential funding.

The importance of recognizing the existence of what is behind the superficial gloss is that meaningful issues can be downsized, marginalized, and cast into glooms of trenchant obfuscation.

Such issues will therefore NOT achieve very much that could be thought of as clear delineation. And so the existence of the issues will not be particularly well-established inside the status-making system - and certainly will disappear from view within the superficial gloss that is presented to the public.

The foibles interior to the fields of psychical and parapsychological research are fascinating enough, simply because of their enduring and endearing human nature soap opera characteristics.

But beneath the foibles inherent in the fields of PSI research is the three-part issue that is hardly ever distinguished as such.

Central to the issue is that PSI phenomena are human phenomena, the exact nature of which is unknown, but which psychical and parapsychological research propose to examine and study. However, like almost all human things, the phenomena are variable and transitory, and are thus far distant from physical phenomena that stand still enough to be examined in depth.

Nevertheless, as the first aspect of the issue in terms of PSI research, there needs to be proof that the phenomena do exist, even if transitory.

Beyond the mere existence of the phenomena is the second aspect having to do with discovering the processes via which the phenomena do manifest.

The third aspect descends out of the second – i.e., IF the processes that permit the manifestation of the phenomena are identified and isolated, there then arises the possibility that the phenomena could be enhanced with regard to potential applications.

Thus, the issue under discussion here has the three aspects of proof-oriented research, process-discovery research, and applications-discovery research.

The three aspects above, having now been separated and identified, seem logical and straight-forward as:

PROOF

PROCESS

APPLICATIONS

One would therefore think that all PSI research is basically conceptualized in ways that pertain to all three. Well, think again!

If the combined literature of PSI research is examined, it is possible to discover that the term "applications" is emphatically a no-no.

And if the term is occasionally utilized, a rather large volume of vigorous diatribe will commence and continue until the concept of applications is safely resubmerged in darkness.

If the mention of APPLICATIONS is, well, forbidden, then there is almost no incentive or justification for pursuing process-discovery research.

In the end, this leaves only proof-oriented research, which for the past nine or ten decades has generally been considered the primary and principal goal of PSI research.

Indeed, the idea of what proof IS carries within it the unquestioned assumptions not only of an impeccable logic, but a self-evident rectitude and an impeccable logic – especially in the modern scientific period, during which the idea that proof should precede all else, has become practically axiomatic.

The "proof" being referred to in this impeccable logic is, of course, SCIENTIFIC proof, and none other.

UNRECOGNIZED DIFFICULTIES SURROUND PROOF-ORIENTED RESEARCH OF PSI

In the context of the heading just above, it must be established that nothing in this essay, or in this Website, is meant to devalue or deny the utterly valuable nature of PROOF.

However, it is possible, sometimes even advisable, to examine the mechanisms via which proof is sought for and established.

This refers to the criteria and frames of reference being utilized as guidelines for researching, testing for, and establishing proof and disproof.

In turn, this implies that different criteria and frames of reference COULD be utilized to achieve different kinds of proof/disproof about the same thing.

To reiterate, this implies that the use of certain criteria could establish proof of something, while the use of other critera could establish disproof of the same something.

For perhaps overemphasis, the above observations imply that proof (or truth) is always relative to the criteria being utilized to establish it, and is the end of THAT story.

Now, as already mentioned above, during the onset of middle modern times (at about 1845), the idea had coalesced that scientific proof constituted the only real proof, and this idea had firmly locked in and gained large societal ascendancy by early 1880s.

The first attempts to organize and professionalize psychical research also developed in the early 1880s.

Since scientific proof was by that time the only acceptable proof-method around, the proof-oriented PSI researchers of the time (and thereafter) had to adapt to the ideas and criteria of scientific proof.

As it was, however, the sciences were exclusively and adamantly materialistic in essence,

nature, and signature, and their research and discovery processes were fully committed to the idea of proving that matter, and the "laws" of matter, were the fundamental and only explanation for the universe.

The early materialistic scientists were not complete idiots, of course, and so they could easily conclude, as they did, that psychical phenomena were not consistent with matter, and indeed disobeyed its "laws."

One of the outcomes of this was that a fundamental scientific definition of psychic and psychical phenomena was issued. This definition is largely forgotten today, but it is still found in most of the better dictionaries.

PSYCHIC: "Lying outside of the sphere of physical science or knowledge."

Furthermore, the early materialists were especially enthusiastic and warriorlike, and the more dense of them viewed that whatever DID lie outside the sphere of physical science or knowledge should legitimately be conceptualized not only as impossible, but also as a threat to the assumed authenticity of materialism.

A bit further down the ladder of stupidity were certain scientific materialists who did not seem to recognize that something that was impossible could not constitute the feared threat.

The situational sum of the foregoing was easily recognizable as of about 1885, and certainly by the turn of the century, and down until today as well.

Nevertheless, proof-oriented PSI researchers early on proposed to achieve scientific proof, and to strategically insert that proof into the heart and mind of science proper. This goal has consumed proof-oriented PSI researchers ever since.

The continuing up-shot of this strategy was, and still is, that it has NOT worked – even though PSI scientific researchers have accumulated much proof-like data that would quickly and automatically be accepted as such in other fields.

Science proper continues to resist acknowledging the proof-like data, the principal reason having to do not with the data, but with its implications.

A DEEPER STORY BEHIND THE SCIENCE/PSI CONFLICT

The foregoing is a brief sketch of the very large conflict drama between science proper and PSI researchers.

However, it serves to illuminate what at first appears to be the general gyst of that conflict, and

which can independently be recognized by others having an interest in doing so.

At first take, the general gyst seems to make sense, and so it is broadly assumed that it does. It is therefore difficult to think that it is nothing more than just another piece of gloss gotten up so as to direct attention away from a basic issue that has quite profound implications.

This issue has to do with PSI scientific proof that has been minimally, but certainly sufficiently, achieved within the basic criteria and frames of reference which science proper utilizes to determine proof – and which proof would automatically be accepted as such in any other field of endeavor.

The question, then, can be simply put: Why has the sufficient proof not automatically been accepted as such in science proper?

One part of an answer almost certainly has to do with a situation that has seldom been brought to light.

SCIENCE was formulated as PHYSICAL science, the primary directive of which was to conduct discovery into matter and all things physical.

The reason for doing this has do with the secondary scientific directive, which was widely enunciated in the past, especially in the so-called Age of Progress that started up in the latter years of the nineteenth century.

The second directive has to do with the idea that fuller and more extensive knowledge of matter would progressively bring the powers, possibilities, and forces of matter and its energies more and more under fuller human control.

This, as it was openly said in the Age of Progress, was to the "the benefit of everyone." Not as openly said, however, was that "more fuller under human control" also referred to those who controlled the control, and who thus benefitted more.

It is via the primary directive of science that we can see that science does have a science side, at least as matter and the material go.

But it is via the secondary directive that we can identify that science has a sociological side, and that the sociological side, in all probability, controls the control of the science side.

We can also see that progressive advances in SCIENCE will absolutely depend on the steps of proof-discovery, process-discovery, and applications-discovery.

With respect to CONTROL, however, it would be obvious that although it can interact with

proof and process, it principally refers to control of applications, largely because applications can be marketed and made profitable.

Here, then, is the kernel within the nut of science, and the seed in the kernel is control-discovery – for what use is anything if it cannot benefit and enhance control for human usage?

The point of dragging through the foregoing has been to illuminate the now more obvious fact that science is not JUST science, but is a system of inquiry that very intimately interfaces with the quaternity of proof-process-application-control.

This can be further elaborated upon by considering the following.

If proof is all if you have, then proof is only what you have. If, however, you have process-discovery, then you have the beginnings of potential applications. And if the applications come about, then humans (or some of them at least) can obtain control of the applications.

The general gyst of this is that proof-process-applications lead to control – and this has been quite clearly understood ever science "went" materialistic – and long before that as well.

ACHIEVING CONTROL vs THE LOSS OF CONTROL

The direct inverse implication of achieving control is that if something that could lead to proof-process-applications, but thereafter might elude or complicate control, then controllers might think it best NEVER to work toward or admit to proof of it.

As it happens, if research of certain PSI phenomena, such as telepathy, clairvoyance, and PK, were permitted to proceed through the proof, process, and enhanced applications stages, then serious complications regarding control would arise.

And THIS is quite well understood not only within the materialistic sciences, but within human control modules everywhere.

In the light of this, then, the essence conflict between science and PSI is not actually a scientific one at base, but a psycho-political one having to do with control.

In that sense, something that is usually forgotten must be pointed up. PSI phenomena are not abstract things in themselves, but are functions within human beings.

Many feel that telepathy, clairvoyance, and PK could constitute human blessings if enchanced beyond their rudimentary configurations. But others feel that, if enhanced, they would be invasive with regard to the average status quos of many control modules.

It also needs to be pointed up that matter cannot really fight back when brought under control, and so successful control is implicit with regard to material applications.

In the first echelon of their existence, telepathy, clairvoyance, and PK are innate human powers, and thus belong to humans, many of which are obstinate and take delight in fighting back – even sometimes just because there is nothing else to do.

If such would find assistance only via enhanced "invasive" telepathy, for example, then it is quite possible that physical control modules might find themselves disconcerted and stressed – symptoms of loss of control.

This is the same as saying that if PSI, especially enhanced process formats of it, ever got out of the box, then various physical control modules might begin meltdown.

 Here, then, is a rather basic issue, and it is of little wonder that it is surrounded by smoke and mirror tactics, as well as by mystification engineered into existence by clever kinds of spin doctorism.

The usage of the term PSI is, of course, abstract, vague, ambiguous, and therefore neutral, so much so that no one really comprehends what it refers to.

If the term PSI is replaced by the term SUPERPOWERS then what is really at issue becomes at least somewhat more visible, and the essential reason behind the PSI-science conflict also becomes a little more clarified. And it can also be seen why the term "applications" is seldom used in PSI research.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROCESS-DISCOVERY

Mere proof of something does not automatically lead to applications, because, after proof, it is then necessary to figure out what processes are involved with regard to what has been proven.

There is thus a large hiatus between proof and applications that can be filled-in only by discovering the nature of whatever processes are involved between proof and applications.

The filling-in will include not only identifying the processes, but also discovering what interferes with or prevents those processes from working, what enhances them, and how various associated processes do or do not mix together.

OVERALL PSI RESEARCH IN THE LIGHT OF THE PROOF-PROCESS-APPLICATIONS TRINITY

In the contexts of the heading above, here is a situation that is extensively complicated for a number of reasons.

As far as this writer knows, one of the major reasons has never been clearly described. It is associated with the desire of many PSI researchers to produce proof so that the field of PSI can be accepted into the fold of science proper.

Since proper science, in ITS inception, was held to be the science of the physical and the material, its overall substantive goal was twofold:

(1)   To inquire into the physical quaternity of matter, energy, space, and somewhat into the nature of time, and

(2)   To submit that quaternity to the proof-process-applications trinity so that what was discovered could be converted into applications.

The physical quaternity was held as being OBJECTIVE – which is to say, existing independent of mind and being observable and verifiable by scientific methods.

The objective is therefore "outside" of the mind, while the objective can be verified by scientific methods that are equally objective, i.e., equally independent and outside of the mind.

However, PSI phenomena, insofar as they are understood, are of the mind, and not independent of it. Further, they are human phenomena, as contrasted to matter, energy, space, and time phenomena that are objectively external to the human mind.

This is more or less the same as saying that what is objective and outside the mind does not produce PSI phenomena.

And it is therefore to be wondered WHY it can be thought that objective scientific methods can be used as critera to observe, verify, and prove the existence of mind phenomena.

If the foregoing reasoning is a little dizzy-making, not to worry. Proper scientists do understand it, and in their understanding, the PSYCHIC, whatever it is composed of, "lies outside the sphere of physical science or knowledge."

At this point, it is necessary to reiterate the formal and official definition of PARAPSYCHOLOGY, which is provided in the handbook entitled PARAPSYCHOLOGY: SOURCES OF INFORMATION (1973), compiled by Rhea A. White and Laura A. Dale under the auspices of the American Society for Psychical Research.

"Parapsychology (the modern and more restrictive term for psychical research) is the field

which uses the scientific method to investigate phenomena for which there appear to be no normal (that is, sensory) explanations."

The phenomena being referred to in this definition are listed as PK, telepathy, clairvoyance, and precognition. These are NOT products of those objective realities which the scientific method DOES measure and can be verified by objective experiment and testing.

It can therefore be wondered that if the PSI phenomena, as products of the mind, are submitted to the constraints and criteria of the physical-objective scientific method, what then can be observed, verified, and proven about the PSI phenomena.

In order to answer this, at least in some major part, it is worthwhile pointing up the formal definition of SCIENTIFIC METHOD: "Principles and procedures for the systematic pursuit of knowledge involving the recognition and formation of a problem, the collection of data through observation and experiment, and the formulation and testing of hypotheses."

This definition seems logical and, overall, inclusive enough, and would therefore seem to be applicable to everything. However, if the word "impartial" were integrated into it, the definition would then be inclusive of everything.

SCIENTIFIC METHOD: "Principles and procedures for the impartial and systematic pursuit of knowledge involving the recognition and formation of a problem, the impartial collection of data through observation, and the impartial formulation and testing of hypotheses."

However, SCIENCE and the SCIENCES are defined only in the context of objective physicality, and they are therefore partial to THOSE contexts only. The major criterion utilized within the sciences has to do with physicality, and only physicality - and so the major scientific criterion is not impartial with regard to kinds of phenomena that do not have a basis in objective physicality.

And indeed, as we have seen, the only scientific definition of PSYCHIC is given as "lying outside the sphere of the physical science and knowledge," and so the physical sciences do not actually have a definition for PSYCHIC, or for parapsychology, either.

Having been dragged so far through the foregoing, the reader by now might be wondering where these discussions are headed.

At one level, the discussions are headed toward examining, in proof-oriented contexts, whether human superpower phenomena of the mind, and not of physicality, can be submitted to systemic criteria utilized to prove physical phenomena but cannot be utilized to prove mind-phenomena.

In order to pursue THIS a bit farther, it is necessary to briefly point up one aspect of the definition of SCIENTIFIC METHOD: i.e., that part given as: "Principles and procedures for the systematic pursuit of knowledge."

This at first simply suggests that researchers organize THEIR pursuit in systematic ways. But more in fact, researchers have to end up organizing their pursuit in ways that are more or less identical to and reflective of the systems they are researching. This needs a little clarifying.

SYSTEM is defined as:

(1)   A regularly interacting or interdependent group of items forming a unified whole;

(2)   An assemblage of substances that is or tends to equilibrium;

(3)   A group of interacting bodies under the influence of related forces.

With regard to the proof-process-applications trinity, something can be proved to exist, but without also discovering why and how it works (i.e., discovering its process-systems), then one only has proof of existence, not proof of function, process, and systems. And until function-process-systems are discovered, there is usually no hint of applications.

Applications, therefore, become possible not because of proof of existence, but by knowledge of systems that can be organized into applications.

Furthermore, proof of existence alone doesn't actually contribute very much to knowledge, even with respect to objective physicality. For example, "laws" that govern the existence of anything cannot be identified simply because of proof of existence. The identification of laws descends out of identifying the systems within and between things.

Function, processes, and systems of any given thing are what they are, and so organized research has to end up building an intellectual "map" of those systems. This is to say that researchers cannot systematically impose their own ideas upon systems that are what they are.

"Systematic pursuit of knowledge" turns out to be not a matter of proof alone, but also a matter of process-systems discovery, which is far more important. It also must be mentioned that the MEANING of something cannot be identified merely by proof of its existence.

For example, proof-existence of telepathy tells us almost nothing about the meaning of telepathy, of and in itself, and certainly nothing about the meaning of telepathy with regard to its process-functions that certainly DO exist.

In some sort of final analysis here, proof of existence alone does not automatically lead to

applications, either in the light of the objective-physical, or in the light of the mind-mental.

Discovery of process-functions, however, can easily lead to applications – and discovery of applications is often the clincher with regard to proof of existence.

But there is yet ANOTHER factor that demarcates between physical and mind systems.

It is understood almost everywhere that the PSI-mind- superpowers transcend the known laws of physicality. That is, they transcend the known laws of matter, energy, space, and time, the laws that constitute the fundamental basement-realities of the physical sciences.

If something is known to transcend the physical laws, it is to be wondered why researchers of that something would attempt to establish proof of its existence within the criteria of the physical sciences.

Indeed, such researchers would fare better by attempting to discover proof of process-function and of the ultimate clincher, applications.

PROCESS-FUNCTION DISCOVERY IN PSYCHICAL AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH

As mentioned earlier, PSI research is top-heavy with proof-oriented research.

But it must be added here that through the twelve decades, since the formatting of organized PSI research, the goal of such efforts was to have PSI phenomena accepted as proven within the criteria of the physical sciences in general.

For clarity, this can be restated as: The goal of such efforts was to have PSI phenomena accepted as proven within the criteria of the physical sciences – NOT WITHIN THE CRITERIA of the PSI phenomena themselves.

One of the results of this is that the criteria that would be applicable to PSI in its own terms largely remain undiscovered.

This means that all we know about those phenomena are the names and terms assigned to them: telepathy, clairvoyance, PK, precognition, and the rather late entry called remote-viewing.

The top-heavy, proof-oriented aspect of PSI has received a good deal of limelight attention.

But the attention has come about because of rather silly sensationalizing of the conflict between the physical sciences and PSI research – and not because anything was proven to

general acceptance within the larger panorama of all things scientific.

And it is because of this that the existence in PSI research of process-function-discvery has been forced to the sidelines and minimalized.

In order to achieve a better picture of this, it is possible to divide the whole of PSI research since 1882 until the present into four general categories:

(1)   Proof-oriented research.

(2)   Process-discovery research.

(3)   Applications-discovery research.

(4)   Control discovery research.

If the entire history of PSI research is reviewed in some depth and detail since 1882, we are obliged to take note of the contextual separation of psychical research and parapsychology that principally came about circa 1935 to the present.

If we do this, then we can assign a very general and approximate percentile to each of the 1-4 research activities designated above.

(1)   Proof-oriented research:

1882 – 20 percent.

1935 – 80 percent.

(2)   Process-discovery research:

1882 – 90 percent.

1935 – 10 percent.

(3)   Applications-discovery research:

1882 – perhaps 10 percent.

1935 – perhaps 1 percent.

(4)   Control-discovery research.

1882 – 15 percent give or take.

1935 – virtually none until circa 1976.

From the admittedly general percentile estimates given above, it is possible to see that many psychical researchers did interest themselves in process-discovery research.

It is indeed on record that they accepted, without feeling obliged to prove it, the existence of, say, clairvoyance and telepathy, and then set about attempting to discover whatever they might about the inner processes, functions, and systems.

However, their work and reports of it, were generally retired into historical dustbins, one important reason being the advent in 1914 of World War I - which lasted five years until late 1918 and was of such a cultural magnitude as to stultify the continuance of more organized psychical research through the 1920s.

The advent of parapsychology occurred circa 1935 in the United States. Whereas the early process-discovery researchers in England, Europe, Russia, and the United States attempted to discover the nature of PSI within its own criteria, American parapsychology exclusively shifted over to proof-oriented research in terms of acceptance within science itself.

Somewhere within the whole of this history, the term APPLICATIONS became anathema – and certainly so within the later parapsychology format of PSI research.

*

One of the purposes central to this essay has been to bring to light that the superpowers of the human biomind can be additionally conceptualized in ways other than the mere nomenclature terms of telepathy, clairvoyance, PK, and etc.

Indeed, they can be conceptualized as powers of mind involving process-oriented and applications-oriented research – any successful outcome of which would automatically be accepted as proof positive.

TO BE CONTINUED AS PART 2

PROCESS-ORIENTED RESEARCH FOR POWERS OF MIND