
REMOTEVIEWING

One Of The Human Superpowers Of Biomind

* * *

PLACING REMOTE VIEWING INTO A LARGER CONTEXT IN ORDER TO COMPREHEND WHAT IT IS

* * *

[A Series of Eight Mini-Essays]

Ingo Swann

07Jan96

Introduction

I have earlier entered into the Net for free access, a number of topics having to do with remote viewing. All of those topics so far have involved situational and anecdotal information. More of the same will follow them in the months ahead.

But beyond situational and anecdotal materials, remote viewing is accompanied by SUBSTANTIVE and TECHNICAL matters that pertain to why and how remote viewing exists, and "works."

The substantive and technical matters have been compiled through the years, and in some instances are the joint product of myself and Dr. H. E. Puthoff, working as a team to compare concepts and ideas and then test them. We often benefited from consultation with a large number of scientists, psychologists and other specialists.

I offer the following eight substantive categories for consideration...

1. Remote viewing and its conceptual nomenclature problems
2. Remote viewing as one of the Sidhis

...to be provided in the near future....

3. Remote viewing and sensory transducers
4. Remote viewing and mental information grids
5. Remote viewing and human superpowers of mind
6. Remote viewing in the Twentieth Century
7. Remote viewing and Twentieth Century skeptics and debunkers
8. Projecting remote viewing into the Twenty-first Century

These substantive and technical matters have not been made public during the twenty years remote viewing was considered a developmental asset to the intelligence community.

However, now that the CIA is occupying itself with minimalizing and disowning remote viewing, there is no longer any reason to keep the substantive and technical matters from public view. In any event, all substantive and technical matters have always remained unclassified and proprietary to me as stated in my working contracts as a consultant with Stanford Research Institute and the Psychoenergetics Project established there by Dr. Puthoff.

* * *

What remote viewing consists of is a fairly complex matter that is not easily reduced to simplistic or familiar stereotype concepts. Very few have inspected the long history of remote viewing among our species. Very few have seen or studied high-quality examples of it.

A literature devoted exclusively to remote viewing does not exist, except in some piecemeal ways. Most people, including proponents and antagonists, will consider remote viewing from within what they already know --- or more precisely put, within the LIMITS of what they already know.

If it is considered that the knowledge each individual has basically consists of frames of reference, then the question does arise regarding what those frames do or do not consist of. In individuals, frames of reference may either be adequate or inadequate, precise or imprecise, present or missing. Since no adequate frames of reference regarding remote viewing have ever been constructed, individuals who chance to encounter some aspect of remote viewing naturally will attempt to process its meaning through their existing frames of reference.

* * *

In this regard, it is fair and even just to mention that most people believe the frames of reference they do

possess are sufficient to process any information they encounter --- no matter how unfamiliar or even alien that information might be to them.

But it would be obvious that unfamiliar information processed through inadequate frames of reference (inadequate information grids) results in, well, to put it simply, results in a mess or a quagmire of confused information and strange opinions.

* * *

The basic purpose of these eight mini-essays is to contribute to the construction of a proper frame of reference regarding remote viewing --- a frame of reference that does not exist as of this writing.

Unfortunately, this proper frame of reference cannot be constructed within the present limits of the kinds and categories of knowledge typical of the modern West. The construction will require novel and unfamiliar analogies and metaphors.

I will present the necessary information in step-by-step ways, and will attempt to be as clear and concise as possible. But I will not be participating in reductionism back into frames of reference that are not adequate in the first place. I will sometimes say the same thing in different ways so as to try to accommodate a wider scope of integration of the new information.

* * *

But in essence I will be painting a new picture --- a LARGER new picture which will not become completely visible until it is finished.

The elements of this new picture cannot be reduced back into existing frames of reference, back into existing "realities" --- because if this were possible, then the necessary picture would already exist. It does not exist. But the basic rudiments of it will exist by the end of these small essays.

* * *

You may, therefore, wish to read these essays more than once. For, even by the second reading the general outlines of the picture will have become more intelligible, and its separate element more fitting. As it stands as of this writing, the bigger picture of remote viewing is not intelligible --- even to many of those who accept its existence.

The First Central Issue

There is one central issue that must be considered ahead of remote viewing, and which is a subsidiary topic to the central issue.

This is whether our species possesses what, for lack of a better concept, might be called superpowers of mind -- of which remote viewing would be one.

Without an answer in the positive to this central question, then remote viewing will never either make sense or find a fitted place within the overall image of our species.

It is generally accepted that our species possesses powers of mind. But it is also understood that how these are identified and treated, depends on social criteria and values, and then upon individual frames of reference based on those criteria and values.

Social criteria and values also tend to establish the contours of behavioral norms, while the same criteria and values also have something to do with which formats of knowledge are accepted, or rejected.

Individuals wishing to fit into the social criteria and values are more or less required to adapt to the accepted frames of reference and dis-adapt from the rejected ones.

If this discretionary process is successful enough, then the individual is accepted as fitted into the contours of the behavioral norms, and especially into the frames of reference that characterize their peer groupings.

* * *

The distinction in the West between so-called normal powers of mind and superpowers of mind is largely a sociological artifact arising out of the dominant frames of reference of the Modern Age --- which began in the mid-1800s, but which is thought to be majorly representative of the Twentieth Century.

As has been stated in many other sources, the modernist frames of reference were derived from the philosophy of scientific materialism. Within the auspices of that philosophy, those human powers of mind that seemed to disobey the laws of matter were shaved off the central frames and relegated to the "impossible."

Thus arose the double notion of normal powers of mind, and that category of mind powers that were dubbed "paranormal" and excluded from the mainline frames of reference. Most pre-modern societies did not make this two-fold distinction and otherwise saw the superpowers as extensions of the usual ones.

* * *

As many post-modern researchers have realized, this distinction worked to prevent the fuller spectrum of human powers of mind from being adequately mapped.

And it is increasingly being accepted that critics and skeptics of the superpowers are utilizing out-dated

and limited frames of reference.

This growing realization has spawned the effort to map the fuller spectrum of human powers of mind. This effort has become revitalized as will be discussed in the last essay of this series.

* * *

In any event, each reader of these essays will have to decide whether or not our species possesses superpowers of mind. This is "the" central issue.

The Second Central Issue

The second central issue is more easily (and CLEARLY) stated. There is nothing wrong with attempting to research our species' superpowers of mind --- any more than there is anything wrong with attempting to research anything.

Indeed, while the Twentieth Century failed in so many other things, it succeeded in establishing one glory --- organized research --- and research can easily be seen as one of the hallmarks of the human mind in all its aspects.

Research of the superpowers, if permitted and pursued, will answer many things pro or con. And such research will surely remodel the earlier inadequate frames of reference --- even those of parapsychology already known to be inadequate. Condemnation of the superpowers before the facts of researching them constitutes one of the failures of the Twentieth Century.

Unless one is of the opinion that we already know all there is to know about the powers of the mind, then the Modern Age exclusion of the superpowers from research doubtlessly will be rectified by exploring and researching them. Such research of the superpowers though, cannot take place based on earlier inadequate frames of reference that excluded such research. For one thing, those frames prevent the right questions from being discovered.

One of the most correct questions is whether our species does indeed possess superpowers of mind.

Now, all this having been said, we'll begin diving into the intricacies of what follows.

Remote Viewing and Its Larger Picture

In our present modernist culture, remote viewing is considered an "inexplicable phenomenon," rather than as evidence of one of the human superpowers of mind.

All things take on greater luminosity and comprehension when they are considered within the larger

contexts in which they are embedded. If something is isolated or alienated from those larger contexts, then fuller comprehension of its substance and meaning is denied it.

Remote viewing is no exception. It is a phenomenology of mind that bears extensive relationship to a number of larger contexts. But it has been dis-embedded from the larger contexts applicable to it.

Thus remote viewing seems a singular thing... something really far out on the fringes where it has no apparent relationship to anything else. It especially seems alien to most frames of reference (mindsets) and modern philosophies characteristic of the Twentieth Century. And so it is within the limitations of those mindsets and philosophies that the existence and possibilities of remote viewing are challenged and sometimes mocked.

Yet, however one might choose to consider remote viewing, it is nonetheless one of the human superpowers of mind... and this is the first and the greatest context within which it should be considered. Perhaps the only context.

* * *

Under other names, remote viewing and other superpowers of mind have been noted from time immemorial, while elements of it have manifested in most pre-modern cultures. And since this has continuously been so, remote viewing is a species thing, as it were --- a power inherent in our species.

This clearly implies that all born humans are carriers of the superpowers and their potentials --- in much the same way that all born humans are carriers of the human gene pool. Since this is so, it would be expected that elements of the superpowers will manifest in given individuals down through the generations.

What different societies and mindsets do with, or about the human superpowers of mind, is a separate issue. There should be no conflict regarding the existence of the human superpowers of mind. But there can be conflict regarding how they are culturally and socially treated. This treatment has ranged from supportive tolerance to destructive intolerance, and even down to woeful persecution of the most obvious carriers of the powers.

* * *

Statement of Three Essential Problems

PROBLEM 1

Under other nomenclature, remote viewing is one of the human superpowers of Biomind whose existence is quite well-noted in transcultural lore and historical documents of the last 5,000 years. The proper context then, for examining and discussing it, lies within the parameters of all human

superpowers of Biomind.

This context is very large, and it clearly includes more than just remote viewing. The chief problem here is that the larger parameters have never been identified very well and so, important elements of the bigger picture are lacking. This lack leaves the larger contexts untreated, and so many are unaware of them and naturally seek to reduce ideas of remote viewing into their personal realities and educational backgrounds.

PROBLEM 2

It might be thought that Problem 1 can easily be remedied by submitting it to discussion and examination. As it happens, though, English and the Romance languages don't contain nomenclature either sufficient or precise enough to do so.

Nomenclature is largely derived from concepts, but in the case of Problem 1, the relevant concepts have never really been identified. For example, "telepathy" and "intuition" are both elements of human superpowers of mind. But some thirty types of telepathy can be listed, and about two dozen regarding intuition. Yet we persist, in English, in utilizing only the two terms.

Precision of concepts is therefore lacking, and this accounts for the missing nomenclature. To paraphrase Dr. Jean Houston, if the only tool you have is a hammer, you will treat everything like a nail. We use only the two terms as hammers to deal with very refined matters which need precision "brain surgery" tools.

PROBLEM 3

The human Biomind organism uses information processes to establish not only concepts of reality, but also awareness of human functioning. The processes of awareness of human Biomind functioning have not been identified very well, and nomenclature appropriate for what has not been identified has not evolved. And so, not only is conceptual nomenclature missing, but the missing contextual knowledge precludes adequate consideration of the true extent of the Biomind's information processes.

It is accepted that we cannot speak intelligently about that which we don't understand, about that which we know nothing about. We don't know very much about the human superpowers. This lack of, or abyss, is an empty gap in our knowledge of the true extent of Biomind functions.

As we will see in the fourth essay ahead, Problem 3 is partially remedied by introducing the concept of "information processing grids." The human Biomind can be described as a recombinant analog mechanism capable of assimilating, processing, comparing and recombining enormous amounts of information.

The term "grid" refers to "grating"... an inter-networking system. It is technically defined as "a network of uniformly-spaced horizontal and perpendicular lines for locating points of information by means of coordinates." That the human Biomind functions in grid-like ways will not be unfamiliar to biocyberneticists or information theorists --- but will be unfamiliar to those who utilize other models of Biomind functioning.

It can fairly be said that some of the "points of information" refer to concepts and relevant nomenclature utilized by individuals and which are needed to process information and which result in understanding it. However, the absence of certain concepts and nomenclature equates to missing links within the individual's information grids.

This simply means that the individual cannot precisely or adequately process information for which points in their grids are missing. Such information will seem alien to them -- and probably arouse internal mind "conflicts" within whatever the individual IS utilizing as information processing grids.

The reason for the internal conflicts is obvious. The "new" information cannot properly be fitted into the existing information processing grids. As will be discussed ahead, some individuals may seek to externalize the conflicts, rather than work toward enlarging and extending the capacities of their information processing grids.

Combining the Three Basic Problems

When the three basic problems outlined above are combined, a larger interlocking problem emerges, and which larger problem is the central substance of these mini-essays. But the basic meaning of the combined problem is that remote viewing can't be understood by information processing grids not equipped with appropriate and expansive concepts and the nomenclature needed to flesh out those concepts.

The "work" of the following mini-essays is to attempt to provide certain cognitive rudiments that allow the construction of information processing grids needed for the comprehension of remote viewing.

It is completely accepted that unless something is understood, then no one can make it work for them. It is also understood that if one is utilizing the wrong models or precedents in order to understand something, then all that emerges is conflict and confusion.

(End of Introduction)

REMOTEVIEWING

One Of The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

REMOTE VIEWING AND ITS CONCEPTUAL NOMENCLATURE PROBLEMS

Ingo Swann

09Jan96

Part One

Three general problems regarding remote viewing were pointed up in the introductory materials of these essays:

- (1) remote viewing as a human superpower of mind;
- (2) lack of adequate concepts and nomenclature by which this superpower can be discussed and comprehended and;
- (3) lack of appropriate mental information grids needed by the recombinant analog mind to cognitively process the necessary experiential information.

*

As a term, "remote viewing" emerged in 1971 and was at first quite obscure. It achieved luminosity when the intelligence community took a long-term interest in what it referred to. Since then remote viewing has been thought of in different ways, depending on whose thinking was involved.

It is to be understood that different people think of things in different ways. There is no real way to prevent this --- and in fact it should --not-- be prevented. For the ability to arrive at different conclusions is very important to the progress and achievements of the human species.

However, what kind of information, and what amount of it, different people utilize to arrive at

conclusions --is- - or should be a matter of concern and interest not only to others but to themselves. It is well known that the use of erroneous or inadequate information results in conclusions of the same kind.

*

A proper working definition of remote viewing will be presented ahead --after-- certain information points have been established. The proper working definition more or less prevailed in the intelligence community up until about 1988.

Outside of the intelligence community, though, between 1974 and 1988, no consistent definition of remote viewing has prevailed or been subscribed to. At about 1980, the term began being popularly utilized as a descriptor for random affairs which might not be remote viewing. Many have most incorrectly used it as a replacement term for "psychic."

As contrasted to the various popular ideas which might be applied to it, a precise technical definition (or descriptor) for remote viewing does exist. But it is a complicated one in that remote viewing is --not-- a singular thing in itself, but a compounded series of awareness-dynamic processes.

*

Experience has shown that English-speaking people have difficulty in combining two different words with a hyphen in order to approximate a concept for which English has no singular word. German and other languages, however, have this capability, and their speakers are used to stringing words together without hyphens in order to get at some special concept.

Remote viewing must be discussed in --its own contexts,-- not within those hampered by terminological and conceptual inadequacies. To get around those inadequacies it is useful to combine two common English words to produce a combined and new meaning.

*

"Dynamic" essentially means "active." "Aware" means "having or showing perception, realization, or knowledge." Realization, perception and knowledge are usually considered somewhat passive states. So the term "dynamic" needs to be associated with "awareness" in order to get at the needed --active-- potentials.

Generally speaking, remote viewing is a form of active perception and realization as contrasted to their usual states as passive reception or passive experiencing. If you have trouble conceptualizing dynamic-awareness experiencing, just remind yourself of sexual arousal, music participating, or encountering a beautiful thing.

In order to figuratively get at this combined but unfamiliar meaning even better, we will utilize an unusual analogy.

Since about 1990 or earlier, the computer subculture began giving special neo meanings to the term -- WIRED--. Loosely defined, the neo term refers to how the mind- awareness of a person is "wired" regarding active states of cognition and subsequent activity based on them.

"Wired" then approximates dynamic awareness as contrasted to being passively aware. It also refers to "nets" or "grids" which consist of interactive "wiring" and "terminals." It also refers to being active ("hot") rather than passive ("unwired"), more or less in the same way as a system becomes active by being electrified or fed energy ("turned on").

In a certain sense, then, --dynamic-awareness- - means "being hot wired." An earlier term from the 1950s --- being "with it" --- meant approximately the same thing.

*

In this sense, then, remote viewing is a form of being wired in the neo sense of that word. The younger, computer savvy "hot" generations who utilize it in that context probably will most easily comprehend what remote viewing actually is:

- a special active form of awareness wirework netting;
- or a "being wired" format;
- or being wired into or hooked up into "multiple terminals" or multiple "wired grids;"
- or being wired into different levels or strata of Biomind information processes.

As we will see below, mental information grids are forms of wiring that can be "hot," crosswired, or obsolete. One can also be "dead" wired, or wired in closed-circuited ways.

*

The younger computer-wired generations clearly think of the human mind as a computer which itself can be up-linked into other computers --- and the whole of which becomes a systemic net or grid of information-carrying processes.

The same system can exchange, up-load and down- load information --- providing one can work or "hack" the system by having access to pertinent addresses behind which various kinds of information are stored and available.

This is actually a technological form of "remote viewing," and is almost an exact metaphor for Biomind remote viewing.

*

The definitions of these neo terms are not the principle issue here. But the concepts behind them are.

Remote viewing is a form of "hacking" the information-bearing terminals of our species bio- mind - -- which itself is a very impressive and sophisticated "net." Each born individual is not only a "terminal" in that net, but carries within itself a replica of it.

In this sense, then, each born human is a reproduction down-loaded from the species Biomind net. In this context, each born human in essence is an issued-forth -- extension-terminal-- of the larger Biomind net.

This analogy is clearly compatible with the known fact that each born human is a reproduced, down-loaded extension of the species larger genetic pool.

*

These analogies and metaphors might be somewhat creaky to begin with since we don't usually think of the mind as a Biomind, and otherwise tend to think of it as entirely separate, self-contained and an extension of nothing except its individual self. On the other hand, we do think of our individual genetic bodies as extensions of the genetic pool as carried down and distributed through genetic lineages.

We can get around the creakiness by accepting that when a genetic babe is born physically, the elements of bio- mind are --also-- born with it. Not only is the physical bio- body born but a mind is also born. The bio-body and its mind are inseparable. And so we just as well think in terms of Biomind.

Geneticists now can show that about 98.5 per cent of our species genetic elements are identical and universal in everyone --- and that only about 2.5 per cent account for --all- - differences no matter what they are.

It should therefore follow that about the same statistical distribution refers to the Biomind born at the same time the body is. In other words, about 98.5 per cent of our Biomind endowment is identical and universal in everyone.

In other words, all of us are more the same than we are different. That we give overwhelming attention to our perceived differences gives rise to much of the human drama. But beneath and behind that drama other perpetual factors are at work.

*

If we accept that about 98.5 percent of our bio- mind endowment is universal in everyone, it shouldn't take much imagination to envision that this greater endowment constitutes the Biomind "hard drive" --- much in the same way that the 98.5 percent of our genetic makeup provides the physical "hard drive" for all our bodily functions.

And indeed, if we utilize the computer-model as something akin to the computerlike functioning of the biomind we are almost required to introduce the term "hard drive." All "terminals" must have access to a hard drive in order to function at all.

*

The reason for the above discourse is that it can be demonstrated that the basis of remote viewing is found in the biomind's hard drive. All reproduced genetic biomind downloads (i.e. you, me, everyone) possess the hard drive rudiments for remote viewing (and other superpowers of mind as well.)

All biomind hard drives are relatively similar. Therefore the basis for remote viewing is universal within each of us --- and which is THE reason elements of remote viewing manifest down through the generations.

The only thing that gets in the way of our becoming "wired" into these hard drive rudiments, are installed mental software programs which abort cognitive access to them. This will become more clear ahead.

*

If credence can be given to any of the above, then it becomes clear why the entire nomenclature of parapsychology and psychical research is inadequate --- and why the cultural West in general has never evolved terms that are adequate or appropriate.

The worst term of all is "psychic." No stable definition has ever been established for it, and there are great hazards in attempting to utilize a term which has not much in the way of an agreed- upon definition. Supporters do assume that it refers to extraordinary, non-normal (paranormal) activities of mind. But skeptics assume it refers to illusion, derangement and a variety of non- normal or abnormal clinical psychopathologies.

*

As will be discussed ahead, that the concept of "normalcy" should have been used as the central focus for modern mind research, is one of the greatest flaws of the Twentieth Century.

But here it can be stated that what is perceived as "normal" anywhere or at any given time is completely and only relative to social circumstances. And our history shows that social relativity has very little to do with the true extent of our species Biomind hard drive capabilities. Social relativity is always a situation regarding software information programs installed into the hard drive. Such software programs come and go at a great rate. The bio- mind's hard drive stays mostly the same.

That true extent of the biomind's capabilities will never anywhere be identified from within local normalcy venues. All of these must be transcended in order to get fairly at the species biomind faculties

and capabilities.

REMOTEVIEWING

One Of The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

REMOTE VIEWING AS ONE OF THE SIDHIS

Ingo Swann (10Jan96)

Part Two

One of the earliest sources which refers to remote viewing --faculties-- is found in the Yoga teachings of ancient India, with echoes of them throughout the Far East.

There are also elements to be found in most early pre-Modern cultures in lower Africa, Egypt, Babylon, Scandinavia, among the Amerindians, among the ancient traditions of the Bushmen of Australia, in early Greece, among Siberian and Persian shamans, and among the Polynesian Islanders, including Hawaii. Elements of remote viewing were also found in early Europe before the Inquisitions of the Middle Ages. And elements of remote viewing again emerged early in the eighteenth through and into the twentieth centuries.

*

The hypothesis now to be considered is this: if the fundamentals of remote viewing exist within the hard drive of our species' Biomind then it is to be expected that elements of it WILL manifest. Indeed, such elements have manifested in the past, in the present, and will continue to do so into the indeterminate future. The formats of the manifesting may be different, but the essential nature of what does manifest is the same.

*

The terms used among these many older cultures are very many. But in English the general concept can be adequately rendered as "distant-seeing" --- a hyphenated term not too difficult to deal with.

We need only combine "dynamic-awareness" (of) "distant-seeing" to get the general drift of what is meant. For unless distant- seeing is expressed via dynamic awareness, then its fundamentals will remain latent and invisible within the hard drive of each human specimen's Biomind.

The historical background for the existence of distant-seeing is quite extensive. But in large part it has been bowdlerized (or "bleeped") from conventional modern history texts utilized by science and academe. Thus the general public is unaware that distant-seeing possesses a vital and substantial history.

*

In most of the cultures the elements that equate to distant-seeing were passed down through the generations by word of mouth -- not in writing.

The ancient Yoga texts differ in this regard. For there is evidence that the methods for developing distant-seeing were in some kind of brief written form perhaps from about 2,000 BC or even earlier. Who the peoples were, though, is in question --- excepting that they probably were not the Hindus of historical times.

Those earlier texts are lost, however, but versions of them were compiled, lost, and compiled anew from about the sixth century BC. In those and later texts, distant-seeing is listed among the numerous "Sidhis."

*

Here is a term that is very difficult to render into English. It won't do to say that a "sidhi" is a psychic power because the modern connotations of "psychic" are neither appropriate nor exact enough.

The ancient Hindu Yoga texts that consider the sidhis are in Sanskrit. This is an extremely elegant language and far surpasses the Western romance languages and English in containing terms having to do with faculties and functions of the mind. It often takes a long English paragraph to give approximate English definition to a single Sanskrit term.

Furthermore, most past efforts to translate into English the Sanskrit Yoga texts range from incompetent, to awful, to useless. This is probably not the direct fault of the translators, but due to lack of frames of reference in the English language.

But two additional problems are that contemporary Sanskrit speakers no longer comprehend what the sidhis are except in a general way. English translators themselves have no real idea. So the English translators select what appears to be the nearest English equivalent. The "sidhis" thus are equated to psychic powers.

But there is a problem here, too, in that the term "psychic" has never achieved a good or stable definition in English.

*

It has been important to the substantive and technical concepts of remote viewing to reconstruct what may originally have been meant by "sidhis," especially the one having to do with distant-seeing. Such a reconstruction is summarized below.

I accept that the reconstruction may be argumentative for a number of reasons --- one of which is that scholars tend to be an argumentative lot to begin with. Whatever the sidhis were in the distant past, they have since taken on legendary status. Scholars therefore deal with them as legendary --- and not as direct participants in the dynamic-awareness phenomena involved.

In what follows I am not at all saying that "controlled remote viewing" as researched and developed at Stanford Research Institute during the 1970s and early 1980s, is the exact same as the distant-seeing sidhi of the Yoga texts. But the working assumption can easily hold that similar mind- dynamic fundamentals are involved in both the sidhi format and the contemporary remote viewing format.

Both formats have one distinct attribute in common, however. It is generally accepted among scholars that a sidhi was NOT merely a spontaneous manifestation of a superpower of mind.

This is clear from the fact that such spontaneous manifestations are separately mentioned in the Yoga texts. In other words, the sidhis were not spontaneous forms of psi. The sidhis therefore cannot be equated with the spontaneous and randomly present forms of psi which have been the topics of modern psychical and parapsychological research.

The evidence is very good that the sidhis were controlled AND enhanced forms of what we would call psi, whose potentials are universally present throughout our species.

In any event, we must distinguish between a POTENTIAL that can emerge spontaneously or temporarily, and a developed ABILITY that is under cognitive control. And it seems likely that the developers of the sidhis did so as well.

It may be that the Yogins saw the potential for the superpowers as an innate manifestation of the Biomind hard drive -- to which I have already referred to in speculation.

But it is quite possible that the ancient Sanskrit- speaking people saw the natural and spontaneous presence of superpowers of mind as the BASIS to build upon and perfect into highly organized functioning. When this building was accomplished, the result was called The Sidhis --- i.e., the spontaneous superpower was brought into a cognitive and controlled state.

*

The CONTROLLED format of remote viewing emerged from similar considerations. If it were not for this I would probably hesitate to connect controlled remote viewing to the ancient sidhi of distant-seeing.

The following might be somewhat difficult to cope with, even though I try to be as clear and succinct as

possible.

*

In the ancient Yoga traditions, the functional basis of the sidhis belonged to the human species and elements of them were to be found in every human.

Whether or not the ancient Yogins distinguished between mind and body becomes more uncertain the deeper one goes into the Yoga materials. The strong modern distinction between body and mind as separate and different things appears not to have extensively existed until about 1850.

We can roughly speak of the sidhis as superpowers of mind-body that extend beyond the local limits of the physical senses, but which senses were VERY NUMEROUS in the ancient Yoga frames of reference. So there is a danger here because the Yoga traditions held that the PHYSICAL senses themselves, were, in fact, very extensive IF they were honed and "perfected."

It is important to establish that the Yoga traditions did not distinguish between physical, mental functioning and superpowers in the way the modern West has done. How they did distinguish these is not clear.

But the traditions emphasized unity of the whole rather than breaking it apart into separate functions --- and which breaking apart would have brought about imbalances within the whole.

In the Yoga traditions, these three categories were not, and SHOULD NOT BE, separated and divided. All of them were integral parts of the human organism which contained all them interdependently.

*

The modern concept that has long prevailed held that the Biomind human organism possessed only five limited physical senses, and that how much we perceive is constrained within their limits.

The question is now pertinent whether there are more than five physical senses. To save time and space here, I now refer you to "Deciphering the Senses: The Expanding World of Human Perception" by Robert Rivlin and Karen Gravelle (Simon and Schuster, 1984). This book reports on SEVENTEEN physical senses identified by bio-neurologists during the 1970s. And the book's last chapter considers "Extra-Sensory Perception" not particularly as a paranormal or "psychic" thing, but as extensions of the bio-body's very many sensory receptors.

*

The historical evidence is very good that the ancient Yogins taught that the abundantly-more-than- five physical senses could, by practice, be so perfected as to achieve many hundreds of highly specialized senses.

The distinction between the perfected MANIFOLD physical senses and the superpower sidhis is thus very narrow -- because a highly-developed physical sense might indeed be a sidhi. All highly-skilled martial arts persons will immediately understand what is meant here.

*

In the ancient Yoga traditions, the sidhis are part and parcel of the whole human organism and its manifold senses that could be honed and perfected. But if we consider that the Yogins taught Biomind holism, it then becomes curious why they singled out the sidhis for special discourse.

There are between seven and twenty sidhis depending on which source is consulted, and distant- seeing is always one of them. Yet the Sanskrit texts comment on certain clearly PHYSICAL senses that can be perfected so as to function as "distant senses" -- such as sensing magnetic directions. This we might think of as a mind superpower but it was not considered a sidhi.

There may be several explanations why the ancient Yogins particularly identified the sidhis from among the many other extended senses. But one explanation is that the sidhis probably would not have been specially commented upon and identified unless there was an essential difference regarding them that needed to be comprehended.

*

Something now depends on what a "sidhi" is. This is quite complex and opinions have certainly differed through the ages, among scholars, and even among Yoga masters.

To the best of my understanding, a sidhi is not exactly a thing in itself to start with. But, with honing and development, it can later become a thing in itself.

You will need to read through the papers ahead having to do with sensory transducers and mental information grids to more fully comprehend this. After you do so, you can come back to this point better prepared.

In essence, a sidhi is something that needs to be put together within dynamic-awareness in order to take on discrete identity. In other words, the basis for distant-seeing might exist within our bio- mind hard drives --- and from which source it might function spontaneously some of the time.

However, in such a "natural" state, it functions in the absence of cognitive dynamic- awareness. In other words, it functions (when it does) AUTOMATICALLY --- while the experiencer usually does not cognitively know when, how, or why it does.

In this sense, it can be said that the hard drive superpower is functioning automatically, but that cognitive control of it is absent. Or we can say that the potential is spontaneously manifesting, but that the organized ability to call it up and sustain it under direct control of cognitive will has not been

developed.

*

It seems that the "direct control of cognitive will" was what the ancient Yogins may have meant in reference to the "sidhis."

If this is the case, then a "sidhi" is different from all our other extensive physical senses --- all of which come equipped with physical receptors born with the human bio-body and which are fully encoded in our human genetic pool.

*

My understanding, which was proven at least somewhat correct in the case of remote viewing, is that a sidhi results from a very highly specialized organization of powers of mind/body.

This organization includes extensive and direct awareness of biological and mental functioning, including knowledge of what Freud and others called the subconscious and the supraconsciousness.

To the Yogins, a human person was born with a bio- mind that possessed potentials. But it was born in a raw state, and was a disorganized mind until it could become properly organized.

I believe that "properly organized" can be equated quite nicely with "mind software programming" which is defined as "installed information grids."

It is quite clear regarding the sidhis that CORRECT self-aware information grids are being talked about here --- information grids which PERMIT the recognition and integration of the vast spectrum of body-mind faculties innate in our species.

*

Clearly, the installation of correct "software information grids" would "organize" the Biomind into highly efficient thinking patterns --- while incorrect ones would result in the opposite.

Indeed, the Yogins held, even in ancient times, that mind can be installed with incorrect or false or fake information grids --- that yielded "illusion." The presence of "illusion" among humans is, at any rate, a very big concept in most Far Eastern philosophies.

Accordingly, life lived within illusion information grids was predictably confusing, painful and awful.

Indeed, the escape from illusion is a major theme in all ancient Yoga. The "escape" apparently meant to escape from faulty mental information grids that deprived their carriers of dynamic-awareness of real REALITY, so to speak.

Furthermore, the Yogins taught that the sidhis COULD NOT be developed and "perfected" in the presence of incorrect information software grids --- even though, as they noted, rudiments of the sidhis might occasionally flare up spontaneously.

*

But this brings up the question regarding from where the rudiments occasionally flare up.

The Yogins appear to be talking --three-- things:

1. a naturally existing base drive for the human bio-body/mind;
2. the fact that incorrect and correct mind software programs can be inserted into the naturally existing base drive; and
3. the difference between illusion and reality.

If all this is thought of in the technological computer metaphor, it seems that the Yogins were actually talking about a bio-body/mind born as a HARD DRIVE --- but into which correct or incorrect software programs could be installed that were derived from experience, learning, indoctrination or misinformation.

If we utilize the computer metaphor, we can add to it the metaphor of a program "virus" whose introduction can demobilize and erode or distort all of the mind's software programs including the bio-mind hard drive. An incorrect thought out of keeping with real Reality thus can act like a virus throughout the entire Biomind systems.

*

Several different kinds of Yoga practice were evolved to correct different kinds of illusion information grids - -- and to install (or "awaken") those more in keeping with what we today would call "innate human potentials."

There was a central motto that was variously subscribed to within different Yoga philosophies and practices:

that the correct way of life was that Way which was in keeping with non-illusion, and thus in keeping with self-discovered true life principles not only of the human species, but of the universe.

To the ancient Yogins, or at least most of them, each human specimen was innately a self-perfecting "unit" within whom existed the basic framework or faculties for enormous powers of body and mind.

These powers could be located, developed and enhanced if the mind AND self-aware BODY could be properly formatted to do so by constructing information grids of self-awareness of potentials.

This was a process referred to by different metaphors such as "the Unfoldment of the Lotus" --- a flower

growing out of water (the subconscious) and unfolding in perfect form in cognitive consciousness. Another popular metaphor, especially favored by later Buddhists, referred to the "Perfecting the Diamond Consciousness."

*

The sidhis appear to have been selected out for special note because it seems that it required MORE of Biomind recombinant elements to achieve them.

It is especially important to note that the sidhis were neither separated from the physical senses, nor held to be exclusively mental in nature.

Rather it seems that the sidhis were additional extensions of the physical senses that required the integration of a very large number of mental and physical faculties.

But the faculties would not work together very well unless selectively and increasingly integrated by the cognitive mind of the human self-perfecting "unit."

They also held that while some of the faculties might function spontaneously, others of them needed to be deliberately integrated so as to achieve higher-order and more spectacular performance.

In this sense, the sidhis appear NOT to consist of A SINGULAR FACULTY NATURALLY EXISTING WITHIN THE BIO- BODY/MIND, but need to be artificially engineered within consciousness by combining a number of faculties within dynamic- awareness. And this is what CONTROLLED REMOTE VIEWING also consists of.

If this was the case, then indeed the sidhis needed special mention as contrasted to all our other naturally- existing faculties and senses. For a great number of our sensory and bio-processes (including our urges and drives) function automatically or autonomically.

But the sidhis had to be engineered into existence within cognitive dynamic-awareness in order to take on "perfecting."

*

But WHAT was it that had to be artificially engineered within cognitive Biomind consciousness to achieve, for example, the sidhi of distant- seeing?

There is only ONE concept that fills the bill. It is very well-known in the modern physical sciences and technology. But it has never been applied to the human bio-body/mind.

It is the concept of the TRANSDUCER --- the topic of Part Three of these mini-essays.

Rather than thinking of distant-seeing as a psychic aptitude, it is more to the point to think of it as a

correct series of sensory transducers that permit the integration of Biomind hard drive faculties that result in cognitively controlled distant-seeing.

Thus, distant-seeing it is not at first a thing in itself, but can become one (a sidhi) AFTER the needed sensory transducers are cognitively located and integrated.

When it became possible, during the mid-1970s, to lift remote viewing up and out of its spontaneous "psychic" nature and to tutor others in it with increasing SELF-PERFECTION - -- well, remote viewing, as a format of distant-seeing, indeed seemed to equate to one of the sidhis of ancient India.

Controlled remote viewing (CRV) was achieved by the cognitive integration of the needed sensory transducers that resulted in the installing of the correct cognitive software program --- exactly as the ancient Yogins had determined. It was then seen that while spontaneous remote viewing is an "experiencing," CRV is a form of "controlled and directed meditation."

*

The concept of SENSORY TRANSDUCERS will be the most difficult concept in these essays. Although you might not agree with the terminology I've selected for them, we can see people walking around with their frames of reference, mental information grids and mindsets.

It is also not difficult to apply the concept of transducers to technological equipment, such as telephones, televisions and radar, etc. All of these utilize transducers to convert one form or energy or signal into another form.

But it is difficult to apply the concept of the transducer to sensory stimuli and to mind-dynamic functions. Yet it can be shown that practically every cell, neuron, or synapse in our Biomind bodies is a sensory transducer of some kind.

(End)

*

REMOTE VIEWING

Central Issues and Problems

Ingo Swann

(19Jan96)

* * *

For the purposes of this document I distinguish between "issue" and "problem" in their noun forms.

ISSUE: Something that results in a final conclusion or decision after consideration.

PROBLEM: Something difficult to solve or decide; a source of complexity; a source of perplexity or vexation; an intricate unsettled question or situation.

I point up that the distinction between an issue and a problem is often vague. But a problem is something that needs to be solved or resolved. An issue needs to be considered in the light of acceptance or rejection.

The Central Issue Regarding Remote Viewing

The central issue regarding remote viewing (distant-seeing) does not at first refer to the phenomenon of remote viewing itself.

Rather, it refers to whether our species possesses what might be called, for lack of a better phrase, human superpowers of mind -- of which remote viewing would be just one.

Like most issues, this one ultimately calls for either of two conclusions or decisions:

Yes.

No.

Discussion

The issue in the first instance is --not-- whether individual specimens of our species possess superpowers of mind. The issue turns on whether such superpowers are inherent at the species level.

If it is concluded or decided that our species --does not-- inherently possess the superpowers, then whether they emerge or do not emerge in individual specimens has no relevancy in the light of that conclusion or decision.

If it is accepted that our species --does-- possess the superpowers, then it is to be expected that manifestations of them would spontaneously emerge in individual specimens, and that the rudiments of the superpowers are inherently contained within all specimens.

* * *

All issues must be considered from their largest available perspective. In order to achieve this, the largest perspective must first be identified.

Failure to identify the largest perspective ultimately means that the issue in question will be considered within the boundaries of lesser contexts -- and which contexts are inappropriate because they --are-- lesser.

It is in this way that all issues are converted and downgraded into problems that persist as such because they cannot be resolved or solved in the absence of considering their largest perspectives.

* * *

The top-line thinkers of our contemporary period are certainly equipped to consider human powers and superpowers at the species level. Such a consideration would indeed be compatible with considering the human genetic pool -- and which consideration is based on the largest available perspectives of human genetic biology.

The human gene pool is in process of being mapped. There is no reason not to map the inherent human powers and superpowers of mind in some sort of equivalent way. Mapping the powers and superpowers would establish their largest perspective possible.

Since this mapping is possible in theory and principle, and since it should be done as a primary and first effort, --all-- objections to the existence of the species superpowers are out of order and are no longer acceptable.

* * *

Any decision that our species does not possess superpowers of mind is untenable... --if-- the occurrence of them throughout our history and down through the successive generations is considered.

Manifestations and rudimentary experiencing of them have occurred in all pre-modern societies and in the modern ones as well.

How they have been variously treated in given social frameworks though, is a separate situation that is distinct from the species issue.

This situation is separate because social frameworks arise and vanish, come and go, become fashionable then unfashionable, and are replaced at a great rate of social change.

How, then, the superpowers have been treated within temporary social frameworks is actually incidental to the larger scope of the central issue -- the species-wide existence of indwelling superpower faculties.

The Central Problem Regarding Remote Viewing

At its outset, the central problem again does not involve the phenomenon of remote viewing in the first instance.

In its largest available perspective, this central problem has to do with social tolerance and intolerance of the species-wide superpowers of mind faculties.

It should be obvious that social intolerance of the faculties would result in a variety of subsidiary problems. But the central contexts of all these would turn or hinge on the matter of intolerance --- not on the matter of the --existence-- of the superpowers at the species level.

Two principal factors need to be brought to light in this regard and to help bring this central problem into acute focus.

--First--, it should be established that individual specimens of the species --can and do-- adapt their mind functioning to mental information grids whose outputs exude behavioral intolerance and demonstrate it in action. That such specimens also can and do congregate in groups and social enclaves is a matter of observable fact.

--Second--, if our species --did not-- possess the inherent basis for the superpowers of mind, then such superpowers would --never-- manifest even in rudimentary form. In this instance, neither tolerance nor intolerance of them would ever arise and never need be considered.

* * *

It is to be understood, then, that the matters of tolerance or intolerance --do arise-- because the existence of the superpowers within our species --also arises-- from generation to generation and down through our history.

As but one example, --intuition-- can easily be considered one of the most fundamental human

superpowers of mind. If the history of our species is fairly and objectively assessed, intuition has played an enormous role throughout it.

Rudimentary forms of intuition can be found in all specimens of our species -- and it is quite probable that the only factors which prevent development and enhancement of it are adaptive tolerance and disadaptive intolerance.

* * *

As a working term, a --faculty-- is defined as a natural aptitude, a naturally-existing physical or mental power or function -- and "one of the powers of mind formerly held by psychologists to form a basis for the explanation of all mental phenomena."

The last definition here is a bit confusing in that the human species does not naturally contain --one-- faculty regarding anything, but a very large number of them. It is more rational and logical to say that faculties form the basis for the explanation of all physical-mental phenomena --- and which, of course, would include the superpowers of mind that persist in arising in each successive generation of born humans.

As another working term, --facilitate-- means "making easier," while a --facility-- is something that facilitates the emergence of faculties (aptitudes) as regards action, operation, or courses of conduct.

* * *

A review of history reveals that those social frameworks tolerant of the superpowers of mind usually found some kind of ways and means to facilitate their emergence and development --- although the facilitating formats have differed enormously.

The same review of our history also establishes that those social frameworks intolerant of the superpowers usually took sometimes extraordinary means to suppress both access and knowledge of them.

* * *

--All-- social frameworks are --secondary-- manifestations of the indwelling faculties of our species as regards erecting enclaves whose essential output-purpose is to include various specimens of the species that are physically interdependent on each other.

Tolerant enclaves of this kind are usually more permissive with regard to the kinds of various specimens accorded a "fitted place" within the enclave. Intolerant enclaves tend to exclude those specimens that are perceived as misfitting in terms of mutual physical interdependence.

Ideological centralization is a --tertiary-- extension of the enclave-making faculties of our species. Ideological centralization focuses principally on instituting mental orientation dependence, and transcends the secondary manifestation of physical interdependence.

The outputs of ideological centralization may manifest initial concepts of tolerance or intolerance. But in the longer historical run of their rise and fall, a saturation of too much intolerance usually causes them to implode -- for they facilitate less and less regarding overall human potentials.

* * *

Most secondary social frameworks may be expansionist in nature, especially in the physical sense. But for reasons that are not at all obvious, almost all ideological centralizing social frameworks are reductionist in nature.

--Reductionism-- is defined as "a procedure or theory that reduces complex data or phenomena to simple terms" --- usually, it may be added, by rejecting and becoming intolerant of the complex data or phenomena altogether.

In a certain sense, reductionist social enclaves are ideological "enemies" of our species --within-- our species -- in that our human species is wondrously complex both as regards its "data" and its astonishing and often magnificent phenomena.

Functional intuition, for example, is clearly a magnificent phenomenon of our species -- and it is easily included among the basic human superpowers of mind. By inspection of them though, most reductionist social enclaves, if they are "fundamentalist" enough, are not tolerant of intuition even though it is the most widespread of our species' superpowers of mind.

The Issue Versus the Problems of Our Species' Superpowers of Mind

The many problems (all of transitory social origin in their on-going historical sense) regarding our species superpowers of mind are often mistaken and advertised as --the-- issue. But the problems, all of them, are "local" within given social enclaves. The issue, however, is universal to and within our species --- and this issue will persist in existing even though social enclaves come and go.

But the local social issues can clearly be identified as preventing knowledge access to both the issue and to the different superpowers of mind --- of which intuition and remote viewing are but two.

Shortly I'll provide eight mini-essays that expand on the themes and topics of this brief, entitled "Remote Viewing, One of the Human Superpowers of Bio-Mind." Among other topics, these essays will discuss the --Sidhis--, sensory transducers, mental information grids, and twentieth century skeptics and debunkers. (End)

REMOTE VIEWING VS ITS SKEPTICS

The Larger Picture of Remote Viewing versus The Larger Picture of Skeptics and Debunkers

Ingo Swann

20Jan96

* * *

A more expansive treatment of this topic will be rendered in a forthcoming mini-essay entitled "Remote Viewing and Skeptics of the Twentieth Century."

It should be stated that this topic is fairly complex. It involves much more than the very tiny minority who opine that our sentient species --does not-- possess superpowers of bio-mind --- such as intuition, telepathy, remote viewing and various forms of creativity and "higher-mind" functioning.

Earlier psychical researchers and parapsychologists have sometimes inadequately addressed this topic in brief papers. But no lengthy examination has ever appeared.

During the mid-1970s, however, one of the agencies of the intelligence community requested a lengthy examination. I was involved with a number of professional consultants in its preparation and the report was duly produced under the working title "Social Resistance to Psi."

* * *

Three of the major observations of the report established the following:

(1) Since doubt is considered a legitimate function within intellectual processes, the role of those who doubt is given more legitimacy than those who do not doubt. Were this not so then the meaning of doubt would become vague.

(2) When doubt is superimposed on direct human experiencing, then the doubt assumes a priority

because of its perceived legitimacy. The superimposition then results in a subtle shift of focus away from examining the direct human experiencing and reinstalls the focus within the contexts of the various intellectualisms that have become involved.

(3) The history of intellectualisms demonstrates (a) that they have relatively short terms of social fashionability, and (b) that they tend to be elitist in nature because the larger populations either do not, or cannot, share in them.

Combining these three observations results in a fourth: that doubt is relative to social enclaves and is thus only transitory against larger issues that remain permanent within the direct experiential thresholds of our species.

Reducing these four observations to a possibly crude level, skeptics and debunkers come and go --- but the experiencing thresholds of the species remain the same. The experiencing thresholds are therefore perpetual. Skepticism that advocates doubt regarding something perpetual is relevant only to the transitory intellectual boundaries within which it has arisen.

* * *

As an apt illustration of the above, Albert Einstein introduced his special theory of relativity in 1905 while he was still a student and working in the patent office in Switzerland. The skeptical responses regarding the theory, and him as a scientist and man, were not only noisy but exceedingly -- voluminous.--

By 1925, historians appraised that the Einstein "debate" had accumulated the largest printed paper volume ever.

When the special theory was proven correct between 1927 and 1929, it was shown that relativity was perpetual --- naturally existing and true. The skeptical and debunking responses were shown as transitory, however ardent and voluminous they had been. None of the names of Einstein's skeptics are remembered. And this is the ignominious fate of most skeptics --- because the times and tides of discovery march on and forget they existed.

* * *

Some of you who chance to read this may wish to consider the existence of our species superpowers of bio-mind merely as theoretical. Fair enough.

But an equally fair appraisal shows that the superpowers in different formats have manifested throughout our species from time immemorial, regardless of culture.

What --has-- differed is how they have been intellectually and socially treated and dealt with in terms of tolerance and intolerance, in terms of acceptance or rejection. As will be discussed in a later paper, the intolerance and rejection has ranged along a spectrum from genocide, extermination, and anti-psyhic mind-programming to lesser forms of alienation such as media ridicule and Machiavellian debunking.

* * *

The sciences and academe of the modern West have never moved full-force behind researching the superpowers. It has even been stated in the past, especially by many noted scientists, that the superpowers are not worthy of scientific interest.

So when modern skeptics protest, it is not really possible to isolate and identify what they are protesting about. That our species --does-- possess superpowers of bio-mind can't really be doubted. Even if only temporarily so, such superpowers often appear in naive children for goodness' sake, and often spontaneously appear and disappear in so-called "normal" adults.

The actual issue, then, is the real extent of human sentiency, the actually existing rudiment faculties of the superpowers within our genetic species.

If this is accepted as the virtual reality issue, then skepticism and debunking regarding it become sub-issues attached not to the virtual reality itself, but to varieties of antagonistic hearsay that infect many intellectualisms. It is this antagonistic hearsay which accounts for social resistance to our species' superpowers of bio-mind.

* * *

Western skepticism of the modern period thus utilizes hearsay before the facts of investigation and research. For example, "there --must-- be some other normal explanation." And this falls more within the range of emotional sentiments than logic and reason based upon discovered fact.

I am also led to understand that this topic is of some interest in the new discipline of the sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK) which examines the treatment and engineering of knowledge by social enclaves within science --and-- the social sub-set enclaves appended to it as is the case with skeptics and debunkers.

* * *

What will serve as an objective and legitimate access point into this complex topic is difficult to determine. In the first instance, though, it appears that there are confusions regarding basic terminology.

The term "skeptic" is taken from a Greek word meaning "thoughtful; to look, to consider in the context of having a mind open enough to do so."

"Skepticism" is defined as the method of suspending judgment, systematic doubt, or criticism until something can be decided upon based upon identifiable facts. Any area which is neither proven nor disproved falls into this category.

* * *

In their accepted academic sense, these definitions prevailed until about 1890, at least in philosophy and science, and are still given in most dictionaries.

During the early twentieth century, however, both terms in popular usage took on meanings having to do with --opposition-- to something. The contexts of having an open mind and suspending judgement until facts are ascertained were therefore abrogated in popular usage.

A "skeptic" and his or her "skepticism" were thereafter assumed to mean "opposed" or "opposition." The phrase "I am a skeptic" was then taken to mean "I don't believe it exists, or is true, or is possible."

* * *

The verb "debunk" means "to expose the sham of falseness of something." Debunking is therefore a valuable function and always has been --- in that certain specimens of our species like to engineer sham and falseness in order to benefit from them.

Implicit in the term, however, is the distinction between (1) exposing --after the fact of examination, and (2) accusing --before the fact. In this double sense, the term can take on Machiavellian efficiency.

"Machiavellianism" refers to Machiavelli's political theory that politics is amoral and that any means however unscrupulous can justifiably be used in achieving political power or purposes.â

The introduction of Machiavellianism into skepticism and debunking runs counter to their original ethical function and sets up lachrymose contexts so labyrinthine that very few can negotiate them. Indeed, Machiavellianism can only be effective provided the labyrinthine contexts cannot be unravelled.

As but one example of Machiavellian debunking, though, I refer the truly interested to the paper entitled "Science Versus Showmanship: A History of the Randi Hoax" by Michael A. Thalbourne just published in The Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research (Oct. 1995, Vol.89, No. 4).

* * *

The largest possible background issue regarding skeptics and debunkers of remote viewing is whether our species possesses superpowers of mind --- of which remote viewing would be just one. Unless consideration is elevated up and into the contexts of this larger background issue no amount of lesser argumentation will suffice to get anyone anywhere.

The second larger background issue concerns the fact that there is nothing essentially wrong with researching the superpowers, both to confirm their existence or not, and if confirmed to identify their particular functions of mind.

--Resistance-- to such research --before-- the facts of the superpowers can be ascertained is therefore puzzling.

The only possible explanation must involve not discoverable facts which could speak for themselves but --motives and agendas.--

Most of us recognize that this is the usual case regarding most human confusions --- assuming that mere stupidity or lack of knowledge are not involved as the first instance. But the introduction of motives and agendas further complicates this particular situation already lamentably labyrinthine in its overall character.

* * *

The etymological history of the term "skepticism" shows that it has undergone several definition formats and social applications since it was first coined in ancient Greece --- down until today when it is almost exclusively taken as referring to someone opposed to the "paranormal" and anything resembling them.

During the Renaissance period, when the schism between science and religion started up, skepticism was largely taken as referring to "doubt concerning basic religious principles" such as immortality, providence, revelation, the existence of the soul, etc. This is to say that --skepticism-- was then used almost as a synonym for anti-religion on behalf of sequestering the evolving sciences from it.

During the nineteenth century, elements of early psychical research did deal with spiritualism --- that enormous cultural phenomenon having to do with scientifically analyzing communications between the living and the dead. So-called "scientific skeptics" objected to this type of research because they feared a reintroduction of religious-type phenomena into science proper.

* * *

This fear has continued to overwhelm more accurate estimations of what the whole of early psychical research involved. An analysis of all published psychical research materials clearly shows that spiritualistic-type research reports account for only about one-tenth between 1880 and 1910. The remaining 90 per cent of the materials was focussed on elements having to do with powers and

superpowers of the human biological mind.

At best, then, anti-religious skeptics who wish (as they still do today) to insulate science from religion can object to only about one-tenth of the whole of psychological research --- while --psychical-- research, by definition, came to an end during World War I.

* * *

When it became possible during the twentieth century to examine elements and attributes of the human mind of and in themselves, it would seem that this particular skeptical format was no longer applicable regarding the mapping of the human powers of mind of and in themselves. At least the principal and vividly stated goal of the modern sciences was to map --everything-- of and in itself.

* * *

Discussing and arguing the pro and con --mapping-- of the powers and superpowers of mind has been going on for over 140 years --- even though most of the pro and con polemics are not only turgid and redundant but are based in past concepts which have been obsolete since at least the end of World War I.

It is much more fruitful to look at the social landscapes within which the discussions and arguing took place. Some of those earlier landscapes, especially science-centered ones, accepted as valid the concept of "anti-psychic skepticism" --- even though the term "psychic" has never achieved a stable or concrete definition.

But if the basic definition of skepticism is accepted in its correct meaning --- "open to consideration and examination" --- then the phrase "anti-psychic skeptic" is an oxymoron.

The ethical, and even logical goal of the true skeptic is to resolve doubt by identifying facts, not to reinforce doubt in the absence of discovered facts --- and certainly not to underwrite Machiavellian debunking tactics to prevent the needed research.

True skepticism does not --begin-- by being anti- anything. The processes of open consideration and examination (i.e., research) will ultimately establish whether something exists or not.

There is hardly no other way via which doubt, belief, or confusions between them can be resolved on behalf of acquiring increases in knowledge. And this is especially true as regards the true extent of human sentience --- for sentient beings have an inalienable bio-mind right to know of the true extent of their sentience.

* * *

To round out this position paper, even a cursory examination of the "conflict" between the existence of our species superpowers and the existence of skepticism regarding them shows these two factors as different and separate issues.

In the first instance, if the superpowers didn't manifest throughout our species then skeptical resistance to them --would not-- come into existence either. Nothing becomes resisted unless it is there to be resisted. It is because the superpowers do manifest that resistance to them is engineered into visibility.

Whether the superpowers manifest in formats involving Siberian shamans, Greek or Egyptian clairvoyants, Maya far-seeing, or contemporary remote viewing as an espionage tool, none of the formats would be possible if their fundamental faculties were not part of our species "equipment," so to speak. Phenomena along these lines that recur regardless of culture and down and through each human generation ought to be accepted as existing.

Modern skeptics, however, defined these faculties as abnormal, illusion, mental derangement, or psychopathological in origin. Mis-identified and prejudiced as such, the faculties were then open to the assumed legitimacy of debunking.

But are these --modern-- definitions correct ones? And if correct, how was the correctness established?

Well, it is open knowledge that the mainstream sciences and philosophies, --by their own admission,-- have --not-- researched the superpowers of bio-mind.

* * *

Based, then, on a near complete absence of researched information regarding the superpowers, it is --necessary-- to inquire into the nature of the information data bits an "anti-psychic" skeptic is using as his or her intellectual processing grids.

If such a skeptic is utilizing the conventional definitions of the modern mainstream sciences and philosophies --which have neither considered nor researched-- the superpowers, then such a skeptic is utilizing nothing at all except hearsay or prejudice based on it. Clearly those who --have-- attempted to research the superpowers know more about them than those who never have made the attempt --- just as conventional modern scientists and philosophers have not.

* * *

It is quite easy to show that the --topic-- of our species superpowers of bio-mind has been bowdlerized or "bleeped" from the lexicons of the modern sciences and philosophies. This leaves experiencers of some element of the superpowers without a leg to stand on --- leaves them helpless --- for there is no help to be found within the social precincts which have bleeped the superpowers to begin with. There is no organized, supportive social structure to which the experiencers can appeal --- even to protect their

full rights as sentient human beings.

* * *

Here is the basis for a pogrom. A "pogrom" is defined as "an organized massacre of helpless people." Such a pogrom regarding "sensitives" took place during the Inquisitions of the Middle Ages. Some historians estimate the high body count at 9 million over a 300-year period. Ridicule and defamation during modern times of sensitives and researchers of the superpowers is a kind of pogrom, especially when supported in the mainstream media.

It is interesting indeed why in our scientific times there should be such a pogrom that victimizes our species superpowers of bio-mind with its marvelous spectrum of sentiency. It may be that someone somewhere doesn't want that marvelous spectrum to be identified and DEVELOPED.

Comments, anyone?

(End)

REMOTE VIEWING VERSUS TELEPATHIC OVERLAY

Ingo Swann

04Feb96

* * *

The issue of telepathic overlay is very complicated at first if you know nothing about it. But after you know enough, it then becomes a rather simple matter. It is the learning that is difficult, and for a number of reasons.

Among the first of those reasons is that the topic of REAL and ACTIVE telepathy is avoided in most societal contexts. One sees references to telepathy in fiction and in some few superficial non-fiction books. One even sees telepathy mentioned in parapsychology contexts, but parapsychology has no real important place within most mainstream societal contexts.

It is generally accepted that our species probably does have telepathic powers. But when one gets beneath the superficial treatment of telepathy, one finds that hardly any extensive and serious work has been undertaken in the direction of really sorting it out.

There are good probable reasons for the lack of really serious work regarding telepathy. Certainly one of the reasons for the avoidance is that people fear having their minds read or invaded. After all, telepathy IS defined as mind-to-mind contact, and the mind- invasive principle is implicit in this definition. Additionally, if telepathic contact with other minds is possible, then it IS but one short developmental step to one of the ugliest topics on Earth -- mind-control.

It is quite probable, then, that people who fear having their minds (or what passes for them) invaded and read by a telepath probably not only don't want telepaths around but don't want the topic opened up for research and development.

As it turns out, then, not very much is really known about telepathy, most probably for the reasons above. I can make this statement because I've spent many years tracking down information not only about telepathy and its many types, but information about social treatment of it and its close relationship to other related topics.

It is helpful here at the start to point up that although telepathy is delicately defined as mind-to-mind, it more literally might be defined as from one mind INTO another mind.

Parapsychologists occasionally have studied the mind-to- mind thing. But other types of research have considered the mind INTO another mind thing.

Some of those other types of research have included those of mental influences, mind-control, mob and mass psychology, telepathic contamination, and various forms of subconscious and subliminal study.

In the contexts of remote viewing, telepathic overlay would introduce into the responses of a remote viewer a kind of dirty-data contamination originating in the mind of someone else.

The pathway for the contamination probably would not be a conscious one, but a subconscious one. So the telepathic introduction of the dirty data would take place without much realization on the parts of anyone associated with the viewing. [You may wish to refer to my essay regarding the Signal-to Noise Ratio already available.]

Before going on, I'm obliged to point up a peculiarity I've observed during the many years remote viewing was under research and development.

It is this:

SOME will get what telepathic overlay means and implies even though very little is said about it; OTHERS will never get it no matter how much is said of it.

People with very strong and overpowering egos usually reject the possibility of telepathic overlay, as do those who don't seem to have any naturally active superpowers of bio-mind.

It should also be mentioned that telepathic overlay has extensive meaning to situations outside of remote viewing contexts. As you will see below, it is only by touching upon some of those situations that what is meant by telepathic overlay can be fleshed out.

There is one other important reason why it would be difficult to comprehend the meanings of telepathic overlay as that phenomenon relates to remote viewing. This has to do with understanding remote viewing itself, what it really is versus what many think it to be. I'll address this particular issue near the end of this essay.

The most generally accepted definition of TELEPATHY holds that it consists of the apparent communication from one mind to another otherwise than through the channels of the senses. I have taken this definition from a perfectly respectable dictionary. So two of its initial and all-encompassing flaws must be pointed up.

First, it is difficult to comprehend how "the channels of the senses" can be subtracted from the telepathic equation since some kind of sensory mechanisms must be involved if communication from one mind gets into another mind.

We do have subconscious and subliminal senses, and so this flaw in the definition probably should be corrected to read "otherwise than through the channels of the physical, conscious senses."

In this context, it's worth noting that specimens of our species can be described in many ways. And one of those descriptions can easily hold that each specimen is a walking, talking bio-mind organism replete with astonishing arrays of "senses," and most of which have NOT been identified.

Indeed, it's not too much to say that we are highly designed and extremely refined sensory machines

both as regards bio-body and its internal sensing apparatus and mechanisms.

Just because most have not learned to identify and develop MOST of their inherent sensing systems and channels is no reason to exclude telepathic "communication" from "channels of the senses."

As to the second flaw, the accepted definition above leaves one with the conviction that that telepathy exclusively involves MIND.

But that involves what one thinks the mind is and is not. And in that regard many past definitions of the mind are entirely questionable -- while many of them have been abandoned anyway.

In any event, MIND itself has a number of definitions, as many as twenty or more in some sources. But it is commonly understood as (1) the element or complex of elements in an individual that feels, perceives, thinks, wills and, especially, reasons; and (2) the conscious events and capabilities in an organism.

Subliminal and subconscious researchers will think those two major definitions are hilarious -- pointing up that the activities and qualities incorporated in those definitions are but the merest tip of the profound iceberg of Mind.

As it is, however, when it is said that telepathy is mind-to-mind contact, the above definitions imply CONSCIOUS perception or awareness of something telepathic. The above definitions also imply that if we cannot consciously identify something as being telepathic, then telepathy doesn't exist.

In this regard, that there may be subconscious or pre-conscious telepathy of which one is unaware sort of falls by the wayside. The idea of subconscious or subliminal telepathy is thus somewhat alien to the usual concepts of telepathy.

A third complicating factor regards the following. After intuition, telepathy is the second most commonly experienced of the superpowers of the human bio-mind.

But like intuition, a careful study of historical and living testimony about telepathy reveals that there are very many types of it, and not all of which can be incorporated into the standard definition of conscious mind to conscious mind.

There is thus a spectrum of telepathy, and which spectrum can best be described as varieties of information exchanging at either the conscious or pre-conscious levels.

The above having thus been said, we must now get to work to dig deeper into what is involved.

In the cultural West immediately before the term "telepathy" was coined (in 1882), the information exchanging was called thought-transference.

The exact meaning of that earlier term is important -- for it involved two concepts that went missing after thought-transference was renamed telepathy.

In the thought-transference model, those two concepts were SYMPATHETIC STATES and RAPPORT. It was accepted that if two or more people became involved in sympathetic states or rapport, then transference of thoughts and EMOTIONS could be exchanged -- even though the mechanisms involved were not easily identifiable.

The concepts of the existence of sympathetic states and rapport can be traced back into antiquity (under other terms, of course.) But the concepts were named as such during the High Renaissance and from that

time they ultimately followed through into the study and research of Mesmerism.

In general, the Mesmerism model was almost completely involved with researching the causes and effects of sympathetic and rapport states -- and which, it was discovered, could be induced by various methods.

The hypothetical mechanisms of information exchange were thought to consist of sympathetic states and rapport during which something "fluidic" took place between two or more people.

The sympathetic and rapport states were themselves thought of as fluidic -- or, as might be said today, altered states of consciousness, during which people become somewhat aware that altered states seem to flow into and out of each other.

Anton Mesmer is best remembered as the so-called discoverer of hypnotism -- but which in fact was adapted from his work by later researchers and is a rather gross form of the subtle states the Mesmerists worked with.

As hypnotism is understood, though, it is a state which needs to be induced in someone by another person, the hypnotist -- and after which the hypnotee is under the control of the hypnotist.

A large number of studies regarding the effects of hypnosis clearly establish that the hypnotee not only responds to the conscious commands of the hypnotist, but also is often found to be in telepathic rapport with the unexpressed or subconscious motives and agendas of the hypnotist.

This type of thing is occasionally referred to as telepathic bonding at levels beneath the consciousness of the hypnotist.

But if we introduce the concept of telepathic overlay, then it could be said that some kind of information overlay from the hypnotist is being transferred to the hypnotee via telepathic routes that are not known to or even suspected by the hypnotist.

As a gross example of this, the hypnotee then gives the answers the hypnotist wants, or which answers fit into the unexpressed expectations and convictions of the hypnotist which have somehow become overlaid into the hypnotee.

There can be no doubt, however, that ALL hypnoid states are also sympathetic and rapport states in which the telepathic exchanges of information can and do result in ways which not only include conscious but subconscious content.

As we shall see ahead, deep hypnosis or even light hypnosis is not necessary for this kind of telepathic overlay to take place. Such can occur as a result of even light rapport and which would not be considered as hypnotic.

Moving back now to 1882, the scientific concept had come to the fore that the brain was the mechanism for everything. And so early psychical researchers wished to emulate that concept in order better to be seen as scientific. One cannot really blame them, for the rapport of the modern scientific model had infected almost the whole of the Western world.

However, sympathetic and rapport states were considered as unscientific -- belonging, as scientific spokesmen said, to the pre-scientific and superstitious past.

In order to escape from the so-called "unscientific" past regarding thought-transference, the early

psychical researchers wished to abandon the thought-transference model.

So they theoretically redefined the concept by calling it telepathy -- and which was first advertised as inter- communication between brain and brain by means other than that of the ordinary sense channels.

As it happened about the same time, the concept of radio and radio broadcasting had come to the fore, and which concept was definitely scientific. Radio broadcasting involved sending and receiving equipment via which information could be sent out across distances and picked up by receiving equipment.

This seemed an ideal analogy for telepathy. So telepathy (actually empathy broadcast or sent across distance) came to be thought of as brain sending across distance to another receiving brain.

The radio model of sending and receiving signals across distances has since been thought of as the definition of telepathy.

The concept of "brain-to-brain" was modified after World War I to "mind-to-mind" when the then-new field of psychology began emerging in strength.

After that, psychiatrists dealt with brain, but psychologists dealt with mind. Hardly any psychiatrists entered into psychical and parapsychological research. And so the whole of what was involved became a problem in psychology -- and from which arose para-psychology and which studied the so-called "paranormal" phenomena of the Mind.

Now it is very important to point up that, as a result of all those conceptual and nomenclature changes, the old model which incorporated sympathetic states and rapport vanished altogether.

To my knowledge, it was only the earlier Soviet researchers of the 1920s and 1930s who reinstated those two important factors, recombining them into their novel definitions of bio-communications. The West, including the US, has not yet reconsidered and restored them into the prevailing concepts of parapsychology and telepathy.

So the phenomena and effects of rapport and sympathetic states are not generally recognized. However, you can satisfy yourself along these lines by attempting to identify situations characterized by sympathetic and rapport states, but which are not otherwise recognized as such.

Within the contexts of all of the above, then, the problem or the situation of telepathy is, first of all, a matter of sympathetic states and rapport.

RAPPORT is defined as relation marked by harmony, conformity, accord or affinity.

SYMPATHETIC is defined as (1) existing or operating through an affinity, interdependence, or mutual association; (2) showing or being linked by empathy; and (3) sensitivity to the emotions or moods of others.

If we add to this "empathic sensitivity to the thought- forms or thoughts of others," then we do arrive at a combined, approximate definition of telepathy -- one which goes far beyond the simplistic mind-to-mind thing.

Within the remote viewing contexts, TELEPATHIC OVERLAY would consist of picking up on information from someone else's head and mistaking that information for the "signal." The SIGNAL, of course, would consist of information pertinent to the distant location or "target." Picking up on "signals" from someone else's head and accepting them for the RV signals can be called telepathic overlay.

The question now emerges: Does this kind of thing happen? Yes, it certainly does -- but only within certain kinds of circumstances.

Accessing the target information is the goal of remote viewing. Accessing any other kind of information is "noise," in the sense of being contamination which distorts the clear reception of actual signals. Accessing telepathic overlay information is therefore noise -- and, as it might easily be understood, would be quite deadly to the remote viewing faculties, processes, and results of RV.

Please see my essay regarding the Signal-to Noise Ratio.

As discussed in other of my database essays, the Signal- to-Noise Ratio is fully involved here. Telepathic overlay is not the only form of noise which degrades the remote viewing signals. But it can be an important noise source if the ostensible remote viewer is unaware that telepathic overlay not only exists but does so in very subtle ways.

Where telepathic overlay is present, its information content **OVERLAYS** and contaminates the signal line, usually obscuring the latter from cognitive perception of the viewer.

Beyond its debilitating effects on the remote viewing faculties, telepathic overlay is very interesting of and within itself -- and is also meaningful regarding the entire spectrum of superpowers of the human bio-mind.

Telepathic overlay was identified by myself and Dr. H.E. Puthoff in about 1975, and together we worked to determine its causes, its relationship to remote viewing, and how to avoid or eradicate it.

We were quite concerned that the viewer was picking up information from the minds of those associated with the viewings rather than from the distant site itself.

This was also a problem which worried the sponsors very much, and for reasons which should be obvious.

If telepathic overlay was the case, then we didn't have remote viewing at all. We had some format of telepathy.

At first we felt that the sources or causes must be quite complicated. But in the end we discovered that a single situation was the source of most telepathic overlay. When that situation was cured, telepathic overlay tended to vanish.

That single situation revolved around Who had power over Whom not only during the RV work but as regards the relationships of all involved.

In other words, the telepathic overlay situation somewhat resembled the subtle telepathic situation of the hypnotist and the hypnotee.

The hypnotist was in power-control of the situation AND the hypnotee. The hypnotee was in some kind of rapport with the hypnotist in which the hypnotee accepted the commands and suggestions of the hypnotist.

The hypnotist expected the hypnotee to follow commands and suggestions -- which the hypnotee usually did.

But another unexpected effect could be observed regarding a subliminal or subconscious transfer of information from the hypnotist to the hypnotee. The hypnotee often became telepathically connected to the motives, agendas, and desires of the hypnotist.

To aid in clarifying this, we now have to distinguish between:

- (1) telepathy which one or both parties might be consciously aware of, and
- (2) subconscious or subliminal telepathy which neither the hypnotee nor the hypnotist are consciously aware of (and which might be termed sub-telepathy to distinguish it from the former).

Regarding these possibilities and their implications to remote viewing being studied at SRI, several psychologists and hypnotists were consulted regarding this matter. It was generally agreed that something of the kind could account for telepathic overlay contaminating remote viewing sessions. It is well understood in psychology that if one person has suggestive power over another, the latter will not only accept the suggestions (or commands) but often will somehow mysteriously emulate that person in more subtle ways. The controllee will often sense the controller's wishes, desires and wants without their being vocalized.

The whole of this is a kind of rapport, and certainly a type of sympathetic state with the controller. Controllees often go so far as to non-consciously emulate the controller's dress, posture, preferences, mannerisms, and etc.

Thus, what we termed telepathic overlay regarding remote viewing has a larger picture and an historical past under many other names in that the whole of this is typical of what is sometimes called charismatic influencing.

Charismatic influencing is also a situation regarding who has power over whom, even if only very subtly so. Charismatic influencing is also a situation which involves rapport and sympathetic states.

Telepathic overlay regarding remote viewing cannot really be understood unless the particular problem it represents is cast against a larger picture and which must be precisely defined.

This larger picture consists of whether the human species is a telepathic species and, as such, is susceptible to sub-telepathic situations and conditions which exist and function beneath conscious awareness of them.

It is thus necessary in this essay to present some evidence of this general sub-telepathic potential -- none of which, by the way, is found in parapsychology studies and documents.

To my knowledge, the first really scientific approach to what was involved took place between the two World Wars (essentially between about 1924 and 1938) when studies regarding MOB BEHAVIOR were funded and undertaken.

The concept of MASS BEHAVIOR was shortly added to the studies. The two concepts were scientifically dignified as "mob psychology" and "mass psychology."

Both mob and mass behavior demonstrate quite remarkable phenomena, and one particular phenomenon seems to stand out regarding both types of behavior.

This has to do with the removing of individuals from their individualizing sense of logic, reason and common sense -- and somehow replacing those with a sense of emotional participation which is

collective and rapport-like rather than individualizing in nature.

This type of thing was first referred to as EMOTIONAL RAPPROCHEMENT, the latter word meaning to bring together -- and, in the case of mob and mass psychology to bring emotionally together in a shared rapport or sympathetic kind of way.

But mob and mass behavior are also characterized by their intensity, and in this regard the term RAPTURE is fitting. It means "a state or experience of being carried away by overwhelming emotions." The distinctions between "rapture" and "rapport" are quite narrow. The rapture of violence in mob psychology was, of course, a noted characteristic of mob behavior when the shared anger sentiments had reached saturation and began being acted out collectively.

The term eventually settled on was ENTRAINMENT -- which is somewhat difficult of definition and whose psychological meaning is often not found in dictionaries.

In its pristine sense, ENTRAIN simply means "to get on a train." But when used in a psychological meaning, it obviously refers to thinking, acting, and responding in ways which are collective rather than individual -- in ways which are quite like sympathetic or rapport states. It was this type of thing which was meant by entrainMENT.

And in this sense, although entrainment can be thought of as intellectual, it usually refers to emotional or EMPATHIC subconscious strata of our species whose potentials are far more collectivizing than are individualistic logic, reason and common sense.

The use of the term "empathic" in mob behavior research documents brought the whole problem very close to some kind of telepathy -- whose original definition was empathy communicated between human specimens across a distance by means unknown.

Researchers of the early 1930s distinguished between mob and mass psychology. The mob was out of control, hence unpredictable and dangerous. The mass was under control, or at least some modicum of it, and not therefore dangerous.

But other than this, the real distinctions between mob and mass behavior are quite similar, in that mass behavior can quite easily disintegrate into mob behavior replete with riots, violence and other destructive whatnot.

The early researchers of mob psychology brought their work up to the point where it was realized that mob behavior was somehow infectious in ways which were decidedly NOT visible or easily accounted for.

A perfectly sensible person could become incorporated within the mysterious collectivizing dynamics of a mob and become "entrained" at a rough emotional level which was somehow susceptible to taking on board those rough emotions.

The person then became a sympathetic participant, an entrained one, and began manifesting rough, and usually gross, emotional behavior out of keeping with common sense, logic and reason.

Some of the early researchers began supposing that mob and mass behavior could be explained only by introducing a psychic hypothesis -- a psychic telepathic "something" which would account for the entrainment-like infection.

I'm obliged to point up that the words "psychic" and "telepathic" WERE used, and that in this essay they have not been invented by myself and retrospectively applied to the research of the 1930s.

I'm also obliged to point up that the introduction of a "psychic hypothesis" regarding any form of human behavior was taboo in all mainstream formats of modern research during the 1930s -- and is still taboo today.

As it back then turned out, after the need for a psychic hypothesis had been indicated, it appears that ALL research in this area ceased, due, one might suppose, to the political incorrectness of this hypothesis, and/or withdrawal of funding because of it.

In any event, the rigors of World War II soon intervened, and a great deal of research in these areas ceased altogether. Rather roughly speaking, this kind of research resurfaced after the War, but under the concepts of mind-control and behavior modification. Mind-control exponents thought that a psychic hypothesis was not necessary, and who anyway do not study mob psychology.

Both mind-control and behavior modification are, at base, essentially problems regarding who is to have power over whom.

The psychic hypothesis of the early mob psychology researchers focused on the possibility of some kind of subtle, non-conscious telepathic hookups or channels.

At the subconscious emotional response levels, individuals were sensitive to the "entrainment factors" which "infected" all or most of those exposed to them -- and which reduced individuals back into some kind of collective, hive-like behavior.

There is only one suitable word for this: RAPPORT -- via which sympathetic sub-telepathic infections can be induced into those, well, into those infected by them.

We have seen by now that the concept of rapport is obviously important to all telepathic matters. But it is a term rarely encountered in research today -- except in subliminal research where researchers are quite aware that human specimens are subliminally connected by various kinds of subconscious rapport states although not at all conscious of being so.

Indeed, it is the existence of rapport which helps in many ways to distinguish between INTUITION and TELEPATHY, the two superpowers of the human bio-mind which are most frequently experienced world-wide.

The term INFECT is unpopular regarding telepathic stuff, because in its first definition it is largely taken to mean CONTAGIOUS in ways which contaminate or corrupt. Even so, regarding telepathic overlay and remote viewing, the former would contaminate the latter, and there is hardly any other way around this phenomenon.

But there is a second definition regarding INFECT: to work upon or seize upon so as to induce sympathy, belief, or support.

And INDUCED sympathy puts us within the realms of sympathetic states, rapport, and entrainment -- whether such are consciously perceived or subconsciously present in some kind of a psycho-active way. And all of this is not very far removed from the "psychic hypothesis" of the early researchers of mob psychology -- an hypothesis seeking to explain the infectious telepathic nature of the overpowering

emotionality which literally sucks people into subconscious entrainment and participation.

One of the on-going situational problems regarding telepathy is that there are many different kinds of it -- only a few of which seem to fit in with the sender-receiver model.

In the past, I was able to identify some thirty-five or thirty-six kinds of telepathy -- some of which, for example, show that information can be **ABSORBED** without being either "sent" or "received." From this latter category can be derived the concept of "telepathic osmosis" -- **OSMOSIS** referring to a process of absorption or diffusion suggestive of the **FLOW** of osmotic action.

We need only to suppose that such a kind of telepathic osmosis can exist at the subconscious levels -- and thus we achieve the model for the existence of telepathic overlay regarding remote viewing.

And at this point we also arrive back at the discarded concept that thought-transference (of thought **AND** emotion and empathy) entails some kind of "fluidic" mechanism.

In this sense, what we call telepathy appears to exist along a spectrum of some kind. Subconscious telepathy would absolutely have to be included in this spectrum.

The concept of subconscious mind-linking (as opposed to conscious or intellectual mind-linking) would actually serve better to bring the existence of this spectrum into better view. People can say that they are not telepathically linked consciously -- but they well may be subconsciously.

I suppose that mind-linking may more easily be thought of as intellectual agreement. But it is quite easy to show that other formats of mind-linking exist with or without intellectual agreement.

As an example of one kind of mind-linking that is never thought of as telepathic entrainment, it can easily be observed that an individual who personally is very charismatic can, even without trying to do so, induce certain entrainment states in his or her followers.

Examples are very numerous along these lines. Such a charismatic individual can utter the most amazing nonsense - - but even so can accumulate a dedicated, hypnoid-like following whose entrained members will give up everything in order to be part of it.

Thus, it can be witnessed that charismatic examples of our species can have some kind of telepathic power over others, a type of power which is explainable only by introducing a psychic hypothesis consisting of rapport and sympathetic states.

So, IF telepathy **EXISTS** at all, then one has to be somewhat backward to think that it exists only when one is cognitively aware of it, or that it exists only when an experiment to test for it is set up.

And if one examines for the many different types of telepathy, then one has to be slightly addled to accept that the conscious sender-to-receiver model is the **ONLY** model for it.

As a result of all that has been discussed so far, we can now reexamine the definition of **TELEPATHY**.

The word **TELEPATHY** actually means empathy across distance (tele-). "Empathy" refers to (1) the capacity for participating in another's feelings or ideas, and (2) the projection of a subjective state so that those affected by the projection themselves appear to be infused with it.

It is unfortunate, though, that what the "subjective state" consists of has never really been identified -- largely because no one comprehends what it consists of. And for that matter no one really knows what empathy consists of, either.

However, a careful reading of the two definitions given just above will reveal that they mean something far different than so-called mind-to-mind contact or so-called mental telepathy.

Clearly the projection of (1) conscious mind content (2) empathic states, (3) subjective states, and (4) subconscious sympathy and rapport are FOUR entirely different sectors of the telepathic spectrum of the superpowers of the human bio-mind.

For one thing, empathy is FELT, not thought about. And in the bio-mind systems feelings are subconsciously processed quite differently than conscious thinking.

And feelings-empathic are transmitted quite more easily than conscious thinking as well. After all, thinking has to be understood to be processed. Feelings and empathy and subjective states do not need to be understood.

Love and hate, both mostly consisting of subjective states, are often thought of as "contagious," but for reasons that are quite mysterious and completely unidentified -- unless the sub-telepathic hypothesis is admitted.

But even so, all formats of telepathy appear to have their basis in empathetic and rapport states. For one thing, it might be noticed that telepathy of any kind is hardly ever reported between people who are not sympathetic, or are out of rapport with, each other.

Now, in the light of all that has been discussed above, the question remains regarding remote viewing and telepathic overlay and how to eliminate the latter.

To discuss this, we have to incorporate the probable existence of conscious AND subconscious telepathic information.

We also have to incorporate, theoretically at least, the high probability that subconscious telepathy goes on all of the time.

We also have to resort to the hypnotist-hypnotee model and the concept of who is to have power over whom.

Regarding the hypnotist-hypnotee model, it is easy enough to consider that subconscious telepathic information flows FROM the hypnotist TO the hypnotee -- meaning that the hypnotist's signals will overlay those of the hypnotee.

In this sense, the hypnotist's signals will be duplicated by the hypnotee, and the latter's subconscious systems will respond accordingly.

This may be the same as saying that the weaker is influenced by the stronger -- and this IS unambiguously the formula for who is to have power over whom even though many manifestations of this formula are very subtle.

But this is almost the same as considering who goes into rapport with whom, for if the weaker is influenced by the stronger, then the weaker has gone into rapport with the stronger.

If subconscious telepathic signals are involved, which they are most likely to be, then the signals flow from the stronger to the weaker -- which is to say, flow from those accepted as having power to those accepted as having none or very little.

Now, in the typical parapsychology laboratory situation, consisting of experimenters and test subjects,

the experimenters are accepted as having governing power. It is THEY who are conducting the experiments, while the subjects are just participating in them as guinea pigs.

In the first instance, the subjects do want to please the experimenters -- and so one of the bases for rapport comes into existence.

The experimenters then tell the subjects what to do, when to do it, and for how much and for how long. If the subjects have gone into rapport with the experimenters, a variety of strange situations then ensue.

A number of those situations have, to their credit, been investigated by parapsychologists themselves -- but without including the possibilities of sympathetic and rapport states which are politically incorrect within science itself.

If, for example, it was discovered after the fact of the experiment that an experimenter did not expect the subject to succeed, then the subject usually didn't -- even though the same subject occasionally succeeded elsewhere under other more positive experimenter auspices.

In such a case, it is quite feasible to suspect the existence of telepathic overlay at the subconscious level in which the experimenter's expectation of non-success somehow overlaid the subject's effort.

Indeed, many subjects themselves have stated that they cannot perform if someone involved in the experiment is sensed as "negative" either consciously or non-consciously.

Within this context, it might be assumed that if the experimenter through and through wants the subject to succeed, then the subject ought to be able to produce stunning results. Something here does depend on the subject's capabilities in the first place.

But if rapport has been established, then it is quite probable that the subject will do no better than the experimenter could if he or she undertook the same experiment -- because the experimenter's incapability has telepathically overlaid the subconscious strata of the subject.

Most parapsychologists themselves are not "psychic." Indeed, as a social subset of science in general, they have a commitment NOT to be psychic in order to retain their scientific objectivity.

Admittedly, the whole of this is quite subtle and many of its aspects are debatable -- especially if the phenomena of sympathetic and rapport states are rejected to start with.

But the issue here is not experiments themselves or their power-dynamic pitfalls, but whether telepathic connectiveness does exist at other than conscious levels.

If it does, then much which usually is never taken into account, or even thought of, has to be brought up for serious consideration.

Another type of experiment which is sensitive to the power-dynamic pitfalls are those in which the experimenter guides, interrogates, or questions the subjects. Even though this relationship between experimenter and subject is not seen as a power one, there is no question about who is in power here -- rather, who is in control.

And if rapport is to arise, there is no question of who is going to go into rapport with whom. If the existence of sympathetic and rapport states is accepted, then it is easy enough to see that the subject could easily go into rapport with his or her experimenter interrogator.

As it is, the general public has no idea of what actually goes on during a parapsychology experiment. Some small segment of the public may eventually see a report about it which will include the

experimental design, protocols and results. The report is actually a selection of bits and pieces of the experiment made presentable.

But if the entire overall experimental process, its environment, and participating personnel were put on film, such would reveal that many experiments somewhat resemble a psychological zoo.

It would be seen that some, but certainly not all, experimenters have very little real interest in the subjects, but a great deal of interest regarding THEIR experiment. In my own experience of many years, even social graces are sometimes not observed regarding the subjects.

I've talked with many subjects who at first enthusiastically wanted to be "tested" via an experiment, but who felt they were a piece of crud afterward.

The role of the subject is, of course, to try to produce the phenomena the experimenters are after -- and, in most cases, produce the phenomena the experimenters themselves cannot.

If you read between the lines of the paragraph above, and depending on who the experimenters are, including their particular egos and psychological balances, you can perhaps sense that some peculiar, subtle and difficult micro-social affects will arise -- few of which are ever mentioned in reports of experimental design and results.

There is one word which will help bring together most of the elements which have been discussed in this essay: INTERACTIVE. This is taken from INTERACTION which means mutual or reciprocal action or influence.

Perfected interactive conditions are highly redolent of achieving complete rapport -- and which is the basis for telepathic identification between the interactive personnel.

In the ideal parapsychology or remote viewing experimental session, the goal is to have the subject (or viewer) interact with the target materials or distant location.

For ease of reference here, we can say that the viewer is expected to exclusively communicate with the distant location or target.

However, if the local environmental factors of the experiment and personnel involved with the session also need to be interacted with by the subject or viewer, it is quite easy to comprehend that the communication with the target by the viewer can become split in gross and subtle ways.

And it is this splitting which permits the introduction of telepathic overlay -- and especially if the role of a second person other than that of the viewer becomes influential and dynamic.

In the early days of remote viewing research at Stanford Research Institute, it was supposed that the viewer could benefit from being guided during a session by someone else. Which is to say, benefit by interacting with the guide.

Further down the line of research, this WAS to prove to be the beneficial case regarding tutoring in the techniques of remote viewing.

But after the trainee had acquired the techniques and had become exceedingly proficient in them, the active role of the tutor-guide then ceased altogether -- and for reasons which should by now be obvious.

Before this had been understood, however, several effects of the guided remote viewing session were identified. For one thing, this particular model tended to increase the interactive dependency of the viewer on the guide (later referred to as the "monitor").

This dependency effect sometimes became so grossly evident that the viewer ultimately said nothing unless prompted to do so by the monitor.

In this sense, then, the viewer was responding more to the monitor's role than to the viewer's role of exclusive contact with the distant location. The viewer's exclusive interaction with the distant location had become split between the location and the guiding function of the monitor -- and whose role was seen as interrogating the viewer about what was, or might be, at the distant location.

I will now illustrate some of the affects and difficulties of this guided method by condensing several of them into the following scenario.

The monitor asked the viewer if the site was a nuclear reactor or a computer research installation. "I don't know," replied the viewer. "Well, is it a nuclear reactor?" "Yes." "Is it a computer research installation?" The viewer again replied "Yes." At this point, the monitor assumed that the site was a nuclear reactor with computer support, and asked the viewer to describe what she was seeing. She did so in a way which ultimately was determined to somewhat match what the guide thought such a place should look like.

In experimental test situations like this, the monitor- guide did not know what was at the distant location -- and which turned out to be the Golden Gate Bridge.

This, then, was not remote viewing. At the vocal interactive level, the viewer was clearly responding to the suggestions of the guide, more or less in the same way an hypnotee might respond to the suggestions of the hypnotist.

But at the non-vocal level the viewer proceeded to describe something which matched what the guide thought the nuclear reactor might look like.

Thus, we can describe two different kinds of interactive overlay, one of which was verbally determined and one of which fell into the wobbly category of telepathic overlay.

This guide-the-viewer procedure was undertaken in good faith by all concerned, and it certainly needed to be investigated, and in no sense did the guide-monitor consciously want to control the viewer nor did the viewer want to be controlled.

But in the final analysis it could be seen anyway that the focus of control-power had subtly shifted to the guide- monitor, that the viewer had probably fallen into sympathetic rapport with him, and thereafter the viewer did not interact with the distant location but with the conscious and subconscious mind of the monitor.

In this sense, then, the formula of who was to have power over whom was subtly present, even if no one involved consciously thought about implementing it.

The whole of this gave a good deal to think about -- for unless something could be done to resolve what otherwise was a mess, then remote viewing would be up against a wall of perpetual telepathic contaminants coming from who knows where.

Up until that time, it seems that no one really realized, or didn't admit to, the possibility that people are continuously interactive at some deep telepathic levels -- and which levels are very interactive at least in sympathetic and rapport states.

Now, a diagram would be convenient here. Rather than use pixels to do so, I've discovered that I can erect simple forms of them with keys available on my keyboard. I will now try to construct one which incorporates most of what has been discussed in this essay.

Below I will construct two pyramids representing two people, and cast them against the formula of who is to have power over whom, in the stronger versus weaker sense.

You can assume that the stronger (S) will exert some kind of power over the weaker (W) -- as in the case of the hypnotist-hypnotee, experimenter-subject, or monitor-viewer.

Conscious levels

Stronger Weaker

..
..
....
....
....
....
....

Interactive telepathic levels

...>.
...>.
...>.

As regards this arrangement of two people who might interact at the subconscious telepathic levels, if the weaker goes into rapport with the stronger, or is made to assume that status by some kind of social-environmental circumstances, then information would telepathically flow from the stronger to the weaker -- as indicated by the three > marks.

There are, I think, some positive aspects to this -- for example, in tutoring or educating, for anyone might wish to benefit from telepathic transfer of information via a good teacher.

But in many other instances, in remote viewing precisely, the transfer of information could be seen only as telepathic contamination.

Some form of this contamination might easily emerge if the viewer is dependent on the monitor for anything at all.

The way all of this was ultimately handled at SRI, as least so far as controlled remote viewing was concerned, was to shift the power relationship exclusively to the viewer in ways which TERMINATED his or her interaction with anyone else, even with the monitor.

This is to say that AFTER the viewer had been fully trained and could operate with high-stage proficiency, the viewer became the captain of the remote viewing ship -- while the role of the monitor

became very minimal indeed.

In other words, if telepathic overlay flowed from the stronger to the weaker (the impressionable, or the suggestible,) then the only feasible way to try to eliminate telepathic overlay was to create controlled remote viewers who could maintain themselves and their performance as the central power core of any viewing -- and this regardless of whomever else might be involved around the edges of the viewing process.

After all, the CRV'er PRODUCES -- whereas all else (including everyone else) is incidental to the product.

The only initial problem with all this was to get the potential RV'ers themselves and EVERYONE ELSE to agree to this. Almost everyone likes to direct something or someone in order to have a "place" within what is going on.

But there are earlier models for this. The concert pianist, for example, studies long and hard to achieve competency. But when that has been achieved, when he or she steps onto the performance platform it is his or her show. It is inconceivable that the pianist would need someone else standing by and directing what and when to do something.

Likewise, after the guru teaches the chela, the guru steps aside and does so voluntarily -- at least in the ideal scene.

In any event, something along these lines WAS achieved regarding controlled remote viewing -- and telepathic overlay vanished as a contaminating noise source, as did any form of suggestivity or influencing from others. The VIEWER controls the viewing, and ceases interacting with anyone else during it. Monitors make no attempt to interact with the viewer. Telepathic overlay vanishes.

It now has to be pointed up that there are two models for monitors regarding remote viewing: the TRAINING monitor and the FORMAL OPERATIONAL SESSION monitor. Unfortunately, as the years have lately unfolded these have become confused, and the latter model has disappeared. The training monitor of course guides and instructs the potential remote viewing student -- but only until he or she achieves various states of proficiency, and ultimately all of the states necessary to produce high-stage results WITHOUT any interference from anyone at all.

The role of the operational session monitor is thus very minimal, and is mainly constituted to serve the needs and demands of the achieved CRV'er.

Thus, while the training monitor at first has a great deal of power within the training mode, the role of the operational session monitor is practically nil.

More detailed descriptions of the discovery, realization, and amelioration of telepathic overlay will be included in my forthcoming Internet book REMOTE VIEWING, THE REAL STORY. What remote viewing actually is will be detailed in the book, and I dare say that many will find that it is something quite different from what they had assumed it to be.

The modern elements of thought-transference and traveling clairvoyance arose from research successors to Anton Mesmer during the early 1800s -- and who studied sympathetic and rapport states during which the phenomena of both often manifested with exceeding clarity.

However, this is an epoch of history which has been almost totally erased from access. Fortunately, the intrepid historian of such phenomena, Eric J. Dingwall, spent many years collecting all relevant documents still available from France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Scandinavia, Russia, Poland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Latin America, the United States and Great Britain. He published this amazing collection in four volumes entitled ABNORMAL HYPNOTIC PHENOMENA (J. & A. Churchill, Ltd., 1967.)

Although these volumes may be hard to locate by now, I heartily recommend them to those ardently interested in the superpowers of the human bio-mind -- a number of which are breathtakingly presented in them. And, furthermore, presented in ways strip away the cloying, simplistic stereotypes fashionable today.

(End)

REMOTE VIEWING AND SIGNAL-TO-NOISE RATIO

a.k.a. The "Noisy Mind/Dirty Data" Issue

Ingo Swann

25Feb96

* * *

In June of 1972, Dr. H. E. Puthoff invited me to make a short visit to Stanford Research Institute (SRI) [later renamed SRI International]. From this visit soon arose the important Psychoenergetics Research Project at SRI, largely funded by you-know-who, and which creatively prospered until Dr. Puthoff resigned from it in 1985.

The purpose of the first visit was not only to experimentally poke around in the psi phenomena but to discuss basic issues regarding them. We found it relatively easy between us to erect a roster of issues we both suspected were critical to the phenomena but which were seldom, if at all, considered elsewhere in the world.

On the roster appeared the Signal-To-Noise Problem. I had already begun grappling with this problem during experiments at The American Society for Psychical Research (ASPR) beginning in 1971. But as a physicist, Puthoff was entirely familiar with it, since it is one of the greater issues in the whole of science. And so, on this item, he and I found we were of like mind.

The only initial confusion was that this topic appeared as about eighth or ninth on the roster after a number of psychological situations we thought might be more important. By about the end of 1974 though, the signal-to-noise issue topped the list, and was finally and correctly identified as THE problem.

In other words, the REAL story of remote viewing, its beginning and end and all that goes in between, first and foremost has to do with the signal-to-noise ratio.

It is worth pointing up early here that the central interest of the intelligence community in psi phenomena DID NOT focus on a bunch of psychics strutting their stuff, or on a bunch of parapsychologists seeking to theoretically explain psi theoretically. That interest, and especially the interest of the sponsors, focused precisely on the signal-to-noise ratio.

And so the real story of why the intelligence community became interested in remote viewing is also the story of the signal-to-noise ratio applied to it. You see, both Puthoff and I, although somewhat inadvertently at first, presented the issue of remote viewing as a signal-to-noise problem, and not as anything else more familiar to average concepts of psi.

*

It now must clearly be stated that if the parameters of the signal-to-noise issue, and its attendant problems, are not thoroughly understood, then remote viewing cannot, and will not, be understood in any real, functional clarity.

It does not matter what else you might think you (pro or con) understand regarding remote viewing. This single issue is axiomatic not only to remote viewing but to ALL of the other superpowers of the human bio- mind.

For the definitions and descriptors of signal-to-noise I largely depend on my copy of the fifth edition of Van Nostrand's Scientific Encyclopedia (1968) because it (and possibly later editions) is easily available in libraries and schools. The basic definitions of the ratio will not have changed since 1968, and never will. If at first the definitions seem difficult, just carry on for all will become clear ahead.

SIGNAL: (1) An independent variable; (2) A visual, audible, or other indication used to convey information; (3) The intelligence, message, or effect to be conveyed over (or through) a communication system; (4) A signal wave.

NOISE: Any undesirable sound. By extension, noise is any unwanted disturbance within a useful frequency band, such as undesired electric waves in any transmission channel or device. Such disturbances, when produced by other services (or systems or sources) are called interference. Noise is also accidental or random fluctuation in electric circuits due to motion of the current carriers. From this concept of noise, the term is used as an adjective to denote unwanted fluctuations in quantities that are desired to remain constant (or clear and not interfered with.)

We can now shorten these definitions. "Signal" is the message or information. "Noise" is whatever distorts, deforms, prevents, interferes with, disorganizes, changes or aborts the signal down to the point where the signal might not be locatable or received at all.

In a scientific sense, the signal-to-noise ratio is most familiar to electrical engineers and anyone dealing with instruments (radio, television, radar, sonar, etc.) Computer jocks would consider garbage in, garbage out (GIGO) as noise.

Anyone with a radio would be familiar with noise, calling it static. If the picture on your TV is not coming in crystal clear, then some kind of noise is interfering with it. Messages or information which are not clear and precise are noisy ones.

In terms of the electromagnetic universe in which we all live and are vitally hooked into, we know that information can be transmitted via precise EM waves and frequencies usually referred to as band. Our visual receptors receive signals of a very small band of the EM spectrum, which we call the light spectrum. Our sonic receptors (in the ears) receive another band of the EM spectrum. And so on.

When our eye receptors or their system become damaged or eroded, we say we can't see as well. But actually, the eye-sensors conveying information are suffering an increase of noise.

*

The phrase "signal-to-noise ratio" thus refers to how much signal and how much noise is present regarding just about anything and everything.

The full meaning of the signal-to-noise ratio, then, is that we live within a signal-to-noise universe, or a signal-to-noise world, where the ratios between the signals and the noise are of crucial and critical importance.

We can even extend this to include the distinctions between noise-as-chaos and signals-as-order. And as well, can include real truth as clear signals and untruths and the not-true as noise.

Finally, we can say that signals equate to accuracy, while noise equates to inaccuracy.

*

With regard to remote viewing, then, or to any other of the superpowers of the biomind, it is important to know that our species does possess the basic faculties for them. But beyond that, this importance is secondary if those faculties are submerged in more noise than signal.

And, with some notable exceptions, this is the average case among most specimens of our species -- more noise than signal.

At this point, then, the only thing that matters is the signal-to-noise ratio.

For, you see, our species might possess extraordinary faculties for a lot of things. But by inspection, it is also an extremely noisy species in many more ways than one.

*

In any event, when in the very early 1970s, Puthoff and I, and soon others, included the signal- to- noise

problem in our research agendas and proposals, the result was that we placed the issue of psi perceptions in a context that was instantly recognized by scientists and technicians worldwide.

As you will see in my essay entitled "Remote Viewing - Misconceptions and Confusions," the intelligence community had begun examining and tracking psi developments in the early 1930s. It had generally been concluded, by the late 1950s, that the existence, or not, of psi was not the issue.

Indeed, almost everyone accepts that psi faculties exist within our species, and have done so from time immemorial.

But the crucial distinction has always been the critical signal-to-noise ratio --- also expressed by the companion metaphor as the ratio of accuracy to inaccuracy.

Now, it is interesting to note that parapsychologists, although aware of the accuracy-to- inaccuracy ratio, had hardly ever interpreted this as the signal-to-noise ratio.

With respect to the Psychoenergetics Project at SRI between 1973-1985, almost all of the principle funding and support was acquired on behalf of identifying and researching the signal-to-noise issues clearly present regarding psi performance.

Obviously, if these issues could be sorted out, it was theoretically possible to decrease noise and enhance signal.

*

The first step that needed to be undertaken was to ascertain the average ratio of signal/noise among naturally occurring psi perceptions in both gifted and non-gifted persons. If this average could be determined, then it would act as the baseline against which increases and decreases in performances could be judged.

A large number of individuals volunteered or were recruited to take part in experiments designed solely to observe the signal-to-noise ratio.

By the end of 1974, it began to look like that average ratio was 20% signal to 80% noise. By the end of 1975, though, further experiments showed that the average was about 15% signal to 85% noise, with some notable exceptions.

*

Is it now completely necessary to point out that this statistical baseline had been confirmed in 1973-1975 by Dr. H. E. Puthoff and his good offices.

Recent claims, portrayed via this or that media, that this baseline was identified by others only between 1989-1993 are completely without foundation. They are as well attempts to rewrite the history of remote

viewing, and without doubt mislead public perception of that history. In fact, such claims or implications have been made by individuals who know better, and whom should apologize to Puthoff.

*

Now, the ratio of low signal (low or infrequent accuracy) to high noise (high and frequent inaccuracy) could not possibly be of any service within the intelligence community respective of using psi perceptions for espionage purposes. If decisions are to be taken based on espionage inputs, one has to be relatively sure that the inputs consist of "good" information and not "bad" information.

So, after the baseline had been determined, the next entirely logical step was to figure out how to enhance the signal, right?

Well, this particular goal has never been invisible to anyone. Very many methods have been evolved purporting to enhance psi signals under the rubric of "developing your psychic potentials."

I was the first to point out, even before I heard of Puthoff or SRI, that if any of these methods had worked, our world would already be populated with a very large number of achieved superpsychics. Well, would it not be? C'mon, Netsurfers, think this through --- and there are now more of You than there are superpsychics, and many of You know the important difference between noise and signal.

*

Now there is a kind of "formula" which is frequently used just about everywhere. In order to perfect something, one has two basic options: find out what's right about it and enhance that; and/or find out what's wrong and cure that.

The usual course decided upon consists of the former. Few think to examine what is wrong, because doing so will have some kind of cause or source no one wants to admit to.

But in electrical engineering or regarding instrumentation, no signal can be enhanced or protected unless the noise sources that erode it are identified.

In 1974, I suggested, well, we don't really know how to enhance the signal --- so let's work to identify the noise sources. Believe it or not, this is an accepted approach in science and among technicians throughout the world. Believe it or not, nothing of the kind had ever been thought of, much less attempted, in conventional parapsychology.

*

But the hypothesis here is a very simple one: subtract the noise --- and what, then, are you left with?

*

The signal-to-noise ratio is universally accepted as entirely meaningful in a large number of human endeavors.

But for reasons almost, but not entirely inexplicable, when it comes to considering the human mind, the signal-to-noise factor has hardly ever been applied.

On the other hand, most will accept that the human mind processes, conveys and acts upon information. If you really want to experience having your synapses rattled, seek out and talk with someone who does not believe that the human mind processes information but is just a stimulus/response organism.

You can also encounter certain specimens of our species who don't want to process certain kinds of information --- and some of whom belabor themselves with ensuring that other specimens don't process it either.

If we can accept that information equates to signal, then we are obliged to assume that mind processes signals under the rubric of processing information.

*

If one gets this far without having minor nervous breakdowns, then we are forced to accept the axiom that the signal-to-noise ratio is as relevant to information as it is relevant to anything else.

We then come to the concept that mental information processing grids that become constructed in each specimen of our species are susceptible to the signal-to-noise ratio.

If we take the very daring step of abandoning all other images humans hold of our species and ourselves, and temporarily consider each specimen of our species principally as A THINKING MACHINE OR INSTRUMENT --- well, we now have a metaphor of ourselves that would be entirely consistent with the situation regarding the signal-to-noise ratio.

Gasping for breath here, we can now consider how each thinking machine is mind-dynamically WIRED.

To carry on with this particular line of discussion we would have to consider that each born specimen is also a born biomind thinking machine.

But there is a larger, more encompassing situation. It is this.

It is widely assumed that each specimen of our species is born with at least the rudiments of a mind. Each, therefore, is also born to think, since we believe that is what the mind chiefly does.

Indeed, it is universally agreed that the powers of thinking are our most pronounced and special attribute --- and that it is this single attribute that has elevated our species to the top position of masters of all things on Earth, excepting earthquakes, volcanoes and the weather. The chief image we hold of our species, then, is that of the Thinking Being --- as species *Homo sapiens sapiens* (Man who knows that it

knows.)

*

Mind and thinking, however, process information. It is therefore implicit that any mind-processing of information requires systems to do so. Systems which process anything are susceptible to the signal-to-noise ratio and its attendant problems. Broadly speaking, then, the human mind is susceptible to signal and noise, as are the processes it uses to think with and through.

Yet the signal-to-noise situation is never applied to the human mind either as a processor of information or as a thinking thing.

*

Additionally, anything which processes anything is, by definition, a machine.

MACHINE (definitions of): It is amusing to note that my trusty Webster's first gives an "archaic" definition, to wit, a constructed thing whether material or immaterial. "Archaic," of course, means that the term was once used in those two contexts -- although today it is somewhat of a challenge to imagine what a constructed immaterial machine might consist of.

In any event, the major contemporary definitions are: (1) an assemblage of parts that transmit forces, motion and energy one to another in a predetermined manner; (2) an instrument designed to transmit or modify the application of power, force, or motion; (3) a living organism or one of its functional systems [and which does (1) and/or (2) above.]

Please note that definition (3) above IS given in my dependable dictionary --- and is therefore not a figment of my imagination, and is not archaic or obsolete.

*

Now emerges a signal situation or question. Clearly all of us at base entirely believe that we are living organisms that possess functional systems --- or which we believe to be functional. But does anyone think of themselves as a machine, as a thinking machine whose assemblages of thinking parts transmit or modify energy, forces, power, or motions?

*

Well, the concept of ourselves as human beings arouses the idea of ourselves as an entity of some kind. And against this entity concept the issue of the signal-to-noise ratio hardly seems relevant.

And, indeed, if the entity did not think, or thought of Nothing, then it wouldn't be relevant, right? Instead

we would be entirely composed only as stimulus-response bio-mechanisms (as some early psychologists theorized.)

Human entities, however, are born to think --- and furthermore are genetically pre-installed with the systemic equipment and hard-wiring to do so. In other words, we are not just bio-born, but are born biomind mechanisms (a.k.a. entities.)

Thereafter, information is absorbed or introduced into (i.e., input) the entity-born-to-think. And it is this information it then uses to think with through the systems pre-installed to process information.

Since all information is a matter well within the signal-to-noise ratio and its attendant problems, and since all humans utilize information to think-process with, all humans no matter what they are called are susceptible to the signal-to-noise ratio and its variations.

In any event, there is probably no such human critter which is absolutely and completely information-less.

All humans, then, are walking, talking, eating, defecating information processors --- to which the signal-to-noise ratio is not only important but basic and fundamental.

*

As I've already indicated, we don't at all think of ourselves in any way remotely resembling the above.

About as close as we come to the above is that occasionally someone encounters or talks about "clear thinking."

Sometimes people wonder what others are using to think with.

Today, some of the computer literate have begun to wonder how and why people are wired they way they are --- largely because they are aware that if computers are not correctly "wired" then those advanced machines produce information noise or noisy information.

Indeed, a "virus" introduced into a computer system is a source of "noise" which proceeds to discombobulate all of the installed computer programs and systemic functions designed to process and produce unadulterated "signal."

*

Today, it is generally considered that computers are lesser (so far) emulations of the human mind. Indeed, the WorldWide Web is, by some, being considered emulative of the worldwide brain.

The signal-to-noise situation is vividly applied to computers, their programs, their information inputs and outputs, and into all the reaches of computerdom and Internetland. There is no misunderstanding that computers, although emulative of the human mind, are information machines. Machines which

exactly match and correspond to the first two definitions of "machine" given above.

*

I do consider all of the above as hypothetical, of course, and would never dare to indicate that anyone is merely a walking, talking, thinking machine with a number of appetites, fixations, and preferences.

But having brusquely advanced the hypothetical line-up just above, I can now indicate that the closest conventional approximation to them is that sometimes the idea of "clear thinking" is mentioned here and there. Clear thinking, as, perhaps, opposed to noisy thinking.

Well, we can describe our species in many different ways. But Alas! One way to describe ourselves is that, based on easily observable evidence, we constitute a species that is fascinated and sometimes completely preoccupied with turning fact (signal) into fiction, and fiction (noise) into fact. We are so excellent in all this that we can even turn truth into the not-true, and the not-true into truth.

Indeed, we are the only known species that does these rather remarkable transfigurations on a rather continuing and redundant basis.

*

In any event, it doesn't really matter how we think of ourselves or our species --- since in any which way we do or don't, as individual specimens are susceptible to the signal-to-noise ratio.

*

By now some of you chancing to read this essay might wonder what all of it has to do with remote viewing (distant-seeing) and the other superpowers of the human biomind.

Well, if the mental information processing grids of a given biomind specimen are noisy regarding its indwelling hard drive of superpower signals, then that specimen probably won't very well be able either to identify or process the relevant inputs of information.

In other words, the noise ratios internal to the grids have to be reduced before the signals can become perceptible.

There is a very apt analogy here. If you are in a very noisy room, it's quite probable you can't hear what the person next to you is saying.

I.e., if your mental information processing grids are very noisy regarding your natural superpower endowments, then you won't hear what they are saying. This is rational logic, is it not?

*

As the result of the above discussions, we can now talk of remote viewing in the light of the signal-to-noise ratio.

It can be shown, with relative ease, that the signals associated not only with the remote viewing processes, but with all the superpowers, are quite subtle, and perhaps even fragile. (See my three essays on Intuition.)

Although the concept of signal-to-noise was not used in pre-Modern societies, the facts of the subtle nature of the signals were generally understood quite well. Indeed, most pre-Modern societies worked to set up noise-free environments within which it was believed the subtle signals could better be detected, sensed or perceived.

Also set up parallel to noise-free environments was the concept of the "quiet mind" --- i.e., the noise-free mind. Many methods were advanced regarding how to achieve the noise-free mind --- or how to delete the noise from the mind at least for the duration needed to detect the subtle signals.

*

The ideas of the noise-free environment and the quiet mind are, of course, familiar to just about anyone with an interest in the biomind faculties which detect subtle signals. These ideas have been pursued during the modern period, sometimes quite broadly and vigorously. And it is generally believed that if these two noise-freeing factors can be established, then the outcome will be the acquisition of enhanced superpower information.

In other words, a wholesale number of "superpsychics" would emerge, the question regarding the existence of the superpowers would have been settled once and for all, and the human world would be a different thing.

In spite of the expectations, not much of the kind has happened. The incidence of high-stage superpowers remains quite low, while the most convincing manifestations of them remain spontaneous and frequently occur within circumstances that are decidedly not noise-free.

*

There is only one most likely explanation for this "failure." It is this. While we certainly can comprehend the relationship of signal to noise, we also need to know more precisely what signals and noise consist of.

Even a quiet mind might not recognize signals unless its mental information processing grids can identify them and their special characteristics. And no one can delete noise unless it is recognized for what it is.

*

As has been discussed above, it is probably more relevant to identify noise and noise sources in order to delete them from mental information processing grids. But herein exists a great difficulty.

Having spent some twenty years working along these lines, it is clear that mental information processing grids possess noise factors that ARE NOT RECOGNIZED AS SUCH.

For example, an incorrect concept that is thought to be correct will not be identified as a noise source.

As a gross illustration here, some believe that ESP is the work of the devil --- even though ESP is treated very positively in the Bible although not under that term.

Such specimens therefore possess a mental information processing grid that they believe holds correct data, but which none the less is "dirty data" (noise.) They will obviously have problems with their own ESP potentials.

Likewise, a science type who believes the idea correct that the superpowers are impossible because they transcend time and space will not be able to process evidential or correct information regarding the functions of the superpowers. Or if they do try to process such information, it will go through that particular disbelief filter and come out in some fashion according to it. Anti-psi skeptics, for example, cannot correctly process correct information and data, and when they try the only result is dirty, noisy conclusions.

*

It is quite broadly accepted that the minds of OTHERS can contain incorrect hypotheses, convictions, ideas and concepts --- all of which contribute to noise held in the mind. One's own mind, of course, never suffers from the same condition.

*

The human mind, collective and individual, is probably the single biggest source of NOISE on our planet, while the minds of various specimens often produce some of the dirtiest data possible.

Even so, most specimens of our species believe that the ideas and concepts they possess about things and phenomena are the correct ones to have --- and, furthermore, the correct ones to perpetuate and to make others share in.

Additionally, many specimens don't actually possess clear and concise concepts and ideas they believe to be correct or incorrect. They rather possess concepts and ideas that are vague, nebulous and ambiguous without realizing as much. Obviously, nebulous concepts tend toward being noisy ones. Many specimens possess no ideas and concepts relevant to various kinds of information --- and so they route that information through some other grid which has nothing to do with anything.

Finally, as mentioned earlier, there is the copious evidence that our species has the marvelous penchant of turning fact into fiction, and fiction into fact.

If either or both of those reversals have been installed, in this sense, then, the "quiet mind" probably isn't the same thing as a noise-free one. Any mind can roam quite contentedly among its self-held noise if the belief is held that the noise is not noise.

*

Alas! It is difficult to proceed with this line of discussion because doing so can quickly degenerate into volcanic situations, diatribes, polemics and worse. Hardly any specimen can bear the idea that its mind and grids are occupied with so much as even one dirty data point or noisy information package.

*

In any event, the signal-to-noise situation is entirely relevant to all of the superpowers. Indeed, no one calls a superpower a superpower if what issues forth from it is noise and dirty data.

Accuracy and clarity are the signal features of each and all of the superpowers. And if such is not present by confirmatory feedback, then something other than superpower functioning regarding signals has occurred.

*

Near the beginning of this essay I discussed how the naturally-occurring signal-to-noise ratio was discovered and confirmed at SRI relevant to remote viewing. With certain notable exceptions, that ratio was discovered on average to be about 15-20% signal to about 80% noise.

This average ratio was clearly not suitable for remote-viewing espionage purposes. Efforts were then undertaken to study not the signal, but the noise and its sources in an effort to delete them from the mind- dynamic processes involved --- after which signal could be identified and enhanced.

What then happened is the real story of remote viewing and also the reason that the SRI project lasted for so long under Dr. Puthoff's auspices. Had not decreases in noise and increases in signal been demonstrated, then it is quite clear that the project would have been abandoned after a year or so.

Fourteen years later the remote viewing effort began failing --- largely because too many individuals who had become involved opted to ignore noise sources. When, then, in 1989-91, a certain individual again tested for remote viewing potentials, he rediscovered the 15% to 18% signal to noise ratio. The whole of this story will be told in my forthcoming book which will be published initially via the Internet.

REMOTEVIEWING

One Of The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

SENSORY TRANSDUCERS

Ingo Swann (15May96)

Part Three

Based on the extent of my accumulated understanding so far, there is little doubt that the topic of SENSORY TRANSDUCERS constitutes about 70 percent of what one needs to know about all or any of the superpowers of the human biomind.

*

An additional 20 percent is involved with the topic of mental information processing grids, and which more or less equate to our mental "software" programs or networks. This topic will be partially considered in Part Four of this mini-series of essays.

*

This leaves about 10 percent which involves special knowledge concerning the nature and structure of the "hard drives" of our species biomind and the fundamental faculties inherent in them.

*

The "accumulated understanding" referred to above is drawn from over thirty years of research, eighteen of which were spent in laboratory work, testing and strict oversight confirmation. For the most part, the laboratory work was conducted at Stanford Research Institute (SRI), funded by the intelligence community upon instructions to do so by congressional committees. The whole of the eighteen years of research then proceeded under the direct auspices of many thorough-minded scientific

oversight committees.

*

The SRI project was the most extensive, intensive and longest in duration ever mounted to inquire into the nature and functions of the so-called "paranormal" aptitudes.

Even so, in this present essay the resulting information can only be offered for what it's worth to those who chance to read it. For in the absence of tutored exercises it can only be theoretically considered.

*

The only real problem (among many lesser ones) is that the three topics noted above have not been identified before. And so they have never heretofore taken on a broad reality basis -- at least within the concepts utilized by the cultures of the modern West.

When cast against the enormous amount of popular and professional literature of all kinds which has accumulated on the general topic of "psychic abilities," the reduction of what is involved to only three major topics will at first seem unreasonable.

I will therefore depend on the old axiom that it is what is NOT understood which seems complex and complicated, perhaps even unsolvable. But when it is finally understood it becomes easy and people wonder why they hadn't understood it before.

*

To help launch into this essay, and to help make it as internally complete as possible, it seems advisable to remind of the working definition of the superpowers -- and which has already been presented in other essays in this database.

*

Generally speaking, the usual powers can be seen to involve the physical and tangible which our basic five physical senses inform us of. These powers are not considered "psychic" ones because it is thought that they can be "explained" within the terms of physicality -- even though a number of the usual powers actually belong in the superpower category.

*

The superpowers of the biomind involve sensory and perceptual faculties which transcend the extent and limits of physicality and inform us of factors by ways which cannot be explained by its known "laws." SOME of these aptitudes have been identified, and are grouped together under the generic term "psychic."

*

In the modern West, psychic aptitudes are considered "paranormal" or "parapsychological." But other and earlier cultures did not make this strange and unfortunate distinction -- and which led to the Western mainstream condemnation of the paranormal as abnormal and irrational.

*

It is much more profitable to consider that specimens of the human species possess arrays of sensory receptors.

We should also consider that the sensory receptors detect "signals" and enter the signals into the biomind identifying mechanisms which convert them into feelings, perceptions, impressions and etc., and which ultimately interact within the individual's intellect.

*

In Western technical concepts and jargon, mechanisms which convert one form of input energy to another form which can be utilized by different systems are referred to as TRANSDUCERS.

*

If we extend the concept of transducers to include biomind situations, then we can very easily arrive at the concept of SENSORY TRANSDUCERS (a term which has been coined by others than myself.)

*

In the case of the human biomind, the enormous number of sensory receptors function in various ways which input various signals (forms of energy information) into the vast complex of the sensory systems. But the input signals need to be transduced into other forms in order to be utilized by the various biomind systems.

*

The following is exceedingly important.

It would appear that the human biomind sensorium possesses the inherent hard drive faculties TO CONSTRUCT an enormous variety of sensory transducers.

But it also appears that beyond the inherent hard drive faculties, the transducers are constructed only as a result of repeated exposure to the signals in some kind of cognitive way.

*

This is to say that although the biomind systems are bombarded, as it were, with signals of all kinds,

sensory transducers appear to form only if the intellect in some fashion recognizes a need or usefulness for them.

Since perceptions of needs or usefulness are usually determined by environmental and social factors, human specimens will usually elect to form only those sensory transducers which integrate them with those factors.

*

And it is at this point that the concept of sensory transducers becomes immeasurably complicated -- and for the following reasons.

For the most part, those sensory transducers which are typically constructed, more or less follow the lines of local environmental, social and educational influences.

*

As but three examples, people who spend their lives in the high mountains have no need of the sensory transducers formed by those who spend their lives majorly on water or the oceans -- and vice versa. Urban dwellers have no need of the particular sensory transducers needed by farmers -- and vice versa. Intellectuals have no need of the sensory transducers formed by those who depart from the intellectual armchair and go out into the "field" to work within hands-on situations.

*

This is to say that our species, and very probably every specimen born of it, possesses the inherent faculties for sensory transducer formatting. But the general, overall result is the formatting of a wide variety of sensory transducers in given individual and socio-educational groupings. This is the same as saying that different people format different sets of sensory transducers -- meaning that some form sensory transducers which others do not.

*

It is now necessary to introduce the concept that there are differences between what might be called the "gross" and the "subtle" sensory receptors. I don't particularly like those two terms, but they are about the only ones we have in order to convey the ideas of the concept.

*

The gross sensory receptors inform us of the tangible. The subtle ones inform us of the intangible. But there is an added distinction which is enormously important. For the tangible can only be experienced locally and regards the physical vicinity which the individual biomind is most accustomed to. But the intangible can be experienced non-locally and will concern matters not dependent on the

physical vicinity of the biomind specimen.

I will extend consideration of these concepts ahead. But in this way we can distinguish between the gross physical sensory receptors and the subtle refined sensory receptors.

It's worth while, here, to point out that most human specimens build a lot of sensory transducers regarding the tangible sensory receptors (i.e., the famous five so-called physical senses.)

What forms in the way of intangible sensory transducers is open for wondering about.

*

In order to get deeper into the topic of this essay, sensory transducers, it is necessary to undertake some background discussions so as to establish a broader information basis which will ultimately aid in comprehension.

*

To get into this, I will begin by giving the formal technical definitions of TRANSDUCER taken from a reasonably authoritative source -- VAN NOSTRAND'S SCIENTIFIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, Fifth Edition. The exact definitions are very important, for the concepts of transducers not only underlie the entirety of the human biomind sensorium, but ALL of the superpowers of the biomind.

You may bear in mind, however, that the definitions refer to physical mechanisms and equipment -- and that we will be converting the definitions so that they refer to the human biomind sensorium.

I will help elucidate and simplify after the definitions have been given.

*

"TRANSDUCER: 1. A device by means of which energy can flow from one or more transmission systems to one or more other transmission systems. The energy transmitted by these systems may be of any form (for example, it may be electric, mechanical, or acoustical), and it may be of the same form or different forms in the various input and output systems.

"2. For some purposes the transducer is defined (more narrowly) as a device capable of being actuated by waves from one or more transmission systems or media, and of supplying related waves to one or more other transmission systems or media. It is sometimes implied that the input and output energies shall be of different forms. For example, an electroacoustic transducer accepts electrical waves and delivers acousting waves.

"Among the types of transducers in addition to those designated by nature of energy change, such as electroacoustic or electromechanical transducers, are:

"The ACTIVE TRANSDUCER, whose output waves are dependent upon sources of power, apart from that supplied by any of the actuating waves, which power is controlled by one or ore of these waves.

"The CONVERSION TRANSDUCER, an electric transducer in which the input and the output frequencies are different. If the frequency-changing property of a conversion transducer depends upon a generator of frequency different from that of the input or output frequencies, the frequency and voltage or power of this generator are parameters of the conversion transducer.

"The HARMONIC TRANSDUCER, a conversion transducer in which the useful output frequency is a multiple or a sub-multiple of the input frequency. Either a frequency multiplier or a frequency divider is a special case of harmonic conversion transducer.

"The HETERODYNE CONVERSION TRANSDUCER, a conversion transducer in which the useful output frequency is the sum or difference of the input frequency and an integral multiple of the frequency of another wave.

"The PASSIVE TRANSDUCER, whose output waves are independent of any sources of power which is controlled by the actuating waves.

"The IDEAL TRANSDUCER, a hypothetical passive transducer which transfers the maximum possible power from a specified source to a load. In linear electric circuits and analogous cases, this is equivalent to a transducer which (a) dissipates no energy and (b) when connected to the specified source and load, presents to each its compliance."

I trust you understood all of the above.

*

But now to elucidate and simplify a little, first by saying that I've given the entire definitions in order to show that there are different kinds of transducers. If we apply the concept of transducers to the human biomind, it is quite probable that hundreds or thousands of different kinds of sensory transducers can be formed.

*

More simply speaking regarding the basic definition, a transducer is a device that is actuated by power from one system and supplies power in some other form to a second system.

Another way of putting this is that a transducer converts power or energy of one system into a different form so that it can be utilized by a second system which can't utilize the first form of the energy or power.

*

All of this might seem alien to you -- unless it is pointed up that the telephones we use every day are transducers -- actually two of them.

The speaking end of the telephone converts our voice sounds into electromagnetic signals which can travel through wires or the atmospheres. These signals are then received at the listening end, but are reconverted by another kind of transducer into the sound vibrations we hear and recognize as words. The same can be said of radio and television broadcasting. What is to be broadcast is converted into electromagnetic signals which travel (i.e., are propagated) along various bands of the electromagnetic spectrum -- and which signals are received by the reception transducers in radios and TVs and which convert the EM-signals into the sounds and images we see and hear.

*

The only reason we are unfamiliar with the existence and functions of the transducers is that we experience only the end-products of the transduced information by our radios and TVs. We usually have no knowledge that broadcast information is first converted into EM-signals which are what are broadcast, and then reconverted by the receiving transducers into the sounds and images we hear and see.

*

But almost exactly the same things go on when we speak words and our ears receive them. Our voice box and larynx produce not words, but sonic vibrations which are modulated in various ways by our tongues, lips and jaws. The sonic vibrations have meanings to those who "speak" the sonic vibrations.

The spoken sonic vibrations propagate across a distance and are received by our ear mechanisms not as words but as sonic vibrations, i.e., sonic signals.

If we have not formed biomind transducers which reconvert the sonic signals into word meanings, then the sonics will not take on the form of words -- and we will not understand the sound vibrations and they will seem like garbled language or meaningless noise.

*

Here is the essential problem of languages. In different languages the same thing can be sonically rendered via a vast number of sonic signals. But those who have not formed specific transducers to render them into meaning will not understand them.

In this precise sense, then, sonic vibrations are information-signals which need to be recognized (transduced) as having particular meaning -- and obviously it takes a vast array of sensory transducers to result in this.

*

Our species, and every specimen born of it, has the universal hard-drive faculties to emit and receive sonic vibrations. But the meanings to be attached to them reside within the formative influences of the environments, social groupings and cultures each specimen lives within.

Again the reason why we are unfamiliar with the sonic signal processes is that we do not perceive the vibrations themselves. The sonic vibrations are so quickly converted by our biomind transducers into meanings and/or noise that we are aware only of experiencing the end products.

There can be no doubt that words, as emitted and received sonic vibrations ARE vibrations (signals) because our species has invented mechanical equipment to display the characteristics of the vibrations.

*

The sense receptors we collectively refer to as eyesight are quite similar regarding vibrations. We do not

literally or actually see what is out there. Rather light causes light frequencies (another form of vibrations) to bounce off of what is illuminated.

Our eye mechanisms do not receive pictures of the things themselves, but receive the bounced light frequencies instead. These frequencies are recombined into images by some undiscovered transducer function, and it is these images we perceive in our heads -- and with the astonishing adjunct that we feel we are directly seeing what is out there.

We have no sense at all of experiencing that what we are looking at is a reconstituted image in our own heads, not really something "out there."

*

Again, light frequencies are information signals propagating along a particularly narrow band of the electromagnetic spectrum -- referred to as the visual light spectrum.

These signals are received by the eye-brain mechanisms as a spectrum of information signals. They are not received as images. Another step is required. The signals need to be transduced into the images which the biomind perceives.

*

Now, it is generally thought and taught that we are receiving visual images. This is not true. What the visualizing parts of our biominds are receiving, via our eye systems, is not visual images but light frequencies -- while the images are reconstituted by some kind of transducers into the images we see. The problem here is that the whole of this takes place in a micro-fraction of a second -- so fast indeed that the images which appear in our heads seem simultaneous with what our visual sense receptors are sensing "out there." So we think we are seeing what is out there. We have no conscious awareness of the existence of the mysterious transducers involved.

*

As an added situation, it is well known that people see things differently, and that some see tangible things completely missed by others. And here is the situation regarding which and what kind of sensory transducers have or have not been formatted at the individual level.

*

There is an enormous complexity involved here. As has often been said, scientists today know everything there is to know about our physical eyesight mechanisms. But with one exception: How the light frequencies which travel through the eye mechanisms "register" somewhere unknown within the biomind and result in transduced images.

For those who might want to read in more detail of what I have summarized just above, I refer you to a particular book, probably hard to find but well worth the effort: BEYOND ALL BELIEF, by Peter Lemesurier (Element Books, Great Britain, 1983).

*

In common parlance we refer to hearing and seeing as two of the major physical senses. I suppose this is OK -- as long as one does not look into the mechanisms and processes involved. But in fact, such looking into was not possible before the modern sciences invented refined equipment to do so. After the invention of such equipment, and the applying of it to the dissecting of the physical senses, the definitions of the senses really ought to have radically changed -- because by now the earlier concepts of the senses are almost completely antiquated.

*

Indeed, it is quite possible today to say that we do not have SENSES at all -- unless we utilize the term "sense" as "to make sense of something."
What we actually have are vast arrays of SENSORY RECEPTORS of all kinds quite busy receiving an even vaster array of information-signals.
We also have vast arrays of EMITTERS, equally busy sending out all kinds of information-signals.

*

Various problems concerning concepts and nomenclature about remote viewing and the other superpowers were discussed in Part One of this series of essays.
The general point was made that once the concepts and nomenclature have become established, they also enter into our mental information processing grids -- and thereafter we think of the superpowers only within those terms.
As a result, our sensory load inputs and subsequent thinking processes and their extent can become trapped within the limits of the concepts and nomenclature.

*

Some few researchers have agreed that the modern West has only a very limited number of concepts regarding the superpowers and the paranormal, some of which are quite superficial while others are not correct and therefore are misleading.
For example, the fabled out-of-body experience appears to have a number of different states or gradients, some of which are not completely independent of the biobody.
Yet we tend to think of the OOBIE only within one context having to do with the two-part division typical of Western philosophical dualism. Dualism divides the human biomind entity into only two parts, the biological part and another part commonly thought of as The Spirit and/or the Mind.

*

If one digs deeper into this two-part simplicity, it becomes quite clear that the human biomind is multi-

aspected, multi-dimensional, and capable of many gradient sensory states and conditions that can find no home or reality within the Western two-part concept of dualism.

*

In Part Two, an attempt was made to discuss the SIDHIS of ancient India -- and this topic must now be expanded a little since it leads directly into the topic of sensory transducers and the superpowers of the human biomind.

*

Descriptions of the sidhis will definitely identify them as superpowers of the human biomind. However, although descriptions of the various sidhis have been recounted in many sources published in the modern West, what they actually consisted of in their ancient terms past remains foggy in modern terms. But it is clearly implied in the ancient Yoga texts that the sidhis are the products of learning and deliberate development. It would appear that one cannot develop or enhance any of the sidhis merely by reading about them.

In the context of this essay, obviously would have been needed is the development and strengthening of specific kinds of sensory transducers.

However, what additionally would be involved in developing them is not explained in the ancient Yoga texts -- apparently because the Yogins felt that the superpowers should be developed only by those who had attained certain moral and ethical levels.

*

The Yoga literature of the past, however, does, with some certainty, distinguish between the "gross" and the "subtle" senses.

We in the modern West would distinguish between the physical and the psychic senses -- and assume that our distinction exactly corresponds with what was meant in the ancient Yoga tradition.

*

But within my many years of experience and research, the Western division can only be an approximate one at best. Our modern distinction carries the overtones of Western dualism, and which makes our enormously limiting two-part distinction possible.

But there is hardly any evidence that the ancient Yogins leaned on any format of dualism. Good translations (there ARE bad ones) of the Yoga Sutras seem to indicate the ancient presence of an overall formative philosophy focused not on TWO aspects but on the many different multi-levels and multi-channels of the human biomind potentials.

It would seem that it was this overall philosophy of multi-aspects which released the ancient Yogins from our present modern dichotomy of material versus non-material.

*

If anything, the ancient Yogins might have assigned a good part of what we call "psychic" to the physical senses, since they identified many more than five physical senses. And indeed, recent research in neurophysiology has located the sensory receptors for at least seventeen physical senses, a number of which we would call psychic, such as magnetic directional sensing. [See, for example, DECIPHERING THE SENSES, THE EXPANDING WORLD OF HUMAN PERCEPTION, Robert Rivlin and Karen Gravelle, Simon & Schuster, 1984.]

*

One Western error of interpretation that has probably been made is in exclusively associating the Yoga "gross senses" with the physical senses. And with this, the distinction between gross and subtle senses begins -- and which we today would identify as the physical and psychic senses.

Yet many of the physical senses of biobody can qualify as subtle ones. The Yoga texts show that the ancient Yogins were completely aware of this in that they advocated the development, refinement, extending and honing of many of the physical senses.

*

There is only one possible conclusion here -- that "gross" and "subtle" must have meant something else in those ancient times.

It is my conclusion that the two terms referred not to the senses at all, but referred to how any or all of the senses were USED -- which is to say, to what ends they were used.

*

Within this context, and as IS stated in the Yoga texts, the most fundamental "gross" aspect was to utilize one's senses only to gratify physical passions, lusts or even physical needs.

Any number of what we would call "telepathic" senses can be used to those ends, and which powers we Westerners would certainly view as subtle ones in nature. {In a forthcoming essay I will discuss the telepathic capabilities of the astonishing biobody itself.}

*

Likewise, the ancient Yoga meaning of "subtle" must have meant something different.

The ancient Yogins understood that there was an immediacy in physical affairs, a direct immediacy which trapped or at least focused the awareness of people in it -- leading to the gross usage of all of their manifold senses for physical end.

*

Yet the Yogins also understood that there were intangible matters (influences?) which impacted upon physical affairs, and were even interwoven among them.

Such intangible influences certainly qualify as subtle ones, while the USAGE of the combined biomind senses to perceive THEM would certainly be of a different order than merely perceiving anything strictly physical.

*

It thus follows that the Yoga distinction was at least more between the USAGE of the senses in regard to gross and subtle GOALS than between a strict division of tangible and intangible -- or, as we would say, exclusively between the physical and the psychic sensory receptors.

*

That the USAGE of the senses, whatever they were, was the principal focus of the Yogins is inordinately pronounced if one studies the discursive passages in the ancient texts.

The Yogins clearly indicate that a focus of the senses exclusively into physicality permits gross and familiar formats of behavior, sometimes quite disgusting and heinous.

But they also held that the introduction of perceptions of the subtle intangibles brought about beneficial changes in behavior based in the principle that humans behave according to the limits or extents of what they perceive.

*

Even in bad Western translations of the Yoga texts, this basic "message" is quite clearly put, and there is little way around it. We today, of course, might transliterate this as "lifting one's consciousness into higher realms."

But we would do so on the basic dualistic assumption of more departing from the physical and entering more into the spiritual -- in other words distinguishing, rather unforgivingly, between the physical and spiritual life which we dualistically see as diametrically and permanently opposed to each other.

*

But there is hardly a trace of such diametric opposition in the Yoga texts -- and in this the general Western and Eastern foci differ completely.

The ancient Yogins clearly valued the physical as the embodiment of the enduring Life Principle -- and which, to them, was perhaps the most intangible, but the most sustaining Principle of all.

*

It was the reduction or collapse of the biomind sensory equipment and mechanisms into the limits of the purely physical purposes which disturbed them, and which collapse could be seen only by restoring the

sensory subtle faculties into functioning efficacy.

*

We in the modern West today do not have a very good picture of this -- and for a very surprising reason.

You see, we tend to judge the efficacy of psychic functioning mostly in regard to physical parameters.

For example, parapsychologists use only physical targets in testing for psi.

Psychics are used to solve physical crimes and find lost or dead bio-bodies.

Psychic readers, sometimes very good, are required to address physical situations for their clients -- sex or matrimonial partners, money, when physical circumstances will get better.

Even foreseeing the future has no real importance unless its outcomes can be judged against future, but quite physical manifestations.

Our concepts of telepathy exclusively involve physical situations, most specifically minds in bio-bodies.

Even spiritualistic mediums are expected to be in touch with departed bio-BODIES, and other

remarkable seance phenomena have to be very near to being physical in order to be appreciated.

*

Indeed, we in the modern West SAY that psychic faculties are non-material and non-material in origin.

But we test and utilize them against physicality aspects.

Even when psychic faculties are used, hypothetically speaking, to spot extraterrestrials, the result is that we assume that the ETs are somewhere in physicality and themselves are physical entities of some kind.

In this sense, then, we are trapped within the "gross usage" which the ancient Yogins most likely were referring to.

*

And even the development of controlled remote viewing, of which I was a full part, it was exclusively designed to spy on foreign "hard targets" -- physical facilities of physical military importance.

*

Indeed, we view psychic perceptions as subtle and intangible in nature -- but if and when we attempt to use them it is in regard to mundane physical situations.

*

The ancient Yoga texts can be interpreted in many ways, and as they have been. But one of the ways seems to hinge on the modern Western assumption that the Yogins taught that an increase in psychic powers (as we would call them in the modern West) was the goal.

But this was not the case at all.

The Yogins unambiguously taught that an overall INCREASE or EXPANSION of sensory awareness

was the principal goal -- and that as increases of sensory awareness took place, various sensory mechanisms equivalent to some of our conceptualized Western psychic powers could automatically become activated or reactivated.

*

But here we again trip across a Western conceptual inadequacy -- for we habitually refer to "awareness" without prefixing it with "sensory."

And this is very important regarding the development of sensory transducers.

This inadequacy us to the false assumption that awareness is something of and in itself, something sort of independent of sensory inputs.

Indeed, within the contexts of this inadequacy one can easily say that one is an aware person -- while at the same time being completely unaware of a great deal.

I'm sure you might see the larger overall situation in this regard -- the one composed of aware people who are not aware of a whole lot.

*

In its most basic Western definition, "aware" means alert, and so "awareness" means having or possessing the state of alertness. Most dictionaries let it go at that.

But "alert" means alert to some kinds of input, and all of which have to consist of sensory somethings (and which "somethings" are in these essays being referred to as "signals.")

After all, it does defy logic to say that one is aware of something which has not been sensed in some kind of fashion.

*

In any event, the Yoga texts advocate an **OVERALL** increase of **SENSORY AWARENESS** -- while such an increase obviously must be the result of finding out what one is **NOT** sensing so as to become aware of it. And finding this out obviously would involve a series of processes of some kind.

*

And here we encounter a real snarl, one both delicate and gross, and which could use several essays to discuss. I will therefore postpone entering too deeply into it here, reserving extended discussion to the forthcoming Part Five of these mini-essays -- **REMOTE VIEWING AND THE HUMAN SUPERPOWERS OF MIND**.

The reason for the postponement is that one should have the prerequisite information regarding both sensory transducers **AND** mental information processing grids (the topic of Part Four.)

*

So we will consider only the distinction (in Western terms) between the gross and the subtle sensory receptors.

And here, for the first time, we encounter certain subtle sensory (psychic) factors which, by definition, ARE subtle ones, but which are not called "psychic" here in the West -- in that they are considered normal, not non-normal.

*

Since the conventional concepts of the basic five senses are usually focused only on the physical and tangible, they also tend to focus the intellect on the psychical and tangible, and sometimes exclusively so.

In such a case, it might be concluded that the full extent and entirety of the human biomind perceptions regard only what is physical and tangible -- and which is the general case within the major Western philosophies of materialism and the physical sciences.

*

But intellect has a certain number of powers which are never exclusively based in perceiving only what is physical and tangible.

For example, intellect can perceive connections or relationships between physical and tangible aspects, even though the connections and relationships are nowhere directly visible or identifiable exclusively via the basic five senses.

*

In such a case, intellect has transcended the parameters and limits of the physical and tangible, and has perceived something for which there is no DIRECT physical or tangible evidence.

In other words, and well within the ancient Yoga formats, the intellect has perceived a subtle factor. This relationship factor may indeed be "suggested" by the physical, but of and in itself it is not tangible.

*

In such a case, the intellect, not normally thought of as psychic, has performed a function which we in the West would call psychic -- for if the term "psychic" refers to perceiving what is tangibly invisible, then this simple process of perceiving relationships certainly should be entered into the lexicon of things psychic.

*

If this concept bumps around in one's mental information processing grids, not to worry -- for the perception of relationships is a full beginning part of that endemic superpower called intuition.

*

It is true that the connections and relationships can be confirmed in tangible and physical ways. But the impetus for undertaking the confirmation has arisen from this particular transcendental faculty of intellect.

*

In the cultural West this particular faculty of intellect is majorly referred to as the DEDUCTIVE faculty, and sometimes as INDUCTIVE. But since it involves something not perceptible to the physical five, it involves something invisible -- at least within the contexts of telling the difference between the visible and invisible.

*

Thus, one is left to wonder about where ARE the senses of intellect which obviously must underlie the perception of something which is invisible to the physical five -- and which perception transcends the limits and parameters of the physical and tangible. For, you see, deduction itself must be based in some kind of sensory equipment in that deductions don't exist of and in themselves, but are always sensed and constructed by the individual biomind.

*

The term used in the cultural West for this kind of thing is deduction. But it could quite as easily be referred to as intuition, since the several forms of intuition are all based in some kind of deduction. In the West, intuition is generally taken to mean "direct perception, cognition or knowledge of something which is not physically or tangibly available or in evidence." But a deduction is also the same thing. The perceptions of relationships are not tangibly in direct evidence -- unless one deduces them.

*

To try to ensure complete understanding here, the things between which the invisible or not obvious connections and relationships are perceived may well be physical and tangible. But the perceived connections and relationships themselves are not of physical and tangible origin. They are "contributed" by the biomind systems. And furthermore, they reside only in the intellects which do perceive them -- while they may not at all be perceived by or reside in the intellects of others.

*

By way of example here, inventors proceed by the intellect power of "logical" deduction of invisible relationships and meanings -- but many inventors will insist that they were more inspired by episodes of

intuition and the products of which at first seemed entirely illogical.

*

In any event, if the intellect powers of deduction and intuition are not the same thing, there is at least a linked and very close connection between them.

If, however, the full spectrum of the different kinds of intuition was identified, it would be quite difficult not to include deduction as perhaps the first and most basic form of it.

*

And every specimen of our species is born with the hard drive rudiments of deductive faculties. Whether they are developed and enhanced, though, is a different matter. But this matter (or problem) has very little to do with the fact that our species as a whole certainly does possess the biomind hardware of the deductive faculties.

*

In fact, it can be offered that deductions are EXTENSIONS and ENHANCEMENTS of the physical senses -- almost exactly as advocated in the ancient Yoga texts.

*

But we need to be very precise here in order to ensure understanding.

Step-like functions are involved between perception of physical objects and deducting relationships between them. As has already been stated, even our five physical senses do not themselves perceive things as they are.

What is perceived are sensory recreations of what is input via the sensory receptors -- and then only if sufficient sensory transducers have been erected to process information from the absolutely physical gross to increasing levels of subtly and which increasing levels at some depart from complete dependence on the physical gross.

*

We are now in a position to consider the following three factors:

1. The physical senses are made up of arrays of sensory receptors which, in the first instance, receive some kind of signals. These signals are converted into the sensations we experience, and which sensations are then converted into what we see, hear and etc.
2. Then further conversions take place until the process comes to include information loads resulting in intellect understanding.
3. Then, in the case of deducting, further conversions must take place dealing with information loads that are invisible to the five physical sense receptors.

In other words, we are looking at arrays of increasingly specialized sensory transducers -- and which include transducers which can deal with information which is not drawn from contact with one's local environment of physicality.

*

Each conversion requires a series of SENSORY TRANSDUCERS which convert something to something else -- such as signal into information. Thus what begins as sensory signals can be converted into a number of outputs, of which deducting is one.

The whole of this passage will be enlarged upon just ahead.

*

All sensations received as inputs by the biomind are signals in their first form -- while the conversion from signal state to the meaning condition would require sensory transformation of the signal into sensed information the biomind could comprehend.

In other words, the biomind might be equipped with the rudimentary sidhi sense receptors. But in the case of the sidhis the biobody sensing arrays alone will not suffice except insofar as spontaneous manifestations might occur.

*

But in the ancient Yoga texts, the sidhis are NOT identified as spontaneous manifestations. Rather, they are identified as highly developed skills under the volitional control of their possessors.

And, as is well known, such development requires the cognitive cooperation of the intellect part of the biomind -- and which part obviously would have to erect sensory transducers of its own in order to deal with sidhi development.

This can only mean that although the biomind specimen possesses rudiments for constructing refined sensory transducers, such transducers have to be constructed by repeated cognitive exposure to the precise subtle signals.

*

The only modern Western concept which fills the bill here is that involving the TRANSDUCER -- and, in the case of the developed sidhis, a series of them beginning with signal-sensing receptors ending up with the cognitive transducers. This consists of a series of transducing processes which convert signal into recognizable information which can be accurately understood.

*

The reason I've gone on at such length regarding the sidhis is that through the long-duration of the research work at SRI, the functional discoveries made there increasingly seemed to emulate the

meanings and contexts of the ancient Yoga Sutras in which the sidhis are discussed in ways which equate with the superpowers.

Thus, there was every reason to assess the ancient Yoga texts in light of our own work -- and in this sense the ancient texts became a treasure trove of additional information.

*

In this sense, the old axiom that there is nothing new takes on renewed meaning. If one discovers or rediscovers what is already there -- well, what else can ever be discovered except what it already there? The controlled, volitional form of remote viewing is clearly comparable to the ancient volitional and controlled sidhi described as distant-seeing.

The remote-viewing discovery work uncovered very delicate sense receptors which, when properly transduced into accurate intellect meaning resulted in controlled remote viewing.

Thus, if perhaps not exactly so, the discoveries of the delicate sense receptors and proper sensory transducers must closely resemble the knowledge of the ancient Yogins and their concepts of the distant-seeing sidhi.

*

The concept involving proper sensory transducers, however, is not unique to the controlled remote viewing processes.

Indeed, the need for sensory transducers is not only an individual biomind necessity, but clearly underlies the whole of all our species powers and superpowers of the human biomind.

*

The question now emerges as to which subtle signals need to be recognized so as to erect suitable sensory transducers for them.

The answer to this belongs in the 10 percent special knowledge category indicated at the beginning of this mini-essay. And one could be told what the signals consist of.

But, as indicated in the Yoga texts, it would be repeated, precise exposure to them which would cause the necessary transducers to format. And this is only possible by precise tutoring -- again as indicated in the ancient Yoga texts.

*

We will now leave the discussion of the sidhis and enter into a preliminary discussion which will aid in making visible the importance of sensory transducers. This discussion is needed largely because few will ever have heard of sensory transducers.

*

Largely speaking, even the basic five senses are useless unless their sensory inputs are mitigated and analyzed by the intellect or some other analyzing part of the biomind -- after which a great deal seems to depend on the loads of information accumulated and actively contained in the intellect at the individual level and via which the sensory inputs are analyzed.

*

Be pleased to read the above rather long sentence with great care and attention.

The meaning here is that one's sensory receptors may indeed be receiving certain kinds of signals. But if one's intellect is not prepared to deal with their information loads, then the signals will remain invisible -- at least to one's non-sensitized, unaware cognitive intellect.

I will expand upon the "loads of information" in the contexts of the following mini-essay dealing specifically with the mental information processing grids, or networks, if you prefer.

*

During the modern epoch (roughly from about 1845 to about 1970), it was thought and taught that the five physical senses must correspond exactly to the known laws of the physical and tangible. It was also thought that the basic five were themselves exclusively of physical and tangible origin, and their ultimate "explanations" would eventually be discovered to be physical in nature.

*

It is only during the post-Modern period to the present that the answer here has been found to be both Yes and No -- in that the bio-organic functions of the five physical senses have been mapped. But what is still missing is how, or even why, the physical or any of the sensory signal receptors result in the TRANSFER from biomind sensations into information.

*

But rather than get brainlocked into this mystery, we should consider what happens from another viewpoint.

The most obvious and perhaps the only purpose and function of any or all of the sensory receptors is to deal with information -- to INFORM us of the various aspects of the physical and tangible.

And INFORMATION is always invisible until it is transduced into some "hard" form such as words, codes, mathematics, voice, printed or computer formats, deduction, and, last of all, into intellect cognition.

*

How and why this was not earlier noticed is something of a complete mystery.

*

But here is the incredibly important distinction between what our senses ARE and what they DO. Indeed, debates and polemics about what our senses ARE can go on indefinitely. But when it comes to the matter of what they DO... well, here we encounter an entirely different perspective -- one which opens onto quite wide panoramas and unambiguously comes to include the subtle extensions of a wide variety of sensory receptors pointed up by the ancient Yogins.

*

For starters, if our senses, no matter what they are, did nothing for us, then they would be quite useless.

*

It is extremely difficult to consider that the essence of information is exclusively physical and tangible in its basic nature.

It is true that information can be conveyed via physical means -- the most common forms consisting of sonics, images and linguistic and mathematical codes which make it intelligible to those who can hear, look, or comprehend.

But information itself has to be converted into human thoughts and concepts in order that one can perceive what it consists of.

*

Information theorists now hold that information is always available, and all the time available, whether human specimens perceive it or not.

"Always available" clearly implies the essential invisibility of information -- until it becomes "visible" within the deductive/intuitive cognitive powers of the intellect in the form of "perceptions," and then in thoughts and concepts.

*

It is exceedingly difficult to consider that thoughts and concepts are exclusively physical or tangible in nature.

*

It is true that thoughts and concepts can be stimulated into existence because of physical and tangible sensations. But it can easily be shown that the thoughts and concepts are not the stimulations themselves, but only this or that consideration of them.

Furthermore, this or that consideration can produce, as they automatically tend to do, entire chains of additional considerations -- until a point might be reached which is far removed from anything physical

or tangible.

*

On the other hand, though, the human biomind can produce considerations, thoughts and concepts which have no origin in anything physical or tangible at all -- but which rather have their origin in matters for which there is no "explanation" within the on-going tangible factors of time, space, matter and energy.

*

The most omnipresent type of this is often called intuitive foresight -- and which deals with information, or deduced information, which is not derivable from any existing situations regarding the physical and tangible.

And, indeed, whether intuition be of deduction, insight or foresight, it defies the "laws" of the physical and tangible -- so much so that it easily and unambiguously can be said to transcend them.

*

And it is at this point that we must consider that our species does possess senses and cognitive faculties the information function of which is to transcend the parameters and limits of the physical and tangible -- and, so to speak, plug us into the information which is available all of the time.

*

It is almost completely certain that all of the superpowers are based in two principal factors. These are **SYSTEMS of SENSORY RECEPTORS** and systems of **SENSORY TRANSDUCERS** (both gross and subtle), which result in information which is meaningful to the experiencer -- **IF** (here a **BIG** word) proper sensory transducers have been formatted.

A third important factor is found in **MENTAL INFORMATION PROCESSING GRIDS**, the central topic of the next mini-essay.

*

We will be quick here to define between "the senses," as they are commonly referred to, and sensing **SYSTEMS** which are far more complex than "senses."

Even our common five physical senses are not "senses." If we get beyond the simplistic use of the term "senses" and deeper into the anatomy and dynamics of the physical five, then we find that what we call a "physical sense" is actually made up of extraordinarily complex interactions among a vast number of sensory receptors.

*

These interactions involve the electromagnetic level, the behavior of atoms which comprise our molecules and cells, the functions of our bio-organic materials and the synapses and chemical electrons comprising our nervous systems and brains, as well as our biomind energy fields and our sensoriums. Upon inspection of the sensing systems and their extensive arrays, it is their apparent major duty to detect and input and process information -- and this arouses considerations as to how and in what ways information is processed.

*

If we persist in utilizing the term "a sense," then we are reducing all of our wondrous and fantastic sensing SYSTEMS to a simplistic concept -- one which defeats a comprehension of the larger factors of our biomind sensing systems.

*

Every specimen of our species is a walking, talking array of sensing systems -- and these are so wonderful and astonishing as to boggle even those who study them scientifically.

*

The idea that our biominds process only physical information is foolish, and thus the concept that born specimens of our species have only five physical senses serves only to reduce one's awareness of one's OWN vast arrays of sensing systems.

As it is, even those who believe and teach that we have only five physical senses are themselves always utilizing extended arrays of sensing systems which cannot be confined into or explained by the physical five.

*

There is no doubt that we DO have sensing systems which principally process information relevant to the physical factors around us or wherever we go.

But even the most average person knows and experiences that we process various kinds of sensed information which is not physical in origin or source and which cannot even be deduced from physical factors.

*

As it has transpired during the last three decades, roughly beginning in the late 1960s, cutting-edge research scientists have come to accept that we possess many more than the five physical senses, and that the human biomind deals with various categories of information which cannot be fitted into the normal five-senses explanation.

In this context, I again refer you to the book I've already mentioned: **DECIPHERING THE SENSES:**

THE EXPANDING WORLD OF HUMAN PERCEPTION (Robert Rivlin and Karen Gravelle, Simon & Schuster.)

In this book the arcane complexities of many scientific papers were clarified for the popular reader -- and who would be surprised to find SEVENTEEN senses cogently described in it.

*

In Part Five of these mini-essays, I'll begin an extended but preliminary listing of various of the additionally identified senses and compare them to various superpowers of the human biomind. But at this point, in Part Four we need to turn our attention to those complicated factors called, in this database, the mental information processing grids. Therein we'll have something of a chance at considering how and why sensory transducers either do or do not become functionally formatted.

(End)

REMOTEVIEWING

One Of The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

MENTAL INFORMATION PROCESSING GRIDS AND MEANING TRANSDUCERS

Ingo Swann (17May96)

Part Four

There is probably no easy way to get into this, having considered and dealt for many years with the topic of mental information processing grids.

For here, finally, we depart from theories about what the senses ARE, what our species and its individual specimens ARE -- and we come to the topic of how and why the specimens think and believe as they do in any given way and in any given time and place or situation.

*

Almost everyone believes that what they think (about things) is the proper way to think about them, and some believe that it is the only way. So, discussions as to why human specimens (sometimes called "human beings") think as they do can sometimes achieve volcanic dimensions.

Thus, the central and associated issues involved are usually avoided like the plague. Even in psychology it is the objects and subjects of thinking which are most usually studied, not the thinking processes themselves.

*

This overall avoidance is somewhat understandable, however -- because the thoughts one experiences are the end-products of the processes that produce them, and few are ever really aware of those processes.

It is quite probable that the products of one's thinking processes are based exclusively in whatever

sensory transducers have been formatted -- or NOT been formatted.

The processes are therefore invisible and, usually intangible. For example, the topic of deduction or deducing was briefly discussed in the preceding essay regarding sensory transducers. One is usually aware of the products of deduction -- but hardly ever aware of the invisible processes which produce them.

*

Indeed, various so-called "human beings" can deduce a wide variety of conclusions or opinions regarding the SAME things -- and then sometimes even go to war over their deductions which they tend to value as enormously important.

In the end, though, the SAME things continue to exist and persist while the various deductions tend to pass into history and oblivion when their "makers" do.

*

Since there is no easy or delicate way to get into this without stepping on someone's toes, we just as well bite the bullet. In a certain sense we are here discussing "how one's head is wired" -- and the term "wired," of course introduces the concept of wired networks or grids.

*

Very few human specimens make decisions based solely on what they perceive.

Rather, the decisions they make are based on the MEANINGS assigned to what they perceive -- while it is possible to presume that the meanings themselves are the products of wiring, cross-wiring or absence of wiring.

If what they perceive has no meaning to them, then what is perceived is meaningless -- and often invisible as well.

Additionally, when people perceive things they do not understand, then they sometimes shoot first and ask questions later.

*

The substances of the above four passages are quite well known here and there. And from them it has often been deduced that people are trapped in the limits of their perceptions.

*

But such is not actually the case. They are trapped within the sensory transducers which apparently produce the meanings which have been assigned to what they perceive -- and then only IF they perceive it and actually HAVE assigned some kind of meaning to the perceptions.

Most people perceive a number of things they don't know the meaning of -- and if the perceiving is

strong enough this tends to confuse them.

The most common perceptions regard the tangible, the gross signals of physicality. Beyond that, one can perceive the subtle signals of the intangible realms if appropriate sensory transducers are formatted to do so.

*

Environmental and socio-educational factors favor the formatting of sensory transducers regarding physicality. But many environments do not favor the formatting of sensory transducers regarding the subtle or the intangible.

But in any event, it can be observed by direct observation that all specimens of our species format whatever they do in the way of sensory transducers -- and which thus serve as the basis regarding the extent, or the limits of their "perceptions."

*

In Part Three of these mini-essays, I suggested that the biomind is constantly being "bombarded" by signals of all kinds, and that the biomind possesses sensory receptors for receiving a vast spectrum of those signals.

I can now suggest, but ONLY suggest, that individual specimens of our species format only a limited number of sensory transducers -- and which leaves them "blind" to those signals which need special sensory transducers.

*

On the other hand, it is quite well accepted that the subconscious, for example, receives many kinds of signals. But the information of such signals is not forwarded to the cognitive intellect because the intellect has not formatted the appropriate sensory transducers IT needs to assign meaning to such signals.

Many of the avoided signals involve subtle kinds of information, some of which can be categorized as belonging to the superpowers of the human biomind.

*

On the other hand, such signal-information often "leaks through" into cognitive awareness -- especially if the specimen is undergoing some kind of altered state. Then the specimen might experience a "spontaneous" manifestation of the signals -- probably stemming directly from the rudimentary faculties in the biomind's hard drive.

*

Our dream-making processes are but one example of this. We dream during sleep, but the meanings of

the dreams are often unintelligible to the intellect when it is awake. Which is to say, we perceive the dreams -- but often find it difficult or impossible to assign meanings to them.

But in a certain sense, dreams are a type of deducing which is processed from other sensory receptors and transducers than those which characterize the awake intellect -- and the processes are outside of the arenas of awake intellect.

*

Various rudiments of one's indwelling superpower faculties usually appear in dreams -- for the dream content often has the appearance of dealing in non-time, non-space dimensions.

Like deducing and intuition, dreaming is a constituent of our species which is universally shared by all of our individual specimens. The topics and content of dreams can widely vary, of course. But the biomind faculties for dreaming are apparently the same in every born specimen of our species.

*

However, even in the case of dreams, the perception of them within the biomind awareness systems is the end-product of the processes which produced them.

Nothing just happens, you know. Everything that "happens" is preceded by the processes which result in the happening.

*

To get into the larger topic of this essay, it seems advisable to establish the formal definitions for the term PROCESS.

1. Something going on;
2. A natural phenomenon marked by gradual changes that lead toward a particular result;
3. A series of actions or operations conducting, or transducing, to an end;
4. Treated or made by a special process, especially when involving synthesis or artificial modification.

*

By far and large, people tend to deal only with the end-products of biomind processes -- because on average the processes which produce the end-products are so rapid that they do not enter awareness as discrete sensations.

The speed we would be talking about here is "instantaneous," especially regarding the basic five physical senses. Our responses to the end-products are also quite fast -- mostly so, at any rate. In other words, our biomind systems can, in a split second, processes from signals, through signal (sense) receptors, thence through a large number of information transducers -- and do all of this between

eye-blinks with time to spare.

*

None of this astonishing processing is either felt or sensed by the awake intellect, which operates on a much slower basis.

Most usually, the intellect processes perceived information by "considering" it -- this a format of information processing which can take some time, and which is not all that dependable regarding ITS end-products.

*

One of the better areas to take note of process speed is to consider those who, without any intellectual comprehension at all, automatically jump out of the way of danger just milliseconds before the danger manifests and would have clobbered them if they had not jumped.

Literature and records are stuffed full of such accounts. This kind of phenomenology is usually attributed to intuition or gut feelings -- and this kind of "explaining" is usually let go at that.

However, intuition and gut feelings can be shown to be the result of much slower processes, relatively speaking -- and which always tend to involve the "considering" factor, anyway.

*

In any event, intellect is not involved in this jumping thing, for if it were then the clobbering would have taken place.

If one dissects the jumping thing, a number of items are found to be necessary.

Some aspect of ourselves, possessed with acute sensory receptors, FORESEES imminent danger. In a flash, this aspect commandeers the autonomic responses of the nervous system, stimulates the muscular and bone mechanisms, and the jump takes place.

*

But this indicates that something other than our intellect can process incoming signals, can think and make deductions and decisions.

*

And indeed, those who have studied such phenomena beneath their surface appearances are obliged to attribute this kind of activity to the autonomic nervous systems of the biomind.

The autonomic nervous systems are deemed entirely physical in nature -- but as such, they apparently can ACCURATELY process information-signals with a rapidity and elegance not entirely characteristic of the intellect itself.

*

Biologically speaking, the autonomic nervous system is relatively well understood, except when it comes to something such as the jumping thing. For it is not understood at all how the autonomic systems can FORESEE. And, furthermore, not only foresee, but assign meaning to what is foreseen.

*

Hence, an entire category of very specialized phenomena is missing here, or at least is submerged beneath the collective terms of intuition and gut feeling and which themselves are not inspected very deeply.

*

But the jumping thing vividly demonstrates that our biomind organisms possess subtle superpower sensory receptors and sensory transducers which our intellects are not at all aware of. And I, for one, am completely comfortable in calling anything a biomind superpower which gets me automatically out of the way of being clobbered.

*

I have attempted to utilize the jumping thing as an example of subtle biomind information processing which takes place in a fraction of a second, and which is independent of the awake intellect processes. This was done to help illuminate the fact that the human biomind is apparently possessed of various levels of information processing -- not just ONE -- and which is usually attributed to the awake intellect in which the whole of one's thinking, cognitive phenomena and decision-making are supposed to be isolated.

The jumping thing, if attributed only to the physical autonomic nervous system, shows that the bio-body itself is capable of thinking and making split-second decisions -- and which is to say that the bio-body itself has a "mind" independent of the "mind" of the intellect.

*

If this would be the case, then the focus of our interests should shift from what we think about things within the scope of our awake intellects -- shift to identifying sensory receptors and sensory transducers in general.

*

But there is a great difficulty here. With the exception of the autonomic processes, nothing is valued by an individual specimen of our species except what has meaning within the precincts of its information-processing intellect. Indeed, on

average nothing will be valued or acquire reality unless it takes on such meaning.

*

Aside from our bio-bodies themselves, there is nothing so clearly existing as our species rudimentary faculties of intellect -- and which, during the modern-age epoch, was discriminated as being separate from the bio-body as "the mind."

Under the modern-age conceptions, now in decline, it was held that the functions of body and mind were different -- and many of us who are now advancing in years were actually taught that the bio-body was mindless.

This peculiar teaching, however, is not true.

*

I'll not bother to debate whether this was a right or wrong teaching -- because the actual issue is neither body nor mind, but how information is processed by either or both.

And, indeed, regardless of how body-mind is interfaced or not interfaced, it is still the blatant fact that how and what information is processed that is of superior importance to any and all biomind organisms.

*

It is extremely clear, as it always was, that our species is an information-processing one collectively speaking. And it is equally clear that each born human specimen is **MEANT TO BE** an information-processing organism -- completely and naturally equipped with vast arrays of biomind sensory receptors and transducers.

And these range along a spectrum from the gross physical five systems to increasingly refined ones entirely capable of dealing with exceedingly subtle information contexts.

And indeed, if all of the facts were put on the table, our species is actually and vividly super-endowed along such lines.

*

It is not unusual, however, to find this actuality not considered in its actual sense, but rather held up as an ideal one.

But in turning the actuality into only an idealizing one, we are admitting to our information defaults at the individual and social levels.

*

There are two subtle facets about information which seems to escape many.

1. Information is not information if it does not take on meaning relative to other information

factors which have ALREADY taken on meaning.

2. By itself, information is not information unless it corresponds to and integrates with factors already established as having meaning -- and thus even if information exists everywhere, it will not enter into information systems which cannot accommodate it.

*

Thus the problem becomes one not so much dealing with "new" information, but with "old" information already acquired and accepted as meaningful by this or that individual biomind organism or collective social organism.

And old information, perhaps composed of millions of data bytes, needs to be held in some kind of a biomind meaning system(s) established precisely for that purpose.

New information would need to find a home or place within the meanings of the old information.

If the new information cannot find such a home or place, it will be rejected as information.

*

The question before us, though, doesn't concern old or new information, or even what kinds of information we process.

The question involves not WHAT the information consists of, but HOW we process information in the first place.

*

During the middle earlier part of the modern age, scientific knowledge held that information was processed in the physical brain and the brain's anatomy took on increasing definition -- at least regarding its major lobes.

After the invention of electron microscopes in the 1930s, it could be seen that the brain was composed of a vast variety of features among which were neurons and synapses.

These were interconnected by pathways -- and the concept of "neural networks" or "nets" came into existence.

*

Although there has never been complete agreement as to how the brain functions, it was generally accepted that information "must" be processed by and within the brain. Various portions of the neural nets become stimulated or active when information is being processed -- while the activity is thought to be caused by electro-chemical exciting.

*

Indeed, artificial stimulating by electrodes of various synapses and neurons produces sensations, feelings, sounds and images as if the senses were themselves actually experiencing them. This was considered desirable evidence for the functional physicality of the brain, and this evidence was acceptable.

But electrode stimulation of certain parts of the brain sometimes produced "evidence" which was not acceptable -- and so this kind of "evidence" is hardly to be found in official scientific reports and papers.

*

As but one example, under artificial electrode stimulation, the experiencers sometimes reported vivid visual images and sensations which they interpreted as past-life memories.

These are reasonably similar to past-life regressions under light or deep hypnosis -- and are also somewhat similar to what has been called *déjà vu*, or at least one variety of it (the "I've been here before" kind of thing).

Some people who were undergoing open brain stimulation also reported certain kinds of experiencing which had something to do with clairvoyance or telepathic faculties (some of the subtle "senses.") Since there is no place to fit these peculiar perceptual phenomena in the modern scientific paradigm, they were of course set aside and very little in the way of official reference has ever been made to them.

*

Beginning somewhere before the 1970s, various researchers began to understand that the not only the neural nets of the brain process information. It increasingly became understood that the neurological networks throughout the whole bio-body itself also process information. And since the 1970s it has become understood that certain kinds of information are processed at the cellular level throughout the surface and internal organs of the bio-body.

How information is processed within the human biomind has thus become a vastly more complex picture than was earlier conceptualized -- and, it might as well be put, conceptualized as THE explanation.

*

It has long been conceived that memory is the key to information storage and thus to information processing.

And for many of the modernist decades it was firmly believed that memory and its storage vehicles would be found in the brain.

But to date, the brain has been exhausted as the explanation for memory -- and no one anywhere knows how, why or where memory occurs. It doesn't even appear to be a basic function of any neuro- or neurological nets, and neither does it appear to consist of electro-chemical processes -- although such processes do become active when memory is present, so to speak.

*

And, indeed, this situation is contrary to "what we expected to find" -- as scientists like to say when they are "surprised" by evidence which differs from their major hypotheses or assumptions. The whole of this situation regarding memory is a somewhat amusing story. Those who might want to follow up on it might read **IN THE PALACES OF MEMORY** by George Johnson (Vintage Books, Random House, 1992.)

*

Our present official sciences do not accept clairvoyance as a suitable format of information gathering -- although achieved clairvoyants have said many things which appear as having to do with information processing not only within the bio-body but within the various kinds of energy fields which surround and extend out from it. There are several kinds of these fields (commonly referred to as "auras.") The one extending a couple of inches just outside of the bio-skin covering may be electromagnetic in nature. But others farther outward may not fit into bio-electromagnetic realities.

*

Good clairvoyants often see what they call "thought forms" everywhere within the bio-body itself and in the auras, but often especially around the head and shoulders and just over the top of the head. Some of these seem somewhat permanent, but others emerge and vanish with great rapidity. These "findings" give the impression that memory and information processing is a whole-body phenomenology -- but in this case, the "whole body" would consist of its auras as well.

*

The clairvoyantly seen thought forms and other phenomena seem to resemble holograms since they are perceived as being three-dimensional. And which, if true, would indicate that both gross and subtle energy-produced holograms are significant not only to memory but how energy (or signal) is processed as information exchanges.

*

If this would be the case, then it is possible that the neural-synapse nets of the brain and body are composed of information transducers which convert thought form information into what the bio-body can respond to and with. In other words, memory is a function of energy wave forms -- wave forms being one generic kind of signal. For those who might wish to read deeper regarding the "holographic mind" concepts, I recommend **THE HOLOGRAPHIC UNIVERSE** by Michael Talbot (HarperCollins, NY, 1991.)

*

I must point out that scientists who believe there is a physical explanation for all things have never made the effort to collect clairvoyant reports -- dating, say, from the late 1700s to the present.

It takes a little work to make this collection, as I have found out. But it is not impossible. If enough of the reports are compared and analyzed, similar patterns become distinctly visible -- as if the clairvoyants have seen the same things from differing viewpoint, but are reporting on the same phenomena nonetheless.

There are a number of different kinds or formats of clairvoyance, all of them of course being various superpowers of the human biomind.

*

In the contexts of all of the foregoing, I would have liked to use the terms "net" or "networks" via which to enter into a discussion as to how information is processed.

But these two terms are firmly ensconced in connection with synapses and neurons -- and in any event "net" or "networks" are somewhat passive in character and in themselves give no hint of what they DO. Especially, they do not explain the meaning thing with regard to information -- and no biological explanation has been discovered as to how the human biomind assigns meaning to signals which are transduced into identifiable information and thence transduced into meaning.

*

The word which seems most suitable here is "grid," for in the case of electrical grids it is understood that they distribute electrical power energy to users -- and that parts of the grids can change the amps and wattage of the energy.

Thus, I have opted to utilize the phrase "mental information processing grids," since "mental" implies the meaning thing -- in that we consider meanings via our mental faculties.

*

It is important to point out, though, that this phrase is only a metaphor selected to make discussion possible -- but it has proven to be a very functional one regarding all of the superpowers of the human biomind.

Controlled remote viewing, for example, is in part an exercise in formatting specialized sensory transducers. But in another way, it is also a series of exercises involving mental information processing grids -- an exercise of assigning correct meaning to in-put signals via the whole biomind sensorium (the topic of a forthcoming essay).

*

Most dictionaries define GRID first as a grating, which in turn is defined as a frame of parallel bars or a lattice of crossed ones blocking a passage.

And in this sense, it is understood through common experience that certain mental information

processing grids can block the passage or integration of certain kinds of information signals -- especially, but not only, of the subtle type.

*

Second, a GRID might be a perforated or ridged metal plate used as a conductor in a storage battery. Again through common experience, we know that memory is stored and conducted from somewhere -- since it often takes an amount of time to recall certain things.

*

Third, a GRID may be a network of uniformly spaced horizontal and perpendicular lines for locating points by means of coordinates. This definition is a little more complex when transliterating it into the contexts of information and meaning.

*

Basically speaking, a coordinate is a precise point at which specific information will be found. We utilize geographical coordinates to specify a precise place on Earth's surface, and the precise information characteristics of that place will differ from all others. Likewise, although on a much grander scale, star-system coordinates will enable the astronomer to quickly locate a precise star or galaxy.

In other words, where the horizontal and perpendicular lines intersect will be found a specific thing, or a specific category of information.

With a little leeway we could consider the intersections as "information points."

*

Metaphorically speaking, in-coming information could be processed through a series of grids composed of information points until one is found which is compatible with the in-coming information -- if there is meaning already installed in the existing information point within this or that grid.

If there is no already-installed meaning point, then the chances are that the in-coming information will not be recognized as meaningful. Grid-like gratings might altogether block the in-coming information if it is extensively incompatible with various of the mental information processing grids.

*

Here it seems necessary to remind that information is not considered information unless it is meaningful -- at which time it is considered to be information.

We can say, as advanced information theorists do, that information is available everywhere and all of the time. Technically speaking, then, meaning would also be available all of the time.

*

But in the case of meaning, it seems that our species has to deduce meaning within the terms and limits of their experience and interests.

That our species has the fundamental faculties to deduce meaning is unambiguous.

But WHICH meanings become incorporated as information points in an individual specimen's mental information processing grids appears to be an entirely different matter.

*

But there is a further glitch in this. For meanings assigned may not be correct meanings, or the meanings may not be consistent with the real information inherent in the in-coming signals.

*

To discuss this further, it is almost certain that we have consider the real existence of meaning transducers -- and which transform the products of sensory transducers into meanings.

In other words, our sensory receptors input signals into the biomind systems.

The signals are then converted by sensory transducers into energy forms the various systems can deal with.

The various systems then transduce the sensory signals into information formats which can be utilized by various systems within the whole biomind apparatus -- technically referred to as the Sensorium (see forthcoming essay).

But unless information is further rendered into meaning by meaning transducers then the information will not interact with our installed meaning points and our cognitive transducers will be unable to produce meaning to the intellect.

*

IF, and only IF, the incoming information is rendered into meaning, will the signals take on what is commonly referred to as "understanding" -- whose literal meaning, believe it or not, is to "stand UNDER information so as to grasp the meaning of something.

*

In this sense, then, information transducers MUST be accompanied or surrounded by collections of meaning transducers.

And if so, then this arrangement would be what grid information points consist of -- while the end product would approximate what we mean when we refer to mental understanding when the intellect is in its awake and dynamic state.

*

Actually speaking, though, the whole of this is probably far more complex than the simple characteristics given above -- even if we are speaking of the awake intellect alone.

You see, it is quite certain by now that the biomind also possesses a vast number of subconscious information and meaning transducers -- hardly any of which are accessible to the awake intellect except under certain circumstances.

And beneath, so to speak, the subconscious exist a vast number of signal-information-meaning transducers having to do only with cellular matters -- i.e., which nutrients an organ or cellular system need or do not need, and which either are "sent" to the destinations, or excreted as waste nutrients.

*

Thus, the overall picture here becomes inordinately complex.

But it also becomes inordinately majestic and full of wonder -- if one thinks of the born biomind as a system of arrays of sensory receptors followed by arrays of sensory information transducers, and then by arrays of meaning transducers at all levels of its existing whether consciously perceptible or not.

But I digress -- as I'm always tempted to do when I contemplate the remarkable, astonishing and exquisite nature of our biomind species.

*

We now must come to the definition of MEANING, and in doing so to the NATURE of meaning. And if there has ever been a philosophical swamp, outback or cesspool, trying philosophically to determine the nature of meaning is certainly one of the most prominent contenders.

*

And as an aside here, it is probably advisable to point up that the modern sciences AVOID this issue ALTOGETHER -- because there is not even a theory available which hypothesizes that the nature of meaning will be found in the realms of physicality and the tangible.

You see, meaning is entirely INTANGIBLE -- and yet everyone deals with meaning all of the time (or at least they try to do so).

In this sense, then, if one needs to be psychic in order to perceive the intangible, then everyone is psychic every time they deal with meanings.

*

And, indeed, if the FULL SPECTRUM of the superpowers of the human biomind was delineated and made visual as a chart, the perception of meanings would constitute one of the superpowers -- and have its place in the spectrum BEFORE the several types of intuition.

There can be little doubt that intuition itself is built out of or upon perceived meanings. If we would permit the perception of meanings, always invisible and intangible, to be called a psychic power, then

every specimen of our species would in some sense be a PSYCHIC.

*

Now, through the years I've read my brain and mind into bits by consuming every philosophical excursions I could find on the nature of meaning.

With a few notable exceptions, most of these excursions end up in the same swamp -- but for only one reason.

And this reason has to do with relevancy -- i.e., WHICH meanings are meaningful and which are not, or which meanings are more important than other ones.

In this way, the nature of meaning descends out of the universal stratospheres into the pits of meaning preferences and debates arising because of them.

*

Naturally, EACH philosopher would like his or her meanings to take precedence so that his or her philosophical speculations or theories will take on more social, political, religious or economic relevance and other whatnot relevancy.

*

This is to say that philosophers (and anyone else who desires to fall into this particular pit of no return) argue not about the nature of meaning, but for or against preferred meanings.

And as we shall see just ahead, this is also the "nature" of individual mental information processing grids.

*

In spite of all the debates, polemics and hubris which go on over the philosophical "nature" of MEANING, meaning itself is simple and usually simply defined in most dictionaries as: THAT WHICH IS CONVEYED.

Most dictionaries, however, specify "that which is conveyed, especially by language."

*

As it is, though, that which is conveyed can also be conveyed by music, visual images, intimations of the weather, sounds, tactile sensations, sexual awareness, body language, sensations or feelings of love or hate -- and on and on until we find we live in one gigantic environment of things that are conveyed all of the time and everywhere.

And in demonstrable fact, language of and in itself cannot convey meanings unless one has formatted the sensory and meaning transducers to stand under its particular words and vocabulary. Otherwise a given language will be heard merely as meaningless sonics.

*

Indeed, if we comprehend that our biomind organisms and their sensoriums exist within information signals of every and all kinds, but have not developed meaning transducers regarding them, then nothing is CONVEYED by the information signals.

We consider the printed word as the principal carrier of information and meaning. But indeed, even if the printed words are in one's own language, but one cannot transduce their meaning anyway, then nothing is conveyed. The common phrase "I don't understand what I've read" means that nothing was conveyed.

*

And here by now in this essay we should be able to accept, at least for hypothetical purposes, that information points installed in our mental information processing grids MUST have meaning transducers -- or the information points probably will not form.

But this is practically the same as saying that everything we experience is experienced not only as sensation, but also must be experienced as meaningful in some kind of way.

Otherwise the billions of signals inundating our arrays of sensory receptors might go unnoticed as meaningless -- and it is rather standard practice NOT to notice what is meaningless.

We will also not notice recorded information which is meaningless to us, even if others do value it.

*

One of the bottom lines here is that our mental information processing grids must have information points consisting not only of sensory transducers, but also consisting of meaning transducers.

If it is a case of becoming aware of gross and subtle signals, then appropriate meaning transducers must be established to cope with both kinds.

And it must follow that the LACK of such meaning transducers will leave what might be called "experiential holes or pits" in one's mental information processing grids. I prefer to call these "meaning defaults," though.

*

The lack of appropriate meaning transducers implies meaning defaults -- which is the same as saying that nothing exists in one's mental information processing grids though which to process incoming information into that stuff which is of extraordinary value to everyone and anyone: meaning.

*

It has been commonly taught that our senses rule our lives. But this can be true only in a limited way -- for our lives are more ruled by the meanings we assign to our incoming sensory loads.

It is meaning which governs our understanding. And when we experience something we don't

understand we find ourselves staring into the face of a meaning default somewhere within our grids.

*

And meaning defaults will "mean" that we will not know or understand what has been experienced -- or we will either not experience it or perhaps know that we have.

Or if the experience is vivid enough, the lack of adequate meaning traducers will render our grids into that state commonly referred to as "confused." And it is not unusual to find this or that grid in such a state.

*

The whole of this, of course, is tremendously complex with nuances which can go on forever. And I, for one, certainly do not know the full extent of it all.

But the basis and justification for entering into this tremendous complexity exists in the fact that if one wishes to activate one's latent faculties regarding any of the superpowers, it would be obvious that one's grids cannot continue to have meaning defaults regarding the many aspects of the superpowers.

*

Further, one must install ACCURATE information points, for inaccurate ones equate to meaning defaults also.

It would be obvious that inaccurate meaning transducers would distort signal-information being input into our sensing systems. Such distortions equate to noise in the signal lines -- as any radio, TV, radar or sonar expert knows.

*

Due to the enormous complexities involving mental information processing grids, it would be impossible in a mini-essay to consider all of their nuances. And such an attempt would probably be boring anyway.

But there are a few major sources regarding information and meaning defaults which might be pointed out for anyone who chances to have the interest and patience in noting what they are.

*

I, as well as others writing in other contexts, have already pointed out that the modern West is conceptually impoverished when it comes to information about our species superpowers.

Even the few glitzy, stereotyped concepts descending out of psychical and parapsychological research are neither enough or accurate enough.

All of which is to say that our modern West is possessed of a high degree of information and meaning defaults along these lines.

Where meaning defaults exist, one can be relatively sure that information and meaning confusions exist, although one might not understand what is being confused.

*

But the fact exists that although many how-to books exist regarding ostensible development of one's superpower faculties, few of them really do very much along those lines. Otherwise we would already have witnessed the emergence of many superpsychics.

*

As it happens, and as perhaps the first of the major factors involved, most human specimens do not tolerate the state of confusion very well -- or more exactly put, do not tolerate matters which induce such confusion.

And indeed, since the state of confusion is not at all desirable, about the only way to protect one's self from experiencing it is to construct very strong grids which reject all incoming information-signals except those which fit with one's already installed information-meaning points.

*

It's worth noting that modern psychology does recognize this, and refers to such mental structures as "psychological defense mechanisms." The line-up of typical defense mechanisms is a rather amusing read. The defense mechanisms were earlier referred to as "psychological and emotional armor" which encapsulated the mental awareness and prevented the intrusion of unwanted signal-information.

*

There are two very interesting factors regarding defense mechanisms, in that one possesses them without knowing that one does, and that they work automatically at some information-meaning level external to the awareness of the awake intellect.

*

The source of cause of the formation of defense mechanisms is not understood. But it is understood that one of their principal functions is to reject awareness of information and meanings which are not consistent with what in psychology has been identified as the "realities" of the psychological ego.

*

Another principle function is to prevent the intrusion of signal-information which would restimulate past memories of physical and mental anguish or fear.

*

There are many aspects regarding defense mechanisms which pertain to mundane, everyday matters of living (the "gross" matters referred to by the ancient Yogins). But regarding the superpowers of the biomind, it is easy enough to see why defense mechanisms against them might get dynamically set up within the grids of given individuals.

*

We in the cultural West tend to idealize the superpowers as highly desirable. But, for example, the superpowers of intuition and future-seeing can easily inform one of dreadful things as well as benign things. For instance, I recoil from psychically sighting, as it were, stuff like cruelty, murders, locating dead and decomposing bodies, and other forms of carnage -- because contacting and reliving those events wrecks not only my emotions but even impacts on my physiology. Thus I don't make for a very good psychic crime detective in the way other more stalwart psychics do.

*

I don't have grid defense mechanisms against such "seeing." But there is another way of avoiding the psychic reliving of the horrors -- just not do it, and which, I suppose, is one form of defense mechanisms anyway.

*

One way of NOT looping into the horrors is to close down the superpower sense receptors and signal channels altogether, and this is a well-known function of defense mechanisms. In this sense, we can picture a mental information processing grid as a grating which permits only certain signals through it, and prevents the intrusion of others.

*

In any event, if one becomes psychic, one WILL "see" horrors, and it is this aspect which is never mentioned in how-to psychic development books. In this sense, many achieved psychics realize that psychic superpowers are both a blessing and an agony as well.

*

Another major factor having to do with grids and meaning transducers is a little more complex. One of the true, and exact, but unfortunate aspects of the superpowers is their all-seeing nature -- seeing

the terrible as well as the benign.

One defensive way of avoiding this is to construct information points based not on real reality, as it were, but based on meaning grids and transducers which do not include real reality in the first place. It is not unusual, however, to find grids set up this way regarding almost everything.

*

Now, at this point we might benefit from identifying the difference between primary and secondary meaning transducers.

Secondary meaning transducers consist of those meanings established by some other source as meaningful, and which we emulate in our own mental information processing grids.

Primary meaning transducers are derived from direct experience of signals, and their responding sensory and meaning transducers.

*

One can say that secondary meaning transducers are artificial ones, in that we have imbibed, absorbed or sucked them in from other sources. Such secondary meaning transducers can range along a spectrum from correct to wildly in error.

But, all things considered, they tend to focus only on what makes us feel good about things as considered by the society in which we live.

However, it is important to consider that secondary meaning transducers may not be directly linked to sensory transducers or to sensory receptors.

*

Primary meaning transducers, being formatted because of direct experience, are probably linked directly to sensory transducers and sensory receptors.

*

Now, we must admit that most societies insist that secondary meaning transducers must take precedence over primary ones, and this, as it is often advertised, is best for the society.

And it could easily be demonstrated that the educational practices of most societies prime and pump secondary meaning transducers so that their educated recipients will better fit into the social needs and demands -- and also lest one be in "conflict" with the society.

It's worth mentioning here that secondary meaning transducers can equate to one kind of mind control -- albeit sometimes only indirectly so.

*

As it is, most social organisms like their individuals to emulate and share specific secondary meaning

transducers so that all of them will work as a whole or as a team. The success rate, however, varies.

*

In any event, one's information points within one's mental information processing grids have to do with how "one's head is wired," as put into one of today's language metaphors and as was mentioned in the introductory materials of this series of mini-essays.

In this sense, we can visualize that the bio-body you see is, at one level, a walking, talking series of sensory receptor systems.

At another level, it is a walking, talking series of sensory transducers.

*

But at the ultimately visible level, it is a walking, talking series of mental information processing grids, equipped with installed primary or secondary meaning points -- with the latter probably predominating in most cases.

In other words, direct, raw experience is replaced with secondary, predigested forms of experience.

*

One of the problems here is that secondary meaning transducers usually do not result in the vivid lucidity provided by primary ones, so much so that individuals whose meaning systems are dominated by secondary meaning transducers often demonstrate the appearance of being secondary meaning androids -- sometimes unkindly referred to as replicas of the faith.

This kind of thing can only mean that direct access to primary meaning transducers has been cut back, or perhaps terminated altogether -- and this would mean, as well, that their cognitive connections to their own sensory receptors and sensory transducers can only be wobbly at best.

Excepting, of course, for piecemeal sensory connections to the basic five senses, but which anyway are controlled by the autonomic nervous system more than the awake intellect.

*

Now, it is desirable to mention at this point that when we use the metaphor of MENTAL information processing grids, we would be referring, of course, to the awake state of the intellect -- the intellect being the factor or sector of the biomind which mentally analyses information and ostensible meanings of it.

*

It is an oddity of the modern Western culture to envision only the awake intellect mind as capable of analyzing information and meaning. It thus follows that none of the other analyzing phenomena which go on within us at other levels and in other states of awareness are MENTAL in nature. Our dreams and

intuitions, for example, are not considered of mental origin because they are not products of the logic and reason of the awake intellect mind.

*

This kind of situation of course induces confusions into one's mental information processing grids in the event that one directly experiences some kind of sensory inputs which cannot at all be fitted into the extent, scope, limits or narrow corridors of one's intellect reality.

This situation is made even more confusing in that philosophers and scientists of the modern era concluded that the awake intellect, and ONLY the awake intellect, was the seat of logic and reason in their purest sense.

*

I have tried to trace the origins of this particular conviction, to little avail -- with the possible exception that it was somehow derived from the ancient Greek philosopher named Aristotle.

*

The attribution to Aristotle, however, is terribly wobbly -- for even he recognized that logic and reason were variable and closely tied to relative environmental, educational and secondary meaning transducers (although the famous philosopher, of course, did not utilize that particular phrase).

*

By "relative" is meant that what is accepted as logic and reason (the rational) closely conforms to what one ALREADY assumes to be logical and rational -- and this is based on information points already installed in one's grids.

But as I recently heard in a recent TV movie, "Assumptions are the Mother of all F _ _ _ -ups." You can insert the four-letter word.

*

The point is that what is accepted as logic and reason is relative to what has already been assumed to consist of them. And this is always relative not only to individuals and social pressures, but characteristic of the various epochs of our historical past.

*

We can bypass, at least in part, this particular situation by wondering if logic and reason are, in themselves, ever directly experienced via the biomind's sensory receptors and sensory transducers. If logic and reason can be directly experienced within the contexts of primary signals and sensory

transducers, then one would think that there would never be the problems which have arisen around logic and reason.

*

About the only thing that might be true here is that logic can be deduced, and so the essential nature of logic is in properly organizing REAL information and attributing EXACT meanings to it. But doing as much would probably require the omission of secondary meaning transducers -- which tend to be error prone.

*

The problems regarding reason, however, are more complicated -- for reason seems to be a function of meanings alone rather than one of primary signals and sensory transducers.

*

Thus, within overall human experiencing, it is difficult to present a "logic" which is illogical, for many are ready to point up its flaws.

But it is rather easy to present reason as rational, for this is an excursion in meanings only and such excursion need not be founded on even one iota of fact -- and meanings can be looped together so that they form a closed loop which will not admit the perception of flaws.

This at least regarding various mental information processing grids which are closed loop-like in structure.

*

By way of beginning to end this mini-essay, it is within mental information processing grids that information-meaning points become lodged and fixed.

When sensory transducers convey perceptual information from the various sensory receptors and then into the biomind organism, that information is thence processed through the individual's meaning transducers -- and produce the outputs noted.

*

If the grids do not possess proper information points relevant to the input sensory information, or if the information points are inadequate for accurate processing of the information, then widely variable outputs are manufactured. These outputs are often referred to as "interpretations."

*

One of the most notable quirks regarding information is that unless it has meaning then it doesn't exist -- or at least is uninteresting and disregarded or ignored.

One of the quirks of our species is that only that which appears to be meaningful is considered important, and meaning-transducers are probably built only along some kind of priority in this regard. Certainly all have to quickly build language sonic-recognition transducers, and then additional meaning transducers which more or less give exact meaning to our tangible sonic environments.

*

The next most probable set of meaning-transducers, in so far as I have been able to study the matter, is the need for, of all things, STATUS meaning-transducers -- in order that we should be aware of who's who and why so in our environmental, psychological and social surrounds.

*

Beyond these principal three sets of meaning-transducers, it seems that much of anything else is left to what locally passes for education and knowledge among this or that society -- and to the enormously variable secondary meaning transducers formed by "students" regarding what is taught as education and knowledge.

*

In the end, though, almost everyone interprets what they encounter and/or experience through whatever meaning-transducers they have managed to format.

It is our species, however, which has the faculties to format meaning transducers. Beyond that, whatever is formatted in the way of meaning transducers usually has relevance only to local societies and cultures -- and sometimes only to this or that individual specimen.

*

If we accept, at least hypothetically, that we live in environments fundamentally made up of information-signals, all of these will be found as waves, frequencies and vibrations -- and perhaps in some undiscovered forms. These will include both gross and subtle signals.

*

The arrays of our signal receptors will input these signals into the biomind systems. But the signals will be useless unless the signals are separated into categories by sensory transducers and there after transduced into meaning.

Indeed, if we should receive a set of signals and have no idea of what they mean, then the signals represent only so much noise or "silence."

Thus, the categories of signals have to be forwarded by the sensory transducers to the meaning

transducers in which the signals are converted into categories of meaning.

*

This is to say that via the arrays of receptors the signals are input into the biomind as waves, frequencies and vibrations. But ultimately the output into cognitive consciousness has to be in the form of meanings -- at which point, as we usually say, the signals can be recognized.

The assignment, as it were, of meaning to signals appears to be a very complicated process -- and is something which is not successful all of the time and/or regarding certain categories of signals.

*

Much seems to depend on what kind of signals the biomind has been in some way prepared to recognize -- or has been prepared to reject as meaningless.

Such preparation can be the result of experience and/or social programming -- with the latter usually dominating.

*

Every specimen of our species is born with a wide array of sensory receptors, and with faculties commensurate to them.

On the other hand, each specimen of our species is also born into specific environments -- natural and social -- which emphasize certain meanings and de-emphasize other ones.

And most specimens will adapt their meaning-making transducers so that they accord with the demands of their natural, social and even artificial environments.

*

Emphasized meanings will result in high recognition thresholds. De-emphasized meanings will result in low recognition thresholds -- or perhaps no recognition thresholds at all.

If the meaning-recognition thresholds are low or non-existent, then the biomind specimen will be functionally "blind" to the signals being input via his or her own signal receptor arrays -- "blind" at least in the intellect cognitive sense.

*

In the case of low-threshold recognition of those signals our superpower faculties can deal with, then traces of the superpower's activity will not be found in logical, rational intellect cognition, but in dreams, altered states of awareness, inexplicable hunches and deductions, spontaneous intuitions and etc.

And, except for the rare occurrences of highly skilled natural psychics, it is exactly in these other areas of sensory reception where we in the modern West have historically found our species-wide traces of the superpowers.

*

To end off now, in all of the foregoing mini-essays, plus the introductory materials, I have introduced the major concepts and nomenclature which seem necessary for a deeper consideration of the nature of the superpowers themselves in Part Five forthcoming.

(End)

REMOTEVIEWING

One Of The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

THE SENSORIUM

Ingo Swann (30May96)

Part Five

The term SENSORIUM exists in the English language, but it is very rarely utilized -- and even then with definitions which tragically differ from its original meaning in the English language.

The concept of the sensorium, however, is one we cannot do without if we seriously inquire into the dynamics and processes of the superpowers of the human biomind.

It is thus the purpose of this essay to attempt to resurrect the term and its original concept.

As you will see ahead, there are a number of essential reasons for doing so.

*

The first of the reasons has to do with the deplorable fact that our modern Western culture has a paucity of terms appropriate to considering the nature and dynamics of the superpowers.

If we consider the many superpowers of the human biomind only within the few terms and concepts typical of Western thinking, then the concept of the sensorial is not really needed.

If, however, we begin considering the superpowers within their own universal terms, then the limited concepts of the modern West will not suffice -- and we would ultimately need the concept of the sensorial.

*

And, indeed, the general purpose of the essays in this database is to attempt to extract the anatomy and dynamics of the superpowers out of the various cultural limitations they have fallen into.

All of these cultural formats have established their own concepts, metaphors and terms of reference regarding the superpowers. Some are more serviceable than others.

For example, our West concept of "extrasensory perception" is not very serviceable, simply because some kind of "senses" are always involved regarding any of the superpowers.

*

But in general, the superpowers themselves are not culturally dependent -- for the superpowers manifest throughout our species while the various cultural formats come and go.

And as it has transpired, the modern cultural West is quite weak in this regard, for its concepts, metaphors and terms of reference regarding the superpowers are few in number -- and often misleading as well. I am speaking of both the scientific and popular arenas.

*

One of the larger deficits of the few terms we do use is that they refer to what we call "psychic phenomena."

But in clinical fact, they are NOT phenomena but are RESULTS of phenomena whose workings and processes are unknown and concealed behind the results they produce.

All that we witness or experience as "psychic phenomena" are the end-products of the mysterious superpower processes which produce them.

*

In other words, they are EPIPHENOMENA -- a perfectly good, but seldom used English word meaning "secondary phenomena accompanying another and CAUSED by it." (Emphasis on "caused" has been added.)

*

This is to say that what we experience or witness as intuition, telepathy, clairvoyance, remote viewing and so forth are secondary phenomena (epiphenomena) which have been caused or brought into manifesting by something else -- and which might be called "primary phenomena" to emphasize the difference.

People also refer to the results of remote viewing AS remote viewing. But indeed, the results are epiphenomena of remote viewing primary phenomena, and it is the cognitive control of the primary phenomena which are the substance of controlled remote viewing.

*

This distinction between primary phenomena and their epiphenomena is a very important distinction to bear in mind. For it is one quite central regarding whether anyone will learn to activate their own indwelling superpower faculties.

You see, when Westerners try to develop access to their indwelling superpower faculties, they almost

always try to emulate psychological epiphenomena on the mistaken understanding that they are the primary phenomena.

Which is to say, they are emulating results, not causes. If you think this through with some care, you will see that attempting to emulate results (secondary phenomena) probably will not put one in touch with the underlying causes and processes (the primary phenomena.)

*

On the other hand, comprehending the primary causative phenomena probably will enhance some kind of increased access to various of the superpowers.

In our modern times, though, very little in the way of the primary causative phenomena has been identified.

*

In this essay I will propose that the original concept of the SENSORIAL is central regarding primary causative phenomena.

Being so central, it has direct reference to all of the superpowers and has direct bearing on the following topics and categories which are intimately involved within the causative processes which result in the epiphenomena which astonish most of us.

Energy bodies vs. physical bodies.

Consensus opinion vs. direct perception.

Mental image pictures.

Sensory receptors and sensory transducers.

Mental information processing grids.

Interpretation.

Representationalism.

Acquisition of knowledge.

The Signal-to-Noise Ratio.

Autonomic phenomena vs. cognitive mind phenomena.

*

All of the above (and more) are factors which play roles regarding the various types of superpower activity and their relevant processes.

And anyone who wants to attempt to increase their participation in, say, intuitive phenomena needs to take time to learn about their primary vs. their secondary phenomena.

*

This is the equivalent of building NEW mental information processing grids concerning the workings of

the superpower processes.

*

In any event, NEW concepts regarding our superpowers are called for -- at least as regards modern Western contexts which are too few in number.

If one considers all of the past concepts about the superpowers of biomind, we find, on the one hand, that few really explain very much.

On the other hand, those past concepts, being useless, have served to distort understanding which may be possible in the intellect of those concepts were corrected and added to.

*

The end result here is that we can intellectually jabber and write about our superpowers in a sort of empty-message or stereotyped kinds of ways. But direct contact with the superpowers themselves elude our intellectual comprehension.

Our species is quite good at getting up concepts and theories which, in the end, prove only to be somewhat smelly winds.

*

In some of the earlier essays in this database, I've indicated that the superpowers probably range along a spectrum of special faculties that are very subtle in nature and characteristic.

I've also argued that various elements of the superpowers have spontaneously manifested in all generations born of our species -- especially many of the types of intuition.

Indeed, episodes of intuition are so commonly reported by so many that no one bothers to skeptically contest them. In this sense, it is assumed that intuition exists and is a "normal" experience -- even though it has obvious superpower elements or fragments -- say, of clairvoyance and future-seeing which are rejected as non-normal experiencing.

*

It has failed to dawn on anyone that the categories within the entire spectrum of the superpowers can blend in and out of each other -- perhaps much like different colored light beams in motion and intersecting with each other.

Almost all reports of intuitive episodes clearly indicate that space, time, matter and energy are transcended in some form -- such transcendence also being the hallmark of all of the superpowers.

*

To understand anything properly, we have to distinguish between causes and effects. The results of intuition and of the other superpowers are effects. Hardly any of the causes are known.

*

There is very little in the way of study regarding the internal biomind mechanisms (or dynamic structure, so to speak), which permits the superpower results to manifest.

For clarity, when most people speak of intuition, for example, they speak in terms of what was perceived or felt. They do not usually speak about what permitted or facilitated the perceptions or feelings.

*

A large number of individuals, for example, foresaw the sinking of the unsinkable TITANIC in 1912. But what they foresaw were the results of superpower mechanisms by which they intuited what they did regarding this remarkable event.

*

What I'm trying to get at here is two-fold:

1. That each specimen of our species possesses inherent faculties regarding the superpowers. Thus, elements of these faculties may spontaneously manifest (as they have historically done) under certain conditions.
2. But there is a wide difference between spontaneous manifesting and cognitive and volitional control of the superpowers. Volitional control (by the intellect) would have to be based in acquiring comprehension of the vital biomind dynamics which facilitate the volitional emergence of the superpower activity.

*

As it has transpired during the modernist epoch of the West, we have generally become locked into what might be called the cause-effect syndrome.

This is to say that we intellectually consider the formulas of causes and effects -- but miss a very important factor between them.

*

It is this: between a cause and its effects are PROCESSES. Which is to say that between a cause there is something going on which results in the effect.

A more correct formula would then be: cause-processes-effects.

*

If things are carefully examined, there is no effect produced unless processes have preceded it. And it is the processes which the cause has set in motion in order to result in the effect.

*

The standard definition of PROCESS is given as "a natural phenomenon marked by gradual changes that lead toward a particular result."

*

We can put the above definition another way: "a natural primary phenomenon marked by gradual process changes that lead toward a particular epiphenomenon."

*

In this sense, then, effects are the result not only of a cause, but also of the gradual changes which both preceded and produced them, albeit the gradual changes emanated because of the natural phenomenon.

*

One cannot build a bridge simply by having looked at one and trying to emulate it any more than one can build one's own superpower potentials by looking at the superpower results of others. The processes and structures of bridge-building need to be understood before undertaking the bridge. The bridge one sees is the result or the effects of the processes. The processes and structures of the superpowers also need to be understood in a similar way. The superpowers one sees in others are the results or effects of the processes needed to culminate in them.

*

Having now introduced the concept that processes exist between causes and effects, it is now possible to consider a specific issue.

Unless the processes regarding the superpowers of the biomind are volitionally understood, then attempts to access the indwelling superpower faculties will always remain a chancy, spontaneous affair.

This has certainly been the experience in our cultural West, regarding not only psychical and parapsychology research, but popular experience as well.

And, indeed, there are extremely few concepts in the West which deal with the hidden processes of the superpower faculties.

*

One of the FIRST QUESTIONS to be studied concerns WHERE or IN WHAT the superpower processes go on.

In accord with Western concepts, those processes should go on either within the mind or the body -- since that is how our modern culture viewed things in terms of science and philosophy.

*

But those two entities -- body AND mind -- were for a long time considered as being separate and discrete. As much is still being thought of them, although the post-Modern concept has arisen as to where and how they "interface."

*

I don't particularly like to invent concepts of my own, and even if I sometimes do so I like to relate them to insights and discoveries already existing.

The reason here is that our species has accumulated a great deal of very good information -- a great deal of which is later abandoned or forgotten. So I spend a lot of time doing what might be called "information archaeology."

*

My search for a pre-existing concept which might have bearing on the FIRST QUESTION mentioned above began during the 1960s, several years before I entered active research.

Sifting through past concepts is a long and tedious affair, and so to make that long story short, I ultimately found a concept which seems to fill the bill.

*

I had already established that the concept had to fill the three most important criteria:

- (1) it had to refer to something that existed in everyone;
- (2) it had to be suggestive of special space-time transcendence completely characteristic of a wide variety of superpower episodes.
- (3) it had to be a conveyor to cognitive consciousness of information, or at least of feeling impressions.

*

However, as I continued reading accounts and anecdotes of superpower experiencing, I discovered there was a fourth criterion to be acknowledged and considered.

This consisted of a factor not identified by those studying such matters. It is a somewhat complex factor, and so it now needs to be described in detail.

*

A study of thousands of accounts and anecdotes of superpower experiencing shows that in all cases a transfer of information takes place.

By "transfer" is meant that important information outside of the cognitive intellect is transferred into it by means of processes unknown -- and, as well, literally out of nowhere. This is especially typical of various intuitional and future-seeing formats.

*

In other words, information which doesn't exist in one's usual mental or consciousness arenas is somehow acquired and transferred to those mental or consciousness arenas -- and often to the complete surprise of the experiencer involved.

The transfer takes place by means unknown, and so the processes of the superpowers remains a mystery.

*

However, by studying a large number of cases reporting confirmed cases of superpower activity, it can be seen that the information transfer takes place on a scale ranging from weak to strong -- and sometimes to what can only be called "compellingly strong and forceful."

In the cases of being compellingly strong and forceful (the spontaneous experiencing), the experience is so strong that it overwhelms not only one's cognitive faculties, but often **THE MOTOR FUNCTIONS OF THE BIO-BODY ITSELF.**

*

An example of this is when an individual suddenly and without explanation steps back from some kind of instant mortal danger without having been cognitively aware that the danger even existed.

Indeed, if the person had detected the danger and was trying to sort it out in cognitive understanding, the danger would have clobbered the person during the time it took to sort it out in "one's rational mind."

*

What appears to happen in this "compelling" type of intuitive experiencing is that "something" instantly suspends the usual cognitive and motor functions -- apparently because they are **TOO SLOW.**

The "something" then temporarily commandeers the motor functions of the bio-body and moves it out of the way of the imminent danger which the slower cognitive functions have not even perceived.

*

In this kind of thing, the information transfer by-passes the cognitive functions altogether, and is transmitted directly to the autonomic bio-motor response systems while the cognitive functions are suspended or blanked out.

*

The final result is that the individual has no cognitive understanding of what or how it happened -- only knowing that it did happen after the fact of its happening.

The books are so full of reports involving this kind of "instant motor-intuition" that it makes one look silly to deny that such can happen. Talking with a few war veterans who experienced in-the-field battle will place this in perspective.

*

This situation leads to the fourth criterion mentioned above. The "something" involved with information transfers ALSO has to have the capability of suspending the cognitive functions and seizing direct control of the autonomic bio-motor response systems.

*

Intuition, for example, is often explained as a function of mind and/or consciousness, even though the source or causes of intuition have never been located within their known precincts. Even so, this explaining seems rational enough on the simplistic surface -- until the fourth criterion is considered.

*

A prime example of "intuitive motor-functioning" regards when someone jumps out of the way of immediate danger, and is completely unaware that the danger even threatens. There are very many examples of this type of thing.

The functions of the awake intellect are not involved here, but "something" took over the motor systems of the bio-body and effected the jump.

*

It is amusing to imagine how the mind, its cognitive processes, and the processes of consciousness-awareness, can suspend themselves in order for instant bio-motor intuition to take place. Doing so would take precious time regarding reflecting and thinking enough to reach a decision to suspend themselves. One might be dead by then.

*

In any event, it is understood world-wide that all the identifiable kinds of intuition involve matters outside, even alien to, the usual processes of both mind and consciousness functioning.

Thus, it is fair to assume that we are not dealing with mind and consciousness processes, in that these cannot be seen to be the source of intuitive experiencing.

*

First of all, those processes are too slow to begin with. But second, most intuitive episodes inform one of information which IS NOT ALREADY INCLUDED in one's usual mind-conscious databases (a.k.a. in these essays as "mental information processing grids.")

*

Indeed, mind and consciousness functioning seem to be incorporated WITHIN the "something" which induces intuitive experiencing as well as all the other superpower faculties. And it would appear that this "something" has to be "larger" than mind, consciousness, and usual motor functions put together.

*

PLEASE BE AWARE HERE that the above small discussion constitutes a REVERSAL of the usual ideas.

The usual ideas presuppose that whatever accounts for intuition, etc., exists INSIDE the mind-consciousness thing.

I have just proposed that the mind-consciousness thing exists OUTSIDE of the inside thing, the something which may account for intuition and other of the superpowers.

*

Since intuition is one of the oldest and most broadly experienced of all the superpowers, it seemed to me that a concept ought to exist which incorporated all of the four criteria, or roughly so at any rate.

*

After a few years had passed in a search for this concept, I could not discover one that filled the bill regarding all four criteria.

Meanwhile, through those years, I began to notice how poor the modernist English language was regarding nomenclature used to denote the superpowers.

And I felt that I had discovered a very essential factor -- that we cannot volitionally control what we cannot conceive of or conceptualize.

It is also true that if what we conceive of does not result in control, then we have not correctly conceived of what is necessary.

*

Nomenclature is very important. We use it not only to talk with others, but TO THINK WITH INSIDER OUR OWN HEADS. If we have absent nomenclature for things we COULD think about, then we probably won't think about them. Nomenclature triggers concepts, if it is sufficient and precise enough, and concepts trigger nomenclature.

*

In my search for an appropriate concept regarding the "something" which might conceptually incorporate the four criteria, I had of course run across the term **SENSORIAL**. This term is in most modern dictionaries. But it is so seldom used that hardly anyone is aware of its existence even in psychology or psychiatry -- and in parapsychology as well where I have never seen or heard it utilized.

*

Most modern dictionaries indicate that **SENSORIAL** is derived from the Latin **SENSORIAL**, the ancient meaning of which, so most American dictionaries state, was "sense organ."

Now, we have very many senses, and so it was difficult for me to consider what a "sense **ORGAN**" was in the singular.

But, as we shall see shortly ahead, there is adequate reason to suspect that the term **DID NOT** mean "sense organ" back in Roman times.

*

In any event, the modern English definition is given as "the parts of the brain concerned with the reception and interpretation of sensory stimuli; broadly speaking, the entire sensory apparatus."

*

A somewhat more extensive, and slightly more confusing, description of sensorial is found in the **PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY** (R.J. Campbell, Ed., Oxford U. Press, 1981.) This description is worth quoting in full.

SENSORIAL: "The hypothetical seat of sensation or `sense center' located in the brain, is usually contrasted with the **MOTORIUM**, the two constituting the so-called animal organ-system, while the nutritive and reproductive apparatus make up the vegetative organ-system. Occasionally this term is applied to the entire sensory apparatus of the body.

"When a person is clearly aware of the nature of his surroundings, his sensorial is said to be `clear' or `intact.' For example, correct orientation is a manifestation of a clear sensorial. When a person is unclear, from a sensory (not delusional) standpoint, his sensorial is described as impaired or `cloudy.'

"Psychiatrists used **SENSORIAL** interchangeably with (organic) **CONSCIOUSNESS**.

"The sensorial may appear to be disordered, when the psyche is intensely active, as it is in severe manic states, or when the patient is completely out of the environment, as he may be while in a phase of depressive stupor."

*

If you have trouble with the above definition, don't worry -- because the definition is itself largely troubled as we will discuss ahead.

*

In any event, the definition introduced the term "motorium," and so we need to know something about that thing.

MOTORIUM: "(1) The motor cortex [of the brain]. (2) The faculty of the mind that has to do with volition (as the function of the sensorial is perception and of the intellect, thinking.)"

*

To briefly elucidate some of the perhaps subtle confusions here, on the one hand the motorium is thought to be the motor cortex of the brain -- but on the other hand a faculty of mind having to do with volition.

This volition faculty is distinguished from the functions of the sensorial, whose functions are said to consist of perception, intellect and thinking.

Via these definitions a **DISTINCTION** between sensorial and motorium is arrived at -- as least as regards modernist contexts.

*

There is a very great problem with this distinction, however. For it can quite easily be shown that perception, intellect and thinking themselves are volitional processes.

For additional clarity here, most terms beginning with VOLA or VOLI designate some kind of motion.

Our English VOLITION is taken from the same word in French, both meaning "will."

But both the French and English terms are quite likely derived from the Latin VOLANT -- which meant "flying, capable of rapid movement, in ceaseless motion, or constantly flitting about."

The meaning of the Latin VOLANT is a good descriptor for our perceptions, intellect and thinking processes -- and quite probably for the sensorial as a whole.

*

If the above is somewhat confusing, the point being made is that it is difficult to distinguish between sensorial, motorium, perception, and thinking because all of them involve motion.

In the case of intuition or future-seeing, the motion is the transfer, or attempted transfer, of information from "somewhere" to the cognitive intellect. But it is fair to say that unless the cognitive intellect has established concept grids relevant to the information, the chances are that it will not perceive it.

*

I should probably point up that we are not embarked on mere semantic squabbles, but upon the task of locating some kind of correct, basic concept which fundamentally has to do with the processes of the superpower faculties.

*

Moving expeditiously along then, we are now obliged to note that American dictionaries stipulate that **SENSORIAL** is taken from the same word in Latin.

However, the **OXFORD DICTIONARY** states that the Latin term **SENSORIAL** was derived from the Latin root verb **SENTIRE** which meant "to feel."

*

Here, finally, we recognize something quite consistent with, for example, intuitive experiencing. Most, or even all intuitive episodes begin with a feeling, while in a large majority of cases that is all the intuition consists of -- **FELT** feelings. "I had a gut feeling." "I felt a hunch." A feeling that something had or was going to happen, a feeling that something was correct or not correct, a feeling of impending.

*

If mental image pictures accompany the intuitive experience as well as other superpowers, it is quite credible that they were stimulated into existence because of what was felt.

*

In any event, it is unthinkable that the mental image pictures could come first -- that we then examined them for the feelings incorporated in them -- and then, from that examination, derived the intuition, and then the gut-feelings and hunches.

This would be "doing" intuition backward, for the non-imaging feelings almost always come first.

*

The **OXFORD DICTIONARY** shows when words were first entered into the English language, and the different meanings then and later attributed to them.

So, we will now belabor our cognitive powers and examine the known etymological history of the term **SENSORIAL** in the English language.

*

To begin with, the modern definition given in the Oxford is:

"The seat of sensation in the brain of man and other animals. The percipient center to which sense-impressions are transmitted by the nerves. Also COMMON SENSORIAL (Latin SENSORIAL COMMUNE.) Formerly, also used in a wider sense, for the brain as the organ of mind and the center of nervous energy."

Be pleased to bear in mind the reference to "sense-impressions."

*

However, the FIRST usage in English was nothing of the kind. I shall set this first usage apart from subsequent definitions because we will definitely discuss it ahead.

1647 H. More in SONG OF SOUL. "For there is first a tactual conjunction, as it were, of the representative rayes of everything with the sensorial before we know the things themselves."

Then by 1664, barely twenty years later, we begin to see the use of the term more in the direction of how it is defined today.

1664 Power in EXPERIMENTAL PHILOSOPHY. "Spontaneous motion is performed by continuation of the Animal Spirit, from the common Sensorial to the Muscle."

1695 Tryon in DREAMS ii. "When the first Censorium (which is called the Organ of the common Sense) is obstructed with a soporiferous vapour."

1737 Porterfield in MEDICAL ESSENTIALS. "Which Agitation is communicated to the Sensorial, or that Part of our Brain in which our Mind does principally reside."

1826 Kirby in ENTOMOLOGY iv. "Sensation and perception are by the means of the nerves and a common sensorial."

1861 Sir F. Palgrave in NORM. & ENGL. iii. "Rome became the common sensorial of Europe, and through Rome all the several portions of Latin Europe sympathized and felt with each other."

1867 MacGregor in VOYAGES ALONE. "The tiller, that delicate and true sensorial of a boat."

1872 Darwin in EMOTIONS iv. "When the sensorial is strongly excited the muscles of the body are generally thrown into violent action." I.e., the muscles are thrown into violent action because the sensorial became strongly excited.

*

Psychiatrists during the modern period have attributed many pathogenic situations to this kind of thing. On the other hand consider the following intuitive episode told to me, but of which many similar ones exist in print and testimony.

*

"I was walking down the street when something jerked me back rather violently. At that instant, a bullet came flying at right where I would have been in the next instant, and it crashed through the glass window of the store. I had a few cuts from the flying glass, but was alive. I have no idea of what jerked me backward. But -- Boy, oh boy, was my intuition working!"
And, I may as well add, I myself have experienced three intuition event-episodes of this kind which saved my life and in which my body's autonomic motor system took over.

*

If the sensorial exists at all, we might safely assume that it exists in everyone, that everyone has a sensorial -- and that everyone's sensorial is connected to their motorium.
Based on the definitions above, we might as well assume that it is a biomind sensorial-motorium, and thus exists in all specimens of our species.
So, the concept of the sensorial fulfills the first and fourth criteria mentioned earlier.

*

We can also expect that the sensorial senses and conveys various kinds of information to the cognitive consciousness in the form of sensations, feelings, impulses and signals which may or may not produce mental image pictures. So the concept of the sensorial also fulfills the third criterion.

*

Thus, the first, third and fourth criteria have been fulfilled. This leaves the second criterion, the time-space transcendence thing -- which is the hallmark of many, or even most kinds of intuitive and other superpower experiencing.

*

We now have to put on our thinking caps.

If we examine the example usages of the term **SENSORIAL** from 1737 up to the present, we can more or less trace the drift of its definitions toward becoming an attribute of the brain -- as the "seat of consciousness" in the brain.

*

In this sense of the definition, then, if we wanted to focus our attention or visualizations on our sensorial, we would accordingly try to focus on our brain.

It is therein that the sensorial is said to be located -- although the exact site of this seat-of-consciousness "organ" in our brains has never been identified.

*

But here we need to pause to consider some extensive confusions.

IF the sensorial is defined as the entire sensory apparatus, then we are talking about much more than the brain or any part of it.

The "seat of consciousness" seems a perfectly good phrase, one with a very long and antique history. Just where this Seat is located, however, has never really been determined.

*

Many premodern thinkers postulated that the Seat was within the soul, while even earlier thinkers postulated several Seats for different kinds of consciousness -- and which Seats were often at odds with each another.

*

Furthermore, the term **CONSCIOUSNESS** enjoys a very long list of definitions -- which, to me, implies putting a vast and indiscriminant number of things in a bag and then looking at the bag with the assumption we know what's in it.

As it is, it is difficult to link intuition, etc., with consciousness since intuition informs us of things we are not conscious of.

*

Awareness is one of the items attributed to consciousness. But it is even difficult to link the superpowers with awareness because most of them likewise informs us of things we are not aware of. [See my forthcoming essays which will discuss consciousness and awareness.]

*

But there is yet another exceedingly important difficulty. This hinges on the concept that it is the brain which exclusively is the seat of consciousness, the sensorial, and all else we can sense, be aware and conscious of.

This is a modern concept. And it is one which is closely connected to another distinctly modern concept -- so much so that the two are almost inseparable: that the brain as a physical organ cannot directly sense or perceive what is beyond the limits of the physical senses, for example, the future because the future does not yet exist.

*

But this is what intuition actually does do, in the sense that it seems directly to perceive the future -- whether via subtle or gross feelings or sometimes accurate mental image pictures presented to the cognitive or witnessing mind. So you see the difficulty here of assigning the sensorial to the brain -- and wherein, by the way, it has never been located.

*

Thus it is necessary to point up that most premodern societies overall did not doubt that the future could be intuited, either via feelings, clairvoyance, or visions of it.

And, indeed, the future continued to be intuited even after modernist thinkers introduced the concept that it could not be.

*

I hope you see the rather hilarious dichotomy here -- that modernist thinking said intuition could not happen, but which continued to happen world-wide anyway (at least upon quite frequent occasions.)

*

I will now return to the issue of the sensorial. And in this regard if we turn our attention back to the FIRST 1647 example given in the OXFORD DICTIONARY, here is a usage and a meaning which is distinctly different from subsequent usages.

1647: "For there is first a tactuall conjunction, as it were, of the representative rayes of everything with the sensorial before we know the things themselves."

*

Some scholars of the Renaissance period might realize that this is a premodern usage -- and, as well, a concept that was once familiar within the alchemy, astrology, and the clairvoyant and healing arts and crafts of the Renaissance period.

In other words, it comes from a period before the modern all-is-brain concept arose -- a period when

foreseeing was not yet rejected.

*

Within this concept, it was thought that FIRST there was a "tactuall" conjunction with the representative rays of everything. Which is to say, a "feeling" conjunction of the rays of everything with the sensorial. Of course, what was meant by "everything" might be open to conjecture -- but "everything" usually means, well, everything.

*

In any event, "everything" implies not only what is inside the biomind organism, but outside of it, too. This makes it exceedingly difficult to position the sensorial inside the skull and somewhere inside the brain. For if located inside, the sensorial presumably would not have the tactuall conjunctions of the rays of everything except only after they had passed through skin, muscle and bone. Likewise, it is difficult to consider that the representative rays of everything are interior to the bio-body.

*

The implication in the early definition is that FIRST there was the tactual conjunction of the representative rays of everything. The tactual conjunction was with the sensorial. And the direct implication here refers to outside of the bio-body -- BEFORE the representative rays enter into its arrays of sensory receptors.

*

This concept bears relationship to another older one, sometimes referred to as "externalization of the sensibilities" -- "sensibilities" not to be confused with the senses.

SENSIBLE refers to something that can be sensed, while SENSIBILITY refers to "a peculiar susceptibility to a pleasurable or painful impression, such as in empathy or emotiveness."

*

A "sense" and a "sensibility," therefore, are not the same thing -- for a sensibility involves IMPRESSIONS while a sense processes direct sensory data.

*

In any event, it could be argued, at least for hypothetical wondering, that the tactual conjunction with the sensorial might deliver IMPRESSIONS of the representative rays of EVERYTHING. Indeed, "representative" suggests impressions.

*

We need but convert "the representative rays of everything" into "the representative information of everything" -- with the result that there could exist an EXTENSIVE "sense organ" which was once thought to exist, which was lost sight of during our modern epoch.

*

"Representative rays," since they are not the rays themselves, but only what they represent, falls very closely to impressions -- and IMPRESSIONS is a very big word relative to all of the superpowers of the human biomind, one much favored by most psychics.

*

If, then, the FIRST conjunction to the sensorial of the representative rays does take place, it would be, or would stimulate, a process of impressions involving rays or representations of everything. And since most of "everything" is outside of the bio-body itself, we would be talking of a conjunction, or a connectiveness external to it.

*

But the conjunction would have to take place at a certain location -- and so without doubt we might be referring to the fields or "auras" which surround the bio-body proper. Such fields or auras are referred to as energy bodies to distinguish them from the physical aspects of the bio-body.

If that would be the case, then the SENSORIAL as THE "sense organ" would include not only the physical aspects of the biomind, but also it's energy fields (or electronic) aspects.

*

In other words, the "anatomy" of the SENSORIAL includes not only the physical aspects of the bio-body, but all its energy aspects -- possibly excepting the awake intellect which tends to function only within the parameters of its mental information processing grids.

*

And the "representative rays of everything" would include past, present and future -- if we accede to the concept that "everything" includes them.

And all one needs to do is talk with a few achieved psychics -- who will go on about "impressions" they receive from someplace other than within their bio-body systems.

*

In any event, externalization of sensibilities (as contrasted to the internal senses proper) is clearly involved with most of the superpowers.

And if we accept that, then it is but one short step to considering the sensorial as the "vehicle" which is first tactually conjoined to the "representative rays" from which the representative impressions are drawn.

*

At any rate, it is entirely difficult to consider how impressions "arrive" unless "something" is functioning in order (1) to connect the impressions to what they are representative of, and (2) to convey the impressions or the representations to the bio-mind's sensory users of the impressions.

There may be many squadrons and arrays of such users -- from the cellular level on upward to the cognitive functions of the understanding or misunderstanding intellect.

*

A great deal more can be said in considering the possible existence of the sensorial.

But in beginning to end this essay, we should return to the idea of concepts and that it is quite apparent that the intellect functions according to what, which and how many concepts are available to it.

*

It is understood that much goes on regarding the entire biomind of which the intellect often has no understanding, or is completely unaware of altogether.

It is also true that the intellect somehow designs its functioning in the light of, or against, what it thinks is possible or not possible. In any event, vivid examples abound of intellects which reject what is not thought possible.

*

During the early decades of the twentieth century, it was generally thought, at least in the mainstreams, that the physical brain was the Seat of all human functioning -- and that this would ultimately be proven to be the case.

This concept served to focus intellect awareness on the physical brain as the "answer" to the functioning.

*

Accompanying this concept was another -- that the bio-body possessed only five physical senses, and none of which included the "extra-sensory" factors which were the topic of research of the early psychical explorers.

Those factors then had to be attributed to some other source which was non-biological -- sources which mainstream Western scientists labeled and condemned as superstitious.

*

As time and events dragged on, however, it could be seen that there were many functions which also could not be directly attributed to the then known physical aspects of the brain -- such as creativity and other visionary functions, much less telepathy, clairvoyance and intuition. The concept of the brain-mind then came into vogue, and much could be attributed to the "mind" which could not be attributed to the brain itself.

*

Guided by this concept, people began thinking that the extra-sensory "equipment" was contained in the mind -- and attempted to develop the equipment within the contexts of the mind.

*

Many brilliant people worked on this concept. And so it would seem that if the extra-sensory equipment indeed existed in the mind, then many superpsychics would have resulted. Indeed, this was one of the central concepts of parapsychology -- that extrasensory perception was a mental attribute.

*

It is possible to say, then, that the brain-concept and the mind-concept failed to explain psi epiphenomena -- and that those whose intellect subscribed to those two guiding concepts did not really develop volitional ESP or any other of the known superpowers formats.

*

It would be true, at least in large part, that one's realities are based in the concepts the intellect subscribes to. And if the concepts are not accurate or pertinent, then information gaps exist in the intellect.

*

And it would also be true that the individual seeks to emulate the concepts which help construct awareness of what is possible or not. If the concepts deny or defeat or do not include or permit certain kinds of awareness, then information pertinent to such awarenesses probably will not be processed within the intellect awareness.

*

The concept of the SENSORIAL, in its original definition, is a perfectly good candidate for consideration when it comes to the superpowers of the human biomind.

It is redolent with the externalization of sensibilities idea, and serves to switch focus from internal bio-mechanisms to external factors.

It is quite holistic -- in that it would seem to include not only the bio-body but its energy fields, and which energy fields are certainly linked to the sensory receptor arrays of the biomind organism.

*

And indeed, in my personal experience and research, the switching of focus from brain or mind or body to the sensorial seems to permit conduits of so-called extrasensory information to begin taking place. As a result, sensory transducers long inactive might begin revving up (see my mini-essay regarding Sensory Transducers.)

*

As I have occasionally pointed out, in the end it does not matter which senses we have, or where they are located within the biomind framework.

The only thing that matters is whether they are active or inactive -- and correctly so. (See my essay regarding the Signal-To-Noise Ratio.)

But incorrect concepts held within the biomind intellect seem to have a great deal to do with how what functions, and why and when and IF one is aware of "representational rays" of everything.

*

I will extend the concept of the sensorial in other forthcoming essays in this database. But this concept can be considered in association with concepts of sensory transducers and mental information processing grids, and which essays have already been entered into this database. (End)

ON-GOING SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY OF SENSORY RECEPTORS WHICH ACCOUNT FOR MANY SUBTLE PERCEPTIONS

Ingo Swann (12 September 1996)

[NOTE: The following is a reworked version of a paper I was invited to present on 21 March 1994 at the United Nations on behalf of the Society for Enlightenment and Transformation (SEAT).] SEAT is a reformulation and enlargement of the former unofficial UN Parapsychology Association. SEAT, however, has been granted Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) status and now occupies a meaningful place within the greater U. N. system. For further information regarding SEAT and its purposes, please be in touch with Mr. Mohammad A. Ramadan, Room S-1755, GCPO Box 20, NY, NY, 10017 (fax (212) 963-4879).

[The original title of the paper was YOUR SEVENTEEN SENSES - THE CRUMBLING MAINSTREAM RESISTANCE OF THE PARANORMAL AND NEW SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATION REGARDING THE EXISTENCE OF CERTAIN PSI FACULTIES. This original paper consisted of two major topics: (1) the major characteristics of 20th century mainstream resistance to psi faculties; and (2) recent scientific advances which now substantiate the existence of those faculties. For the purpose of this document I have separated the two topics and will integrate the substance of the first one in a forthcoming essay regarding the anti-psychic mindsets of the twentieth century. This present document focuses on new scientific confirmation regarding the existence of certain psi faculties. The elements presented in the 1994 paper are germane in today's larger picture of human consciousness development and have increased in meaning regarding the near future.]

*

NEW SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES REGARDING THE EXISTENCE OF CERTAIN PSI FACULTIES

**Synopsis of a paper presented on 21 March 1994 at the United Nations
to members of the Society for Enlightenment and Transformation**

Ingo Swann

How many of you here today would like to know you have at least SEVENTEEN senses rather than just five of them? How many think that seventeen would be better than just five? How many of you here

already know that you have more than five senses?

When Mohammed Ramadan and Clarence Robins asked me to come here and talk about something, we had a little difficulty deciding upon a topic worthy of your interest. Finally it dawned on me that there exists what we might call a Particular Situation regarding psychic or metaphysical perceptions and it was decided that the nature of this Situation should be presented.

*

This Particular Situation consists of three aspects or parts.

FIRST: During the modern past, the real existence of psi faculties was rejected within science, psychology and psychiatry. The rejection was based in a number of factors which seemed rational and logical in the scientific past and thus achieved wide acceptance in scientific, academic and media mainstreams of the twentieth century.

SECOND: Those factors which seemed rational and logical in the past have now been superseded by significant scientific discoveries and advances which substantiate the real existence of at least certain psi faculties. Some of these discoveries are now fifty years old. These new discoveries absolutely require a swift and large-scale reevaluation not only regarding psi faculties in particular, but with regard to the larger scope and subtle functions and transformation of human consciousness.

THIRD: However, in spite of the notable scientific advances which affirm the real existence of psi faculties, this necessary and advisable reevaluation is NOT underway in the three important mainstreams - and which mainstreams continue to support, adhere to, and proliferate the now out-dated concepts which, in a broad cultural sense, permitted the past, absolute rejection of psi faculties.

*

There is one outcome of this Particular Situation, and which can be described by a term frequently used within United Nations parlance, a term familiar to me as a past employee of the Secretariat. It is used in many United Nations documents.

The outcome referred to is that if the past rationales which permitted the rejection of psi continue to be proliferated by mainstream pressures, then the scientific advances which substantiate the real existence of certain psi faculties must be ignored or pushed into the shadow of unawareness.

Thus, the discoveries CANNOT and WILL NOT be integrated into advancing scientific thought, academic tutoring and fair media representation. And in this suppressed or hidden state, the discoveries cannot be integrated into the overall goals of the Society for Enlightenment and Transformation which I have the honor of addressing today.

The well-used, sometimes over-used United Nations term for this kind of situation is "deplorable" - and so the Particular Situation I have outlined above is, well, deplorable. After all, advances in scientific discovery are supposed to vitalize enlightenment and transformation if they are made openly accessible. But when such discoveries are ignored, they cannot contribute to much of anything.

*

Because of the Particular Situation I've outlined above, most people are not aware that significant scientific advances HAVE been made regarding substantive support for the real existence of a number of psi faculties.

Many scientific papers have been published regarding the discoveries. But because of the Particular Situation these remain ignominiously dispersed through the various literatures and their implications are not enthusiastically reviewed or endorsed in formal scientific, academic or media forums.

*

Messieurs Mohammad Ramadan and Clarence Robins, both indefatigable workers on behalf of enlightenment and transformation, agreed that I should attempt to present at least a nut-shell overview of the developments which have not at all yet been socially permitted to reach down into transformative social consciousness.

*

To enter into this overview, it is first necessary to set the stage as to why psi faculties were rejected in the scientific past.

A historical review of the phenomena of rejection of psi shows that there were multiple reasons for it. In their modern sense, some of these reasons reach back at least three centuries.

Some of the reasons had to do with simple matters of tolerance and intolerance both at the individual and social levels. But others had to do with what was to be established as acceptable or unacceptable knowledge at politico-social levels. Others had to do with what was to be accepted as normal or abnormal social and mental behavior, especially as regards the first six decades of the twentieth century.

*

The larger historical overview of the rejection thus presents a fairly complicated picture, one which is difficult to negotiate.

In modern scientific terms, however, the major thrust of the rejection was early consolidated within the concepts of philosophical materialism which came to govern early modern scientific overviews and expectations.

As a philosophical commitment, then, the early modern sciences held that whatever constituted scientific reality had to have a physical basis in matter, in the material. And so the consolidation of the rejection of psi was straightforward and simple: That psi could not be accepted until a quantifiable, material-physical basis for it, or any part of it, was identified.

*

What this meant in simple terms was that the human could ONLY access information for which physical receptors could be shown to exist. The five physical senses were based in the physical tactile mechanisms which resulted in the sensations of sight, hearing, tasting, smelling, and touch. But psychic information could not be attributed to any of these, since all of them functioned only within the local environments of the physical body.

As a general result, the existence of additional senses was denied, both scientifically and philosophically, and it was this denial which resulted in the Five-Senses-ONLY theory which was pervasively proliferated throughout modernist societies.

This scientific principle, for it indeed functioned as one, thus served as the rationale and logic for the rejection of psi faculties. I.e., no physical receptors for those faculties were expected to be scientifically discovered. So the on-going rejection of psi faculties was considered justified.

*

It is worth pointing up something here which has dropped out of modernist thinking. Anthropologists have established that in general pre-modern societies did not think in terms of having SENSES. As we might put it in today's computer lingo, they thought more in terms of accessing information or knowledge and achieving perception appropriate to them.

The conversion of the concept of accessing information to the concept of having senses appears to have occurred only AFTER the European Renaissance period. Indeed, it can quite easily be shown that most of the major thinkers of the Renaissance were profoundly preoccupied regarding HOW to increase and stimulate the accessing of information.

*

Thus, the concept that we are dependent on our physical senses rather than dependent on accessing

information dates from AFTER the seventeenth century - while the concept of accessing information is at least 6,000 years old.

In this light, the idea that we access information only via our five physical senses IS modern. The concept that we are completely limited to what we perceive by the physical five dates from only about 1845, and was from the outset solely a scientific hypothesis which has never been demonstrated by conclusive scientific fact.

*

Nevertheless, the hypothesis that human awareness is limited to the five physical senses has been a very powerful one within modernist philosophical and scientific contexts. So powerful, indeed, that early modern scientists never expected to discover the existence of bio-physical receptors additional to the famous five.

Information derived from other than the physical five senses was thought to be impossible, at least in theory. And it was upon this theory that psychic information, so-called, was scientifically rejected.

Indeed, many leading scientists between 1845 and about 1960 let it be known that there was "one scientific demand" which would never be fulfilled: the discovery of bio-physical receptors which would account for psychic information. So, scientific brotherhoods united around the conviction that until physical receptors for psychic information were discovered, then the information should be considered as illusory or psychopathological in origin.

*

Early psychical researchers and later parapsychologists of course protested this rejection based solely on this "one demand" of science. They indicated that if psi faculties were purely psychological in origin and nature, then no bio-physical receptors would ever be found.

However, by the same turn-around of the scientific argument against the real existence of psi, should physical receptors for accessing so-called psychic "information" be discovered, then science proper would be obliged to accept that its one demand was fulfilled.

*

What has just been presented has long been characterized as the "conflict" between science and parapsychology. This conflict has often been distorted to include other factors. But the basic factor clearly and unambiguously hinged on the absence of bio-physical receptors which would account for the

subtle kinds of information so-called "psychics" deal with.

In parapsychological parlance, this kind of information came to be called "extra-sensory" or "non-sensory." These two terms unambiguously demonstrate that psychical researchers and parapsychologists themselves did not consider that bio-physical receptors for psychic information would ever be discovered.

*

And it is from this context that the basic definition of "psychic" is derived: i.e., lying outside of matter, physicality, the physical sciences or knowledge of the physical universe.

*

There is now a very interesting aspect to this conflict which should be pointed out because it has great bearing on later developments.

If the conflict is dissected carefully, it reveals that scientists, psychical researchers, or parapsychologists expected that any bio-physical basis for psi faculties would be discovered.

Indeed, early psychical researchers looked for supernatural explanations outside of any materialistic basis. By their own name, paraPSYCHOLOGISTS clearly opted for a psychological explanation, not a bio-physical one. And there is no evidence at all in the parapsychological literature that parapsychologists invested any time either theorizing or researching for a bio-physical explanation.

*

This is to say, that any possible bio-physical explanation was, and is, just as alien to parapsychology as it was to the material sciences proper.

*

Here matters rested - until the first electron-microscope was developed in Germany in 1932, and later evolved in the United States and Canada. After World WAR II, cellular biology underwent a great jump in importance because of the electron-microscope and even more penetrating and precise later technical advances.

Now began the slow process of comprehending that biological cells were not the simplistic things once thought. Rather, they were composed of ultra-minute factors which functioned in very remarkable ways.

*

Also, during the 1930s another development occurred which was to have enormous importance and impact, an impact which is yet in progress today.

The fact that biological organisms have some kind of electromagnetic substrate was discovered about 300 years ago. But this substrate was considered weak and unimportant in the face of the chemical substrate which was thought to be very strong.

During the 1930s, however, researchers in various parts of the world, and especially in the former Soviet Union, began to realize that although the electromagnetic substrate was "weak" it nonetheless played very important roles within the bio-chemical whole of ALL biological organisms.

*

Advances in bio-electromagnetism were somewhat delayed, however, until appropriate technology could be invented to deal more adequately with subtle bio-energy forms. The technology began to be available during the 1960s, and by the late 1970s the extraordinary importance of the bio-electromagnetic substrate could begin to be seen.

*

A meaningful factor, somewhat amusing, now needs to be introduced, one with which most people are probably not familiar.

Science and technology are often thought of going hand in hand. But this is often not the case. The nearly invisible reason is that the technically-minded and the scientifically-minded don't appear to be the same kind of thinkers.

*

Largely speaking, scientists are more likely to be theoreticians. But technicians are more likely to be engineers.

Scientists theorize and try to test their theories. But technicians build things, often just to see what the things can do. Indeed, technical advances can often be several generations AHEAD of scientific thinking. This is certainly the case with the computer industry evolved largely by technician-types, not by scientists. Indeed, many technological advances have been achieved by technologists who possessed

little in the way of legitimate or conventional scientific backgrounds.

*

The bottom line of all these developments is that during the last forty years a very large series of new research disciplines have come into existence. These new disciplines constitute an intermixing of science, technology, microscopy, subtle chemical exchanging, and electromagnetic and bio-electromagnetic expertise.

Ahead I give a partial list of these new disciplines. But the punch line here is that it was left to these NEW disciplines to increasingly discover (much to their surprise!) the expanding bio-organic basis for many faculties once merely thought questionably "psychic."

*

There is only one impediment regarding an integration of these new disciplines with psychical and parapsychological research. This involves the new nomenclature being evolved with these new disciplines.

The new nomenclature is as alien to science as it is to parapsychology, and at present both these venerable institutions are having difficulty integrating it both conceptually and contextually. I will show many examples of this ahead.

*

But beyond this little difficulty, there is no doubt that many of the advances being made in those new disciplines can be "married" to many otherwise well-known psychic faculties - as I will demonstrate at the end of this paper.

*

At this point, I can't resist making one sardonic comment. Earlier in this paper I have complained about the lack of scientific and popular integration of the implications of these new discoveries.

But there is one group that has taken adequate and accurate interest in these astonishing discoveries and which seems to be more or less up to date regarding them. This group consists of the producers and scriptwriters of the TV series STAR TREK and similar offshoots.

*

The new and now on-going discoveries of biological bases for many psi faculties is now best expressed, perhaps, as PARABIOLOGY, meaning "beyond" past conventional concepts of biology.

Or, perhaps, the term PARAPSYCHOBIOLOGY is convenient - which, if translated into Russian, would become the term translated back into English as bio-communications or bio-information transfer.

*

So far, the new discoveries regarding the biological bases for psi faculties roughly fall into five categories. I have to get a little technical here, but I'll simplify just ahead.

These five general categories are:

- Minute chemical receptors and sensors
- Minute chemico-electro receptors and sensors
- Neural-network exchanges of information in the bio-internal body substrates
- Bio-electromagnetic information receptors and sensors
- Bio-information transfer networks at the atomic, molecular, and neurological levels

*

If these new terms are somewhat confusing, well don't worry too much.

They simply mean that we are FAR BEYOND the five-senses-only fallacy and that our bio-mind bodies have multitudes of exceptional senses by way of delicate systems of receptors and sensors at the cellular, nervous, chemical and bio-electromagnetic levels and their interfaces.

A nice way to conceive the whole of this is to comprehend that every cell, possibly every atom, in our bio-physicality is a receptor or sensor of some kind.

In other words, we are walking, talking, eating, defecating ARRAYS of exquisitely elegant and sophisticated receptors and sensors. ALL of these receptors and sensors are busy ACCESSING information - and knowledge, IF what is accessed can be organized into recognizable thinking patterns.

*

By extended meaning, these delicate systems of receptors can also integrate with our normal five - and, given adaptive learning regarding them, can also integrate with our mental cognitive powers - to result in, yes, what have otherwise generally been called "psi faculties."

*

Now, to give you here some broad idea of the cutting-edge, largely technical disciplines involved, I'll quickly read through a list of twenty-one of them:

Electro-chemical physiology

Neurobiology

Neurobiology

Neuropsychology

Bio-radiation studies

Hormone and Hormonal transmission research

Chemical signal research

Bio-electric research

Brainwave research

Bio-sensitivity research

Bio-electric information transfer research

Sensory coding research

Bio-magnetic navigation research

Bio-electronic systems research

Bio-electric field detection research

Electrophysiological studies

Pheromone and pheromone transfer research

Multi-stability in perception research

Subliminal perception research

Neuro-magnetic response research

Bio-infrared and bio-ultraviolet perception research

*

At this point, I could adumbrate upon more than a thousand scientific papers about these discoveries published in the science literature, even in the esteemed leading science periodicals such as NATURE, SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN and DISCOVER.

The authors of those papers, though, never use the terms psi, psychic, or parapsychology, etc., since the mere introduction of them would cause their papers to be rejected.

The editors and peer-review systems of such publications apparently don't realize, for example, that "bioinformation transfer over distance" means about the same thing as "telepathy" and/or "clairvoyance," or "remote viewing." But this is merely part of the Particular Situation I referred to at the beginning of this talk.

*

I now hold up in my hand before you, so you can see that it really exists, a book published in 1984 via Simon & Schuster, by Robert Rivlan and Karen Gravelle. This book is complete with bibliography of scientific sources, but is easy to read. It's entitled, somewhat misleadingly, as DECIPHERING THE SENSES: THE EXPANDING WORLD OF HUMAN PERCEPTION.

Well, the world of human perception is NOT expanding. Rather, ignorance of that world is shrinking a little.

The book might have been called something like THE DISCOVERY OF THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS FOR PSI AND OTHER ANOMALOUS PERCEPTIONS.

*

The discoveries brought together and presented in this book, although in popular style, are based on hard scientific discoveries that have been achieved in other disciplines outside and independent of parapsychology.

And, as such, the sum of them clearly fulfills - at least regarding certain forms of psi - the earlier scientific demand that a bio-organic basis for psi be discovered.

*

I'll quote from the book's fly-leaf; "For centuries we have used an oversimplified and inaccurate model to explain the human senses. Even now, high school biology classes still teach the 'five senses'. But recent scientific research has discovered that there are many more than five senses, and these discoveries have radically changed our understanding of what the senses are and how they work. Rivlan and Gravelle redefine for the general reader the spectrum of human perceptions from the normal to the newly discovered to the extra-sensory."

As chapter one indicates, the book discusses "The seventeen senses" additional to our usual five ones, and then goes on to place the newly-discovered senses in context with the usual five. The authors consume eight chapters to prepare the reader - before they reach chapter 9, entitled "Extra-sensory perception." Probably because of this chapter, the book was now well-received and is now out of print. But it's well worth tracking down a copy of it.

*

Now, lest there be some misunderstanding here, the two authors are NOT describing psychological or mental functions.

They are discussing the actual existence within our biology of minute physical-chemical-bioelectromagnetic "receptors" and "sensors" that interact within networks of the "information-processing resources of the organism."

It is quite easy to ascertain that five senses are obviously NOT ENOUGH to account for the huge range of sensory possibilities of which the human species is capable, while seventeen senses is probably a more accurate count, with more probably yet to be discovered.

No one can survive very well on just five senses. Just ask any seafarer, mountain climber, football or basketball player, explorer or inventor, martial arts expert, or even someone seeking sex. The moment "automatic reflexes" or "intuitive" stuff enters into their talk, know that you have departed the realm of the physical five and entered into the realms of additional senses.

*

As to what these seventeen new senses are. The seventeen new senses interact with each other to provide a rather extensive list, many of which have in the past been referred to as "psychic." Since we don't have

time here to go through them, I've brought a few copies of that list to hand out, along with some copies of this lecture, and all of which you are free to duplicate.

But, for example, the bio-body is now known to have a functioning vomeronasal system containing receptors enabling, at the bio-subliminal level, the detection of minute amounts of chemical signals that tell us about another's sexual receptivity, fear, anger, and other emotions - an aptitude more commonly referred to as "psychic vibe-sensing."

In another category, through the use of a newly invented device called the SQUID, scientists can and have measured and begun to classify the brain's electrical activity outside of the scalp -

Which in turn has led to discoveries that bio-electric activity extends to some distance beyond the skin -

Which in turn has led to the discovery of bio-electric sensors not only in the skin, but in the neuropeptide activity that transmits all kinds of subtle senses information through the immune system and into the brain - and back again into the body's extremities and all its internal organs, including into its surrounding bio-electromagnetic field.

*

Now, discovered bio-electromagnetic fields extending outside the scalp and outside of the skin clearly equate to the "auras" that many clairvoyants have specialized in "seeing."

Drawing on authoritative scientific sources, Rivlan and Gravelle even hypothesize that, and I quote, "thoughts may, indeed, have wings, and some of us may have the ability to sense what others are thinking" via these newly discovered bio-electromagnetic receptor-sensing networks.

The two authors wonder: "Do some psychics and mystics have this ability, vastly magnified, so they can sense the electricity from considerable distances?" Well, there would have been no question of this in antiquity - or even among Arabian or Mongolian nomads today, as well as "street-smart" New Yorkers.

*

Actually, this is the same question that those researching electromagnetism and bio-electromagnetism have been wondering about for over fifty years.

So it's worth pointing up here that the existence of extensive bio-electromagnetism essentially was demonstrated late during the last century, but its existence has not figured very much either into scientific psychology or in scientific parapsychology - both of these two fields having managed mutually to ignore it altogether.

*

Did you know that in addition to yourself being a bio-meat body with eyes, livers, hearts, and appetites of various kinds, you are also a bio-electronic one? Have you ever thought of yourself as such? If you begin to, well, something interesting might begin to happen.

Dr. Robert O. Becker is one of the leading researchers in the United States regarding electromagnetism and bio-electromagnetism. With Gary Selden, he published, in 1985, a book entitled **THE BODY ELECTRIC: ELECTROMAGNETISM AND THE FOUNDATION OF LIFE** (William Morrow, New York), and which "tells the story of our bioelectric selves."

A companion book is Harold Saxton Burr's **BLUEPRINT FOR IMMORTALITY: THE ELECTRIC PATTERNS OF LIFE** (Neville Spearman, London, 1973, republished 1988). Burr, by the way, is an American researcher but could not find an American publisher for this seminal book.

*

Bob Becker has made many unequivocal statements regarding the psi implications of bio-electromagnetism.

For example, he published in **PSYCHOENERGETIC SYSTEMS**, 1977, Vol. 2, pp. 189-196, an article entitled "An Application of Direct Current Neural Systems to Psychic Phenomena." He stated that "The concept of a primitive electronic communication system in all living things can be a useful tool in understanding both `normal' and `paranormal' phenomena that have lacked a rational biological explanation. Indeed, it appears that human beings are tied to the universe in a web of electromagnetic energy."

*

At this point, I believe I've now presented for you consideration the rudiments of the Particular Situation I referred to at the beginning.

The Particular Situation consists of three factors:

- (1) science demanded that a bio-organic explanation for psi faculties be found before it could accept them as real;
- (2) bio-organic explanations have been found for many kinds of psi faculties; and
- (3) everyone seems to be ignoring both the facts and the implications of (2) as just stated.

*

As to more of what our additional senses are:

Did you know that the soles of your feet and the palms of your hands contain minute magnetic receptors and sensors that "recognize" minute and gross changes in local magnetism?

Here are the rudiments of dowsing, healing, and various rough forms of psychometry which means psyching-out what something is by merely holding it.

Alas, though. If you haven't built neural pathways linking these sensors to your cognitive faculties, you probably won't be able to sense what the receptors in the soles of your feet picking up.

*

In bringing this talk to a conclusion, recall that earlier I mentioned the problem of the nomenclature which is acting as a barrier between the new discoveries and more recognizable concepts of psychical and parapsychological research. This same nomenclature is also acting as a barrier between the new research and the problems of enlightenment and transformation which are the objectives of this Society for Enlightenment and Transformation.

To help begin the nomenclature bridge, I'd now like to give some examples by which the two nomenclatures can be compared.

Recently Discovered Bioorganic Basis for the Following Additional Senses

1. Receptors in the nose sensing systems that "smell" emotions, and that can identify motives, sexual receptivity, antagonism, benevolence, etc. (All these are formats of what are commonly referred to as psychic vibe-sensing.)
2. Receptors in the ear sensing systems that detect and identify differences in pressure and electromagnetic frequencies (formats of ESP.)
3. Skin receptors that detect balance and imbalance regarding what is external to the bio-body, even external at some astonishing distances (formats of remote-sensing, a mixed form of ESP and clairvoyance.)
4. Skin receptors that detect motion outside of the body, even when the body is asleep (a format of subliminal ESP.)

5. Directional finding and locating receptors in the endocrine and neuropeptide systems (formats of dowsing, intermixed with formats of cognitive ESP or intuition.)
6. Whole-body receptors, including hair, that identify fluidic motions of horizontal, vertical, diagonal, even if not visually perceived (as, for example, in the "psychic" portion of the martial art of Akhido.)
7. Skin receptors that "recognize" the temperament of other biological organisms (a format of psi "reading".)
8. Subliminal sensory systems which locate and identify pitch of sound, a sense of heat across great distances, a sense of frequencies and waves, either mechanical or energetic (all being formats of ESP and vibe-sensing, sometimes also referred to as "shaman perceiving".)
9. Receptors that identify positive and negative charged particles at the atomic level. (The term utilized for this in psychical research is "micro-psi" but which is rare. However, it has been convincingly demonstrated, especially in the case of C. W. Leadbeater who published Occult Chemistry (1908). Thirty years before the invention of the electron-microscope he correctly described sub-atomic particles, many undiscovered at the time, but discovered since. Micro-psi faculties are mentioned as one of the ancient Sidhis of ancient India (see, for example, Yoga Sutras of Patanjali).)
10. Microsystem transducing of various forms of mechanical, chemical, and electromagnetic energy into meaningful nerve impulses (all commonly thought of as FORMS OF ESP.)
11. Receptors that sense gravitational changes (a form of PSYCHIC DOWSING.)
12. Neurological senses for interpreting modulated electronic information by converting it into analog signals for mental storage, interpretation, and cognition (one of the bio-mind bases for TELEPATHY.)
13. Bio-electronic receptors for sensing radiation, including X-rays, cosmic rays, infrared radiation, and ultraviolet light, all of these receptors being found in the retina of the eye (part of the basis for various forms of CLAIRVOYANCE.)
14. Receptors that respond to exterior electrical fields and systems (producing forms of CLAIRVOYANCE and AURA "READING".)

Today, the following highly specialized sensing systems are referred to in the new sciences as HUMAN SEMAPHORE CAPACITIES.

15. Skin receptors for sensing perceptions of bonding or antagonism (thought of as forms of INTUITION.)
16. Senses for non-verbal "language" communicating (thought as a form of TELEPATHY or VIBE-SENSING.)

17. Combined sensing systems (neural networks) for making meaning out of at least 130 identified nonverbal physical gestures and twenty basic kinds of nonverbal messages (thought of as INTUITIONAL CHARACTER ASSESSMENT or a particular form of CLAIRVOYANCE.)

18. Receptors that trigger alarm and apprehension before their sources are directly perceived (a particularly valuable type of PSYCHIC FORESIGHT, FORESEEING, INTUITION.)

19. Sensing systems for registering and identifying nonverbal emotional waves (a form of INTUITION and/or TELEPATHY or CLAIRVOYANCE.)

The following are now known to be associated with the PINEAL GLAND if it is healthy and in good working order.

20. Senses and memory-stores cycles of light and darkness, anticipating them with accuracy as the daily motions of the sun and moon change (a kind of PSYCHIC FORECASTING or FUTURE SEEING.)

21. Senses and responds to solar and lunar rhythms, solar disruptions (flares, sunspots) and moon-caused tidal changes (water or geophysical ones), and can sense "coming" earthquakes and storms (a form of PREDICTIVE ESP especially noted in sailors, farmers, but also in cows, dogs, cats, and snakes.)

22. If the pineal gland is fully functional, it acts as a nonvisual photo-receptor (the psychic equivalent being "X-RAY VISION.")

*

The following senses or sensing systems are similar to some already mentioned, but they appear to function upon a completely different basis and are additional those senses already mentioned.

It is now thought that this basis is almost certainly the WATER contained in the bio-body, in the physical components of the nerve systems, and the physical part of the brain.

It is not yet understood how WATER is used this way to create a fluidic but elaborate series of interconnected sensing systems.

One of the best guesses, yet to be established, is that the vibrations of the water molecules link together throughout the entire bio-body and form the equivalent of radar or sonar antennae.

These liquid antenna sensing systems appear to detect the following categories. Divided by categories, they can be thought of as individualized and highly refined sensing systems. All of these categories have been thought of as PSYCHIC, ESP, CLAIRVOYANT, or INTUITIVE - which is to say, been thought of as unexplainable and hence impossible.

23. Sense of non-visual wave motions.

24. Sense of non-visual oscillating patterns.
25. Sense of magnetic fields.
26. Sense of infrared radiation.
27. Sense of electrical energy.
28. Sense receptors for local AND distant sources of heat. (This is an unnamed PSI faculty, but one familiar to Amerindians.)
29. Sense of geo-electromagnetic pulses, magnetic fields, especially biological ones (psychic equivalents unidentified and unnamed.)
30. Although the mechanisms are not at all understood, the liquidic sensing detectors apparently are somehow involved in the remote sensing of anything at a distance, however great. The results, of course, are remote viewing, remote hearing, remote tasting, and so forth.

*

Finally (although there is no "finally" here), we come to sensory systems' receptors spread throughout the entire bio-body, and which apparently feed information into the mind-body interface (if "interface" would be the correct concept.)

31. Whole-body receptors (millions of them) to detect pheromones, sexual receptivity, fear, love, admiration, danger, pain in others, intentions in others, etc., (all formerly thought of as inexplicable forms of ESP or so-called VIBE-SENSING and/or PSYCHIC `READING".)

Please note that the list above

is not complete and is presently in process

of being extended.

*

With the invention of the electron microscope in the early 1930s, large amounts of data had accumulated by the 1950s which irrevocably substantiated that the human being possessed very many more senses than only the infamous physical five.

*

As of the late 1950s, then, there was no longer any justifiable reason to continue teaching and emphasizing the five physical senses.

And, as well, there was no longer any justifiable reason to continue the mainstream debunking of so-called psychic perceptions - because bio-mind receptors have been located and confirmed for a lot of them.

*

During the 1960s and 1970s, the scientific information pool of this kind of discovery had increased enormously - the sum of which brought a complete end to the concept of the five physical senses only.

A "complete end" at least in a scientific sense. But not in a cultural sense - because the meaning of these sensory discoveries is still being completely ignored in the cultural and ideological milieus, even though technical and popular books became available.

*

One of the better, more easy-to-read technical books was **SENSATION AND PERCEPTION: AN INTEGRATED APPROACH**, by H.R. Schiffman, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1976. This book is still invaluable today, and provides an extensive bibliography of sources.

As already noted, perhaps the best popular book, certainly very easy to read, was **DECIPHERING THE SENSES: THE EXPANDING WORLD OF HUMAN PERCEPTION**, by Robert Rivlan and Karen Gravelle, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1984. The first chapter of this book identifies and discusses **SEVENTEEN SENSES**, and also has a competent bibliography updating the one found in the Schiffman book.

*

Both of these books, as well as others, were almost completely ignored, and the conviction that we possess only five physical senses continues to hold sway today.

You see, it is possible to conclude that these books were ignored because they tended toward encouraging people to take justified interest in their extended sensory systems, and perhaps to begin unfolding them.

*

Today there is no justification at all for the continuation of anti-psyche belief systems. There is no justification to teach that we have ONLY five physical senses, and there is every justification to teach that we have very many others.

There is also no justification to continue suggesting that there is a difference between sensory and extra-sensory perceptions and information. The discoveries regarding our numerous senses and sensing systems obliterated the boundaries which, in the uninformed past, tended to artificially separate them.

Instead, we need to think more basically in terms of INFORMATION. It is information that is important, regardless of the manner in which it is acquired, or via which sensory systems are utilized to do so.

*

To help more fully integrate the information presented in this paper, I'm obliged to point up something which, to my knowledge, has not been considered elsewhere.

If we think only in terms of senses and/or sensing systems, then in very subtle ways we may be distinguishing between them and ourselves. It is true that we do "have" or "possess" senses and sensing systems. But something else is also true, and it is very important that it should be grasped.

*

We ARE our sensing systems. And what we call "WE" or "US" or "SELF" is in some full part neither no more nor no less than our sensing systems are acknowledged, developed, and utilized. Since we ARE our sensing systems, the full nature and realization of them must in some direct sense be completely meaningful to the overall goals of this important Society for Enlightenment and Transformation.

In closing here, please note that all of the books I have mentioned contain extensive and excellent bibliographies of published scientific papers. Please refer to them if you are interested in such sources.

(End)

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

IN TWELVE PARTS

Ingo Swann (21Jan97)

INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

This seems to be the case for two basic reasons:

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

Few of these ways are consistent with another.

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

or both of two reasons.

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

(End of Introduction)

TOWARD ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (22Jan97)

PART 1:

NON-CONSCIOUS PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL CONSENSUS REALITIES

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

Well, nothing of the kind is the case.

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

Major Characteristics of A Consensus Reality

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

*

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

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

*

Although proper science considers it to be a mindset of fools, the "field" of parapsychology possesses a general consensus reality, but also a number of contrasting mindset groups within it. This social arrangement is true almost everywhere and regarding all activities.

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

The Relationship of Consensus Realities to the Superpower Faculties

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

Two Typical Questions

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

Stereotypes Within Consensus Realities

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

Dynamic

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

The Destruction of the Consensus Reality Concept of Self-Dynamism

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

What Governs Output and Input of Information

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

The Useless Nature of the Term "Psychic"

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

so might erupt in volcanic overflows.

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

Concepts Missing or Absent Within Consensus Reality Formats

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

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

*

But a very brief note here is required.

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

The Answer to the Two Most Frequently Asked Questions

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

And this process is called consensus reality making.

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

*

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

Zippo!

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

*

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

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

(End of Part 1)

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (22Feb97)

PART 2: INFORMATION PROCESSING VIRUSES AND THEIR CLONES

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

anchored in the bay.

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

Information Processing Viruses

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

Virus

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

Clone

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

Warning

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

In any event, we must move on.

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

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

*

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

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

(End of Part 2)

[The Superpowers of the Human Biomind]

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

Ingo Swann (14Apr97)

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

Well, yes.

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

And that element is the mapping of the human genome.

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

So: do the express superpower faculties run in families?

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

The Genome

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

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

Now Get The Following...

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

Extrapolations and Implications

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

*

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

*

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

Versions of Genome Micromanagement

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

The Superpowers and Gene Micromanagement

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

*

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

All of the foreshadowing has two factors in common:

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

Geneticists

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

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

*

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

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

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

Sensory Receptors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

The New Face of the Superpowers and Their Genetic Enhancement

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

There are at least two reasons for this exclusion:

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

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

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

*

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

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

SO, BAMBINI, THERE IT IS...

...believe it or not.

TOWARD ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (23Feb97)

PART 3: THE NATURE OF PERCEPTION

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

Various lists of nomenclature were produced as a result.

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

Perception

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

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

*

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

*

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

and most people will say they do understand it.

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

All Perception is Indirect Perception

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

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

"To know: to understand: to observe."

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

particular kind of light within the light-interference patterns.

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

Reconstructed or Fabricated...

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

*

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

*

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

being "seen" and the hologramic reconstruction of it.

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

*

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

At least two important factors are yet missing.

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

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

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

The Distrust of Perceptions

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

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

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

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

More Complexities

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

*

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

*

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

Image Stocks In Memory

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

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

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

*

Our nomenclature stock is established and maintained by the consensus realities that do so -- with the exception of "street-talk" and fashionable but unofficial ways of referring to something. For example, "vibe sensing," and to "psyche out" someone or something. These two unofficial nomenclature bits represent quite valid potentials, but usually it isn't realized that the end-products of these also will consist of reconstructions, not direct one-on-one perceptions.

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

Formatting A Concept-Making/Image-Making Memory Library

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*

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

*

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

All the evidence in this regard is very strong

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

*

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

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

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

causing malfunction or cognitive invisibility.

*

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

*

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

*

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

(End of Part 3)

TOWARD ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (01Mar97)

PART 4: INFORMATION, INFORMATION THEORY AND INFORMATION TRANSFER

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

*

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

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

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

*

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

*

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

a separate and distinct individual quality, fact, idea, concept or entity;

a material or substance of a given kind;

a piece of information or news;

an event, deed, act or circumstance;

a state of affairs in general, or within a specific or implied sphere.

*

The five definitions of THING given above can and do account for almost, but not quite, everything - and which is why we refer to everything AS every-thing. And so our perceptions are geared to perceive, identify, and discriminate among THINGS - and which then emerge in conscious awareness as reconstructed images.

*

There is absolutely nothing wrong with basic IT-THINK, and indeed it permits survival on about a 90 per cent basis - except when there are holes or gaps in it.

*

But IT-IS gaps can be somewhat corrected within the contexts of consensus realities in that IT-IS perception that is consistent with consensus reality is considered proper or successful perception, while perception that is not is considered improper or aberrant-undesirable - or at least non-conforming.

*

In general, however, any gap-difficulties along these lines are sort of smoothed over in that the nomenclature of a given consensus reality is the concepto-nomenclature everyone within it speaks and writes with - and tends to think with, too.

*

Just outside the enormous, collective IT-THINK syndromes of our species is a slightly different THINK format.

This "level" of thinking has to do with RELATIONSHIPS between and among IT-THINGS. Identifying it-things, and identifying them as it-things, only goes so far, although that process is entirely serviceable to a certain degree.

*

One can identify it-things, endlessly so, but only because they become perceptually concrete in some form - even an idea takes on a sort of concrete-ness if it becomes shared and approved of.

*

Relationships among it-things, however, are usually of a far different matter because, in the first instance, they have to be deduced. For example, the relationship between hydrogen atoms and hydrogen bombs is not readily apparent, and thus had to be deduced before it became identifiable.

*

This is to point up that although the arrangement of IT-THINK to IT-THINGS is usually on a one-to-one basis, the arrangement of IT-THINK to relationships among and between IT-THINGS is not on any kind of one-to-one basis - excepting the most gross and familiar samples of it. The reason for this difficulty is that relationships between it-things can be many and varied and include anything from the imaginable to the unimaginable, from the boring to the fantastic.

*

Another difficulty arises because once IT-THINK becomes properly installed it tends to run on automatic with the mind-boggling speed encountered in Part 3 regarding the basic ten-step processes of

perception.

*

DEDUCTIVE-THINK regarding relationships, however, usually never runs on automatic unless the deductions have themselves been pre-reduced to common understanding, at which time those particular deductions have taken on the clothing of IT-THINK.

*

Relationships of it-things to one another can be explicit or implicit, with the explicit ones being easier to identify, this type of thing usually being referred to as logic.

*

Implicit relationships, however, are identified as such because there is very little in the way of objective or explicit cues involved.

Thus, the deducing (detecting) of implicit relationships can escape the deductive processes of almost everyone - with the exception of those who somehow chance to "notice" them.

And those who DO notice them are quite likely to be attributed as intuitives. And, indeed, if it were up to me, I'd itemize the deduction of implicits as the basic and most broadly-shared type of intuition's many other types. And here is a basic clue regarding "enhancing" one's intuition - by first enhancing one's deductive processes regarding implicit relationships.

As it is in our present consensus reality, we reinforce the processes regarding explicit relationships, but pay very little attention to strengthening the much more wide parameters of implicit relationships.

*

One of the more recent definitions of "genius" is that a genius is one "who sees what others cannot." Although this clearly involves a lot of factors, the deducing of implicit relationships probably is fundamental here - since most rely on explicit rather than on implicit deducing.

*

Now to move speedily on.

The relationship, for example, between ESP and perception seems explicit enough, and therefore seems logical -- especially when a long line of "psychics" say "I perceive" thus and so.

They are correct in saying that they do perceive. But what they perceive is in fact whatever has been processed through their perception-making systems, the sum of these processes being the perception. And as we have seen these end products are not at all one-to-one images. And so what they report "seeing" may or may not correspond with the actual facts or conditions of what they have "seen" as perceptions.

*

This is a situation that has not gone unrecognized in parapsychology. In testing for ESP, researchers encounter many more "misses" than "hits" and the frequency of the misses has condensed into the theory of "Psi-missing." It is thought that Psi-missing is somehow related to "avoidance" of the "target," and as such constitutes some kind of unidentified psychological factors.

*

You see, "paraPSYCHOLOGY" is, after all, majorly conceived of as a branch of psychology -- not as a branch of perception study. And when it was understood by the rest of science that "perceptions" mostly consisted of "cognitive" versus physiological factors, perception, too, began to be thought of as predominantly having a psychological basis.

*

In any event, ESP and perception of IT targets are thought to go hand-in-hand, and all explicit and implicit considerations along these lines are shared not only in parapsychology, but throughout science, philosophy, and in our present general consensus realities as well.

*

Furthermore, the web of Psi-Perceptions is linked throughout by the IT-making nomenclature commonly utilized.

If, then, one refers to Psi or ESP, it is automatically understood everywhere that you are referring to special formats of perception that have been assigned IT nomenclature: psychic, clairvoyance, telepathy, intuition, and etc.

It is even commonly understood that "special" refers NOT to perception per se, but to the unusual other-than-sensory ways it is achieved -- if and when it is achieved.

*

Well, this "prevailing paradigm," as it should properly be termed, has actually prevailed for about 100 years, and has been unsuccessfully approached and tested in the light of every angle conceivable. The only thing that has been achieved is to document beyond any shadow of doubt that ESP processes do exist, but whose presence by parapsychological methodologies are found at only very low statistical levels (which will be discussed in a later essay).

*

So, "psychic" perceptions have been tested for from every angle possible -- which is to say, very angle

consistent with the prevailing consensus reality hypotheses that ESP and Perception are interrelated both explicitly and implicitly, so much so that you can't have the one without the other.

*

But what if this consensus reality concept isn't complete enough? In other words, what if it has a "gaping hole" in its interconnecting line-up of conceptualizing -- one of those invisible gaping holes that are not at all obvious because the apparent picture seems complete and logical enough?

*

And what if what is needed to fill this hole has been around for about fifty or more years, but has been excluded because the prevailing concepts are considered sufficient unto themselves? And because if the needed factors were to be included, the entire consensus making nomenclature appropriate to Psi-Perceptions would either explode or be useless and vacated.

*

This would mean that everyone has cloned the wrong stuff, so to speak, and what they have cloned in this regard has been acting as mental information processing viruses all along.

Ye gads! This would imply a radical reality shift - one which, in its first instance, would big-time EMBARRASS those possessed of the cloned viruses - not only in parapsychology, but in science and philosophy as well, to say nothing of the consensus realities involved.

Information

The essential definitions of the verb TO INFORM, and the noun INFORMATION, never have been ambiguous, but quite precise and clear.

*

INFORM is said to have been derived from the Latin verb INFORMARE from IN + FORMA. However, the Latin FORMA was a noun, and even though the preposition of IN is added to it, it still remains a noun. And nouns, of course, refer to and are meant to identify it-things, not activities which verbs indicate.

*

FORMA referred to the shape and structure of something as distinguished from its material or constituent parts.

The preposition IN refers to inclusion of some kind, most usually a spatial inclusion, but also inclusion in something that does not have spatial-material form such as belief, faith, opinion or assumption (i.e., in the faith, only in belief, in his or her opinion or assumption, etc., and of course, IN his or her conception or misconception.)

*

The key concept of FORMA refers to shape and structure, and so INFORM refers to what has structural shape, has taken on structural shape, or been put into structural shape. So, technically speaking INFORM remains a noun with regard to whatever form a form is in, becoming a verb only when referring to an activity which puts something into shape-structure.

*

In English, however, IN + FORM as referring to structural shape has been used only rarely, this meaning having early been replaced with the concept of MESSAGES - meaning that messages convey information, and that information is used to convey messages.

If the above seems mildly confusing, it's because it is. So don't worry too much at this point.

You see, on the receiver's part, the actual message is what one deduces from the words (or "signals") which the sender believed represented the message he or she was trying to send. This "process" takes a good deal of "encoding" on the sender's part and a good deal of "decoding" on the receiver's part. But I digress.

*

Additionally, when we think of something formed we tend to think in terms of FORM only, not that something has PUT whatever it is INTO form or format.

*

I now caution each who chances to read the above to slow down, focus a little, and notice two important factors:

1. that there is a vast and very incompatible raw difference between messages and the structure and shape of something; and
2. when we think of form as form, we tend to think of it as an IT object or subject, not as something which has been brought into or put into form by various shape-making, structure-making processes of some kind.

In other words, something which is formed or has achieved form is the RESULT of whatever has caused it to take on shape-structure.

*

In English, then, the concept of "into form" has been dropped or vacated, and so we tend not to think in terms of how and why something has come into whatever form it has.

But this is somewhat typical of English nomenclature, which tends to IT-identify end products as things in themselves, not as the result of processes - which is to say, formative processes that have to be structural in order to arrive at any given in-formed state.

This is best perceived not via words, but by a diagram. I'll provide one in the context of a more refined essay further on. But anyone can make one for themselves by diagramming how an IT does take on form.

*

To help in enhancing clarity here, when we think of those superpower faculties that result in some kind of clairvoyance, we tend to think the images the clairvoyant "sees" ARE the clairvoyance.

I.e., he or she "sees" things that others don't, and by means other's don't have active - hence the clairvoyant angle. We mistake WHAT the clairvoyant sees as the clairvoyance, and fail to notice that the informative processes which permit the seeing are the real clairvoyance.

*

In other words, into-form-making PROCESSES always precede the resulting images.

Thus, if clairvoyance is possible, the IN + FORM clairvoyance-making processes pre-exist what they yield - for what they yield is what the clairvoyant sees. If the processes are not active, then the clairvoyant will not see anything.

If we compare this to perception-making processes, we know that the perceptions are the sum result of whatever they have been processed through. The superpower faculties apparently "work" in the same exact way.

*

It is interesting, and important, to trace the ENGLISH etymologies of INFORM and INFORMATION. The OXFORD DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE summarizes when and under what conditions English nomenclature can be noted as first in use.

*

With regard to INFORM, the OXFORD identifies the primary ancient Latin sense of INFORMARE (to give form to, shape or fashion), but notes: "The primary sense had undergone various developments in ancient and medieval Latin, and in French, before the word appeared in English."

This is a clever way of saying that when INFORM came into English usage it did not mean putting into a form.)

*

This appearance in English seems to have taken place during the 1300s, but seems more than anything else to have referred to "formative principle, or formative character."

*

Used in this sense, the first ENGLISH uses of INFORM were probably drawn from French rather than directly from Latin.

It is certain that the word INFORMATION is drawn from French, not directly from Latin. Its first usage's in English, again during the 1300s, are exactly those of the French:

"The action of informing [specifically as] forming or molding of the mind or character, training, teaching or instructing; communicating of instructive knowledge."

*

In this sense, then, from French into English, INFORMATION referred to mind-shaping, out of which would emerge "character" - such having been a particularly French preoccupation ever since.

*

After this shift in usage-meaning, in English INFORMATION then appears to have separated into two components, both utilizing the same nomenclature term, INFORMATION.

*

The first component remained the same, almost up until the 1930s when it began to be identified as "mind-programming."

*

The second component had to do with providing evidence, either for or against someone, and usually the latter regarding criminal court cases, heresy examinations and trials.

It would appear that "evidence" found acceptable or logical in the light of certain consensus realities was accepted as "information" - while "evidence" found unacceptable was rejected as something else.

*

INFORMATION was still being thought of in exactly this way among the world's intelligence agencies and systems when I chanced to fall into the government-sponsored "Psi-spy" research project at Stanford Research Institute in 1972.

Also, during that same epoch, the then hopeful and exceedingly well-funded realm of "scientific" futurology (now generally defunct) also had adapted to this same concept of information, and was being tortured by it - which is to say, adapted to the concept that information consists only of whatever is found acceptable, or logical within a given consensus reality.

*

"Consensus reality," however, was considered by futurologists to consist of the majority opinion of "informed specialists" and/or their vote. Since majority opinions can be wrong at least as often as right, one does wonder how futurology every got off the ground. However, one doesn't need to wonder why it "failed."

*

During the 1600s, and specifically as the result of certain Renaissance activities, a new concept-context regarding INFORMATION was added into this or that drift of meanings. The earliest noted uses of this meaning occurred about 1649, and we find the gist of this meaning more or less unchanged in WEBSTER'S of 1828, the original edition of the first American dictionary of the English language.

In that dictionary this meaning is given as the FIRST meaning of INFORM. And I quote:

"INFORM, verb transitive: - Properly, to give form or shape to, but in this sense NOT USED. [Emphasis added.]

"1. To animate; to give life to; to activate by vital powers.

"2. To instruct; to tell to; to acquaint; to communicate knowledge to; to make known to by word or writing."

"INFORM, verb intransitive: - To give intelligence, as in: 'He might either teach in the same manner, or inform how he had been taught.' And: "To inform against, to communicate facts by way of accusation."

"INFORMATION:

"1. Intelligence via notice, news or advice communicated by word or writing.

"2. Knowledge derived from reading or instruction.

"3. Knowledge derived from the senses or from the operation of the intellectual faculties.

"4. Communication of facts for the purpose of accusation."

*

As of 1828, then, long gone is the concept of IN + FORMA, as is indicated by WEBSTER'S 1828 itself - and not reactivated until the advent of Information Theory, as will be discussed ahead (save to mention

here that information theory cannot survive without that concept.)

*

In WEBSTER'S 1828, the first definition of INFORM - to animate; to give life to; actuate [i.e., activate] by vital powers - reflects the central hypothesis of VITALISM, which we have already encountered. However, the term VITAL-ISM apparently had not evolved as of 1828, since it is not given in that same dictionary. (The concept of an ism itself seems to have surfaced only in about the 1780s.)

*

However, a brief review of this topic is important - because there are significant links between essential vitalism, information, and activation of the superpower faculties. (An individual essay regarding vitalism will be provided within this series of essays.)

*

You see, IF information (intelligence) is accurate enough, it is broadly accepted that it can activate or vitalize activity, and which would be akin to animating or reanimating them. On the other hand, if information (intelligence) is cluttered with information viruses, one would not normally expect activation. Rather, one would anticipate de-activation, or devitalization - and which, if it could happen, would result in all sorts of de-evolutionary stuff.

*

VITALISM was crushed and beat into non-existence about 1920, at which time the consensus realities of philosophical materialism acquired the contexts of science proper and thenceforth prevailed. And any science based in philosophical materialism simply has to be an IT-MAKING science.

*

Prior to that, philosophical vitalism (technically in existence roughly since about 1533 during the Renaissance) and philosophical materialism (technically in existence since about 1845) had been seen as sister sciences.

The advocates of the two philosophical orientations were soon antagonistic to each other. An enormous conflict, now quite forgotten, ensued, lasted for about eighty years, with the materialists being the ultimate victors. Vitalism was snuffed in academia, and references to it were deleted from consensus reality sources which then prevailed as logical and rational.

*

In spite of all the philosophical imbrolios that are brought forth to explain the victory, the actual reason is quite simple.

By 1920, the material sciences had demonstrated they could produce products of enormous, even fabulous economic value. The vitalism sciences did not produce much of economic meaning. Funding therefore went to the material sciences. End of that story.

*

There were two essential definitions regarding vitalistic principles, to which a number of other concepts were derived. Be sure that I am not digressing or drifting here.

1. That the functions of a living organism are due to a vital principle distinct from physical-chemical forces;

2. That the processes of life are not explicable by the laws of physics and chemistry alone - and that life is in some part self-determining and self-informing.

Please read self-informing as IN + FORM, meaning self-making into form.

*

For conceptual clarity, any use of the term VITAL within vitalism's contexts should immediately be replaced with ANIMATING - at least to discriminate between animate and inanimate conditions.

*

In the end, all of the nomenclature that might be associable to vitalism and/or its two essential concepts was stringently, and with something akin to a vengeance, expunged from modernist consensus reality-making literature. Any even glancing reference to those terms was enough to occasion loss of professional standing, potential funding, and etc.

Thus, cutting-edge scientists have to walk gingerly, and talk around such concepts if and when they chance to encounter any possibility of their real existence.

*

In any event, this brief review of the etymological history of INFORM and INFORMATION indicates that only one concept of them prevails, the concept that information is what one reads and learns from. We can note, too, that two important concepts have more or less fallen into disuse and oblivion: IN + FORMA, and INFORM as it relates to animating principles.

And it is in this consensus reality condition that information theory arose.

Information Theory

So, what IS information theory?

And why might it be of fundamental importance with regard to activating (vitalizing) the superpower faculties?

*

Most sources dealing with information theory are somewhat or completely inaccessible (unintelligible) to those who haven't developed the mental information processing grids or nomenclature to deal with it. However, THE NEW COLUMBIA ENCYCLOPEDIA (1975) has a rather neat rendering, at least as regards the early developmental hypotheses.

*

The theory is indicated as a mathematical one, principally formulated as of 1948 by the American scientist Claude E. Shannon, to explain aspects and problem of information and communication ("communication" later being thought of as information-transfer, especially in the psychoenergetic research of the former USSR.)

*

The entry in the encyclopedia is worth quoting in its entirety, and I'll do this first.

I caution you not to get confused if you don't understand parts or all of it.

After quoting it, I'll lift out the signal, easy to conceptualize, part and clarify it with respect to opening new cognitive channels toward activating the superpowers.

*

I never recommend anything, but sometimes I "suggest." If you have any desire at all to approach an activation of any of the superpowers, I suggest you pay serious attention to the quoted materials below, even to the point of memorizing them (i.e., installing them quite firmly in your memory library.)

*

One preliminary note, though. Shannon et. al. seized upon the term ENTROPY and included it in the discursive part of the theory. This is a term properly belonging to thermodynamics, and has otherwise since been defined in a number of different ways. In information theory it means "noise," and so I'll replace "entropy" with noise, indicating that I did so.

Synopsis of the 1948 Information Theory

"In this theory, the term INFORMATION is used in a special sense; it a measure of the freedom of choice with which a message is selected from the set of all possible messages.

"Information is thus distinct from meaning, since it is entirely possible for a string of nonsense words and a meaningful sentence to be equivalent with respect to information content.

"Numerically, information is measured [via the theory] in BITS (short for binary digit; see Binary System.)

"One bit is equivalent to the choice between two equally likely choices. For example, if we know that a coin is to be tossed but are unable to see it as it falls, a message telling whether the coin came up heads or tails gives us one bit of information.

"When there are several equally likely choices, the number of bits is equal to the logarithm of the number of choices taken to the base two. For example, if a message specifies one of sixteen equally likely choices, it is said to contain four bits of information.

"When the various choices are not equally possible, the situation is more complex.

"Interestingly, the mathematical expression for information content closely resembles the expression for ENTROPY in thermodynamics. The greater the information in a message, the lower its randomness, or 'noisiness,' and hence the smaller its entropy [i.e., the smaller its noise content.]

"Often, because of constraints such as grammar [language, and the way it is expressed], a source does not use its full range of choice. A source that uses just 70% of its freedom of choice would be said to have a relative noise ratio [entropy] of 0.7. The redundancy of such a source is defined as 100% minus the relative entropy, or, in this case, 30% [meaning 30% message-signal adulterated by 70% noise].

"The redundancy of English is about 50%; i.e., about half of the elements used in writing or speaking are freely chosen, and the rest are required by the structure of the language.

"A message proceeds along some channel from the source to the receiver. Information theory defines for any given channel a limiting capacity or rate at which it can carry information, expressed in bits per second.

"In general, it is necessary to process, or encode, information from a source before transmitting it through a given channel.

"For example, a human voice must be encoded before it can be transmitted by radio.

"An important theorem of information theory states that if a source with a given entropy feeds information to a channel with a given capacity, and if the noise in the source is less than the channel capacity, a code exists for which the frequency of errors may be reduced as low as desired.

"If the channel capacity is less than the noise source, no such code exists.

"The theory further shows that noise, or random disturbance of the channel, creates uncertainty as to the correspondence between the received signal and the signal transmitted.

"The average uncertainty in the message when the signal is known is called the equivocation.

"It is shown that the net effect of noise is to reduce the information capacity of the channel. However, redundancy in a message, as distinguished from redundancy in a source, makes it more likely that the message can be reconstituted at the receiver without error.

"For example, if something is already known as a certainty, then all messages about it give no information and are 100% redundant, and the information is thus immune to any disturbances of the

channel.

"Using various mathematical means, Shannon was able to define channel capacity for continuous signals, such a music and speech.

"While the theory is not specific in all respects, it proves the existence of optimum coding schemes without showing how to find them. For example, it succeeds remarkably in outlining the engineering requirements of communication systems and the limitations of such systems." *SEE C. E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, THE MATHEMATICAL THEORY OF COMMUNICATION (1949).*

Formats of (or regarding) Information

When we begin to think of what information IS, most of us probably will think it is what we hear or read in some kind of printed or visual format. We think this because this concept "dwells" in consensus realities as such, and we have cloned it quite nicely. And from any number of aspects that concept is serviceable - as far as it goes.

But. By the time "information" reaches a spoken, printed or visual format, it is an end-product of the processes which have organized and produced it in those formats.

Nonetheless, this end-product can act as a "source" of information and we can more or less duplicate it in our own heads.

*

"Duplicate," of course, means reproduce or copy it into our own heads, the ostensible goal being to understand it. In this sense, then, the information we in-put into our heads has been CONVEYED by the spoken, printed or visual format.

After the in-put, however, the "conveyance" of the information continues getting into our heads by being filtered through the mental information processing grids of the recipient. The grids are extensions of the memory library earlier referred to.

*

In THIS processes, the "information" will ultimately reach steps 8 and 9 of the perceptual processes. Meaning that the "information" that finally comes out as understanding will be the sum of the in-put plus whatever the in-put gets filtered through in the case of each individual.

If matches to the in-put "information content" are found in the memory library, THEN a kind of duplication can take place. The duplication is called "understanding."

*

But if matches are not found, then the information content probably will be routed through the nearest similarity in the memory library. In this case, we are now one-step or more removed from duplication (and removed from "complete understanding.")

If no matches are found, then the recipient of the in-input information content will "draw a blank" - for example, regarding twelve types of snow, camels, telepathy or clairvoyance.

*

In other words, INFORMATION is what we understand, even if only in a partial way. If the in-input does not result in "understanding," then it is NOT information.

Information Transfer

The whole of the above, and its obvious problem areas, is what some information theorists refer to as the information transfer process.

One of the central concepts of information theory is that all information is available all of the time. Some of the theorists mitigate this all-inclusive concept by saying that information sources are everywhere.

Others opine that information can be drawn from everything and anything.

*

In the sense of all of the above, the EXISTENCE of information is not in question. What is problematical, in big-time ways, is the TRANSFER of it into a system wherein it can be duplicated, misduplicated, or blanked out.

In the sense of the human, the prevailing consensus reality concepts usually hold that the "system" being referred to is "the mind" and its mental information processes.

*

"The mind," however, when spoken of this way is applicable as a generality to every human specimen, and which is good enough for a theory.

In matters of actual PERFORMANCE, though, the "individual mind" should be substituted for the all-inclusive generality - because even if information does exist everywhere, it is the individual mind that produces duplication, misduplication, or the blanking out, and which in turn result in understanding, misunderstanding, or nothing at all.

*

Please note that the term PERFORMANCE has been emphasized above because it is entirely relevant toward activating the superpowers, "activating" having to do with performance. And here I foreshadow a topic that will require at least two essays among those several more to come.

Information Signals

Information transfers via speech, print or in visual formats, actually contain two MODES or MODULATIONS of information content.

But to get at this, it must FIRST be comprehended that the words of speech or writing/print the images, charts, etc., of the visual formats are NOT the information content itself, but merely symbols and signs for it.

In this sense, the symbols and signs are the OBJECTIVE "carriers" of the information content - which is to say that they are SIGNALS that will stimulate duplication of the content simply because the receivers associate MEANING to the signals - IF the meanings of the signals are shared in common.

If the meanings are not shared among the recipients, then the signals will be "inaccessible" to all those who do not.

*

And here is one of the most apparent bases for language and its concepto-nomenclature - to establish a shared and sharable basis for the sending and receiving of information content.

This is to say that pre-set meanings are encoded into nomenclature and images, and the consensus reality learning networks transfer the encoded meanings into the memory storage of their citizens so that there can be a mutual basis of information transfer and exchange. An intrasocial collective or group is thus formatted regarding transfer of information within it.

*

The best pre-set words or images to effect this information transfer unity are those that have precise meanings encoded into them, since the meaning-information-content can be "recognized" most easily.

*

Any increasing permutations of meanings regarding a given information transfer signal tend to decrease the cohesion of the unity within the collective, and tend to permit distortions of meaning within individuals.

*

One would therefore think that precise and exact meanings for signals would be stringently established by social consensus necessity. And indeed this IS the case where an absolute need to do so is apparent, the "need" being intimately related to performance, and especially where it is found to be dangerous not to be precise.

For example, no one becomes an electrician based only on the general consensus reality that electricity lights up bulbs and turns the toaster on.

A suitable and precise nomenclature has to be evolved and become shared among potential electricians -

or else they can get fried all too easily. Airline pilots can not become one simply because airplanes fly. Arctic people cannot deal with snow simply if it is snow, and Arab Bedouins will be out-maneuvered in the economics of the camel market if they think a camel is a camel.

*

However, within any given social unity where there is no perceived absolute need to INCREASE nomenclature, that kind of effort is not usually undertaken - because the average citizen within the unity, and with regard to average performance within it, can function quite well via a lesser rather than an increase in signal-carrying nomenclature.

And, to begin with, the so-called average citizen probably won't ever "acquire" a nomenclature in terms of quantity that extends beyond his or her recognized need to do so, or beyond what it takes to fit into the consensus reality they desire to fit into (or, sometimes, are trapped within.)

*

So the average citizen within any given consensus reality had no explicit or necessary need to add more specific nomenclature; but there is also a need not to have too little, either.

The way this is apparently resolved is to establish a number of IT-IDENTIFIERS that do not require much further break-apart into it-TYPES, into increasing refinement of comprehensions of types of something, and which would require the increase of nomenclature.

In this way, then, people who do not need to use different types of snow for survival can be content with snow as something that falls in winter and needs to be shoveled when it interferes with traffic or might crush the roof in. So, among such people, SNOW is snow. It is a perfectly good information signal, and the need for any increasingly refined differentiation beyond that probably has to do only with amounts of it.

*

So, among such people "SNOW" is a "clean" and "clear" signal regarding information transfer, whereas among the Arctic peoples barely fifty years ago it would have been as "noisy" as Times Square at New Year's Eve.

In much the same way, people who don't realize that different types of clairvoyance exist will not have any need to identify them - meaning that the single use of this one nomenclature signal is perceived by them to be sufficient.

But not to anyone who wants to learn how to be clairvoyant. The best instructors of clairvoyance I am familiar with have to begin, as they do, by breaking the single concept apart, at least into "aspects" of clairvoyance.

*

So, here we now approach the concept of "clear" and "noisy" signals, this concept revolving around

whether or not the carrier (word or image) of a signal is a precise, thus a clean one, or whether it induces noise into the signal load.

*

And it is at this point that the essential problems of information transfer integrate with the basic information theory offered up by Shannon in 1948, the basic problem regarding information transfer OF ANY KIND having to do with the ratio between "signal" and "noise."
Please note that in preparation for this series of essays, an [earlier essay](#) dealing exclusively with the SIGNAL-TO-NOISE RATIO has been available in this database for several months. [That essay](#) can now be appended to **this** series' essays as [Part 4A](#).

Information Noise

As stipulated within information theory by Shannon, a message (information content) proceeds along some channel from the source to the receiver.
In line with our interests, information is in-put via some kind of "channel" to the receiver, who then out-put it in terms of information encoded into concept-nomenclature for further information transfer.
But the in-put itself is an information transfer from "a source" wherever or whatever it might consist of.

*

We are thus dealing with TWO information transfers:
(a) the in-put transfer, and
(b) the out-put transfer.

Between (a) and (b), however, is "a channel," and after (b) is concluded another "channel" is necessary to further accomplish an information transfer.

*

So we can think in terms of the in-put channel and the out-put channel, the in-put channel having to do with reception of the information, the out-put one having to do with what we call "communication."

*

In the human sense of all of this, the out-put transfer (the "communicating") must first be encoded into concepto-nomenclature that can be transferred to others simply because their mental information processing equipment is already encoded to receive and duplicate it.
All of this seems clear enough, doesn't it.

*

However, there is one serious glitch. You see, the in-put transfer ALSO has to be processed INTO the same mental information processing equipment in order that it CAN be "received."

*

If that mental information processing equipment (which now has to do DOUBLE duty regarding in-put AND out-put) is not pre-formatted with some exactness regarding both quantity and quality of the in-put, then the "channel capacity" will be LESS than it needs to transfer the full information load into the receiver system.

If this is the case, then the out-put transfer will be only a partial one, or perhaps hardly anything at all. If it would be the case that the in-put and out-put channel cannot MATCH any of the signal, then the signal will disappear into the blanked out thing.

*

In basic information theory, anything that hampers, distorts, confuses, obliterates the signal is referred to as "noise."

In this sense, if the noise "in" the channel is less than the signal, then a code exists (or can be established) for which the frequency of errors (noise) may be reduced as low as desired.

If the "noise" in the channel is greater than the signal, then the signal may not be identified; it can still exist in the channel, although so embedded in the noise that it cannot register, be picked up, or identified.

*

In the sense we are interested, the human sense, it turns out that human mental information processes ending up in "perception" can produce not only signal-laden but noise-laden conceptualizations and mental image pictures with hardly any way to discriminate which is which.

Where Does Information Processing Noise Come From?

In answer to this question, the daring among us will assume that the noise originates in our own heads - and which is usually the case.

But a deeper inspection of noise sources reveals that what's in our heads and which contributes to the noise may not be innately present to begin with.

*

A better part of the noise sources in our mental information processes is ACQUIRED - usually by the enculturization processes that make us fit in our given consensus realities.

This understanding is rather broadly accepted in some echelons of human inquiry, especially if the consensus reality social processes drift into mind-programming rather than overall efficient education.

*

But there is another far more powerful, but far more LESS obvious, noise source, and it is one we all adapt to in order to learn to communicate.

Language itself.

*

As Shannon pointed up in his information theory (and much to the shock of many at the time) that one is "constrained" to utilize language - and with language comes the concepto-nomenclature that becomes lodged, by necessity, into our memory library.

I'll paraphrase how Shannon put it.

*

Regarding English, some fifty per cent of the concept-nomenclature we lean upon is required by the structure [and familiar usage] of the language. The other 50 per cent is open to free choice of concepts and nomenclature.

Shannon's implication was that if the language-determined part was inhabited with noise-making redundancies, then any adaptation to the language would induce these into mental information processes of ALL those who utilized it.

So, you see, we are not at each individual level "guilty" of faulty information processing - at least 50 per cent of the time.

*

But whatever their source, even the 50 per cent presence of noise-making viruses can easily decrease or prevent performance ever activating.

*

As it turns out, although noise-making redundancies can be identified in every area of human endeavor, some are more prone to a larger percentage than others, especially those that have become adapted to ambiguity. Dare I mention politics and over-bloated administrations? Or the present conditions of the "fine" arts? Or the parameters of "love," "hate," "sex?" Of course, I'll not mention the realms of "psychic phenomena" - since everyone knows what they are.

*

In any event, it might be said that where over-simplification and ambiguity prevail, so too do noise-making redundancies - all of which bury the signal within the noise, no matter how fashionable is the noise.

It's somewhat worth mentioning, generally speaking anyway, an area of human endeavor thickly populated with noise-making redundancies tends to be "volcanic" in nature. Such areas can exist peacefully within their own parameters, stabilized by their own consensus realities. But if intruded upon, or if THEY intrude upon, things begin to heat up.

*

The topics of information and information transfers will be picked up again in additional essays. It is now desirable to devote Part 5 to a correlation of what has been discussed in Parts 1 - 4. In Part 6, we'll discuss not only the noise-making redundancies embedded and perpetuated within ambiguities, but their utterly destructive viral effect on clean, clear "signals." Ambiguous concepts induce structure-lessness, hence they wreck any signal-awareness of STRUCTURE, and without knowledge of the structure of anything very little else can ever be known about it. As we shall see in subsequent essays, STRUCTURE is the IN + FORM, or the format, of something - and as such is what needs to be worked with or within, not against.

*

In any event, any real attempt to activate any of the superpowers must encompass the reality that signal-to-noise ratios are intimately involved. Thus, the presence in any system of disinformation or misinformation can act as if it is infected with viruses.

(End of Part 4).

TEACHING AND LEARNING REGARDING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (15Aug97)

INTRODUCTORY

This essay is the first of a series in which the various topics of teaching, training and learning will be discussed regarding their relationship to various identifiable elements of the superpowers.

*

In getting into these topics, it must frankly be stated up front that new ideas and concepts will need to be introduced -- these new concepts, of course, being presented for whatever they may be worth as knowledge develops in the future.

About the only thing that can more or less be said for sure is that past concepts have not been sufficient regarding either identifying the nature of the superpowers, or sufficient as enabling ways and means for teaching and learning.

*

However, in approaching the new, the old must be examined in a preliminary way and as informative background -- if only to help illustrate why the new should be searched for and incorporated.

At this point, I have been intimately involved in these matters for nearly three decades -- and throughout this time experience has shown that comprehension regarding the superpowers is benefited by larger rather than lesser amounts of background knowledge and information.

Experience has also shown that people like to get quickly to the racetrack and get on with the race. However, if one can't find the racetrack . . . or the racetrack found is the wrong one, one in which illusory rather than real races are run . . . or the racetrack is merely a facade in a Hollywood lot with nothing behind it except imagination . . . well?

*

For example, the superpowers have been thought of as "powers of mind." However, the powers of mind models (or facades) have produced no significant increase in the population of achieved "psychics." If, then, I were to say (as I will at some point ahead) that some full part of the superpowers constitute

problems not of mind but of aesthetics, then no one would even begin to comprehend what is meant in the absence of any background orientation to help point the way.

*

From the outset here, the essential definition of the superpowers within the scope of this database should constantly be carried in mind -- largely because that definition is germane as to why, in the past, fruitful approaches to teaching-learning of the superpowers have been so difficult to discover.

*

As used in this database, the term SUPERPOWERS refers to those processes or functions of the human biomind systems that transcend the "normal laws" of time and space, and matter and energy. This definition has been expanded upon in other essays already installed in this database.

*

To help bring some advance clarity, anyone who has investigated teaching and learning probably realizes that the processes involved are easiest if whatever is being taught and learned focuses on something tangible and identifiable. In such a case, teacher and learner can literally look at whatever is involved. Thus, agreements can be reached, and information accepted and understood about the tangible.

*

At a slightly more complicated level, teaching and learning can take place regarding ideas. But if ideas don't necessarily or somehow refer back to tangibles, then difficulties can arise. There is also a distinction between ideas that are required to end up DOING something, and ideas that are not required to do anything except be talked about. There is also a distinction between ideas that are correct, or at least applicable, and ideas that are not correct and are applicable only to those who think they are correct.

*

In any event, it is possible to say that anything that can be included in the realm of matter, energy, space and time is also thought of as tangible, at least more or less. Thus, methodological teaching-learning approaches are facilitated because the tangible is at least thought of being THERE.

*

By comparison, the superpowers wheel and deal in the intangible -- or at least in what is considered within the present realms of knowledge as transcending the tangible.

*

Now, the usual approach to teaching-learning the intangible is to seize upon the methods utilized in teaching-learning the tangible -- because the latter are familiar in the historic sense.

In other words, it is tangibly possible to teach a learner how to bake a tangible cake and have some expectation of succeeding. All one really needs is a list of the elements and procedures regarding backing the cake, and the formulation of a procedural recipe regarding what to do and how to combine the elements.

*

There have been very many attempts to teach and increase superpower functioning by teaching via methods best fitted to teaching and learning how to deal with the tangible.

However, human societies (at least in their modern forms) are. But human society is not yet overloaded with powerful superpsychics. Indeed, many stipulate that the superpowers CANNOT be taught, especially among materialists and parapsychologists who have had no luck at all along these lines. However, in other quarters expectations remain high in some quarters even so.

This factoid more or less indicates that the mere superimposition of teaching-learning methods appropriate to the tangible don't really work as advertised and hoped when it comes to the intangible. And so it might rationally be supposed that the superpowers have to be approached quite differently than cake-making-via-recipe processes and procedures.

*

There are two implications here, the first being that the "normal laws" of time, space, energy and matter (all being relevant to the tangible formats of these) cannot be used with any great efficiency to define what the superpowers consist of.

Second, it is true that various social groupings have established nomenclature bytes to specify some of the phenomena that result or down-load from the superpowers.

*

For example, PRECOGNITION refers to "seeing the future," and which implies at least transcending time and matter. MATTER is tangible, and TIME is derivable only via some movable or motional aspects of tangible matter.

Thus (and please consider with some attention what now follows), when classes are set up to teach precognition, what it usually taught are concepts regarding how to transcend matter and time, these being tangible -- and then the major concept focuses only on visualizing doing the transcending of those two tangible components.

Various statistical studies of such teaching-learning (IF they are undertaken) show very little in the way of increasing future-seeing. This failure easily leads to the concept that precognition cannot be taught. It is worth noting in this regard that some statistical studies along these lines have been undertaken in

parapsychology. But a far greater number of them have been undertaken in that now somewhat defunct discipline called FUTUROLOGY -- because at a certain point futurologists were exceedingly interested in whether the "psychic component" could be added into making futurology more effective. In any event, if we refer back to the concept of PRECOGNITION, it can become apparent that the active term is COGNITION -- and so someone might chance upon the idea that teaching how to increase the scope of cognition per se might be worthwhile.

After all, it is understood of COGNITION that people can suffer cognitions only with regard to their "cognitive capacities." These capacities are understood as being bounded within the LIMITS of an individual's knowledge, understanding, or familiarity -- with the exception of DREAMS which frequently exceed the one's cognitive capacities.

*

Meanwhile, the existence of the nomenclature bytes (such as "precognition") makes it SEEM that the superpowers and their down-loaded phenomena are on a par with the normal laws. Even so, having a word for something doesn't automatically mean that we understand important details of whatever it is the word refers to.

For example, many are willing to try to have precognitions. But very few have any real idea of what a COGNITION consists of, or how one of them comes about, or even why they do.

The direct implication here is that few can manage or expand their cognitive basis because of an absence of information or knowledge about that basis. Thus, the statistical rate of successful taught-learned precogniting remains very low overall.

In case a reader might be wondering by now, this is not a matter merely of semantic difficulties.

*

Briefly alluding to other possible examples, we have the terms "telepathy," "out-of-body" and "remote viewing." The first refers to the so-called mind-to-mind thing, the latter to the so-called seeing-at-a-distance thing.

So people think they understand what is being talked about when the terms are used in that the two "minds" have a certain tangibility, and of course distance is a tangible thing. And so some are likely to set up teaching courses regarding how to achieve mind-to-mind contact, how to "get out of your body" (this also a tangible thing), and how to see at a distance.

*

As it is, the terms we utilize are sort of like an old fire arm whose buckshot when fired spreads across a distance in the hope that a piece of the shot would hit something. If this is judged against the notable lack of taught-learned courses, our terms don't seem to hit very much of anything even when fired close up.

*

The second immediate factor to mention is that although we believe we understand what teaching, training and learning mean, very few know anything at all regarding the important fundamental and detailed processes involved. Most know only that teaching and training are supposed to result in learning.

And so if someone says they can teach something, many people sign up, pay the fees, and sally forth under the wide-spread assumption they will learn whatever is being offered as teaching.

*

The expectation behind the assumption exists in the fact that teaching-learning system works best regarding simplistic, non-complex, and easily understood matters -- and which matters can be confirmed within the contexts of tangible physicality. In this simplistic sense, there appears to be a one-to-one relationship between teaching and learning.

*

This direct relationship, however, begins to falter to the degree that information being taught become less simple and more complex. If the degree of complexity increases, one will soon encounter understanding (i.e., "cognitive") levels that are not on par with, or not parallel to what is being taught. When this happens, teaching might still proceed with gusto, but problems regarding learning might be encountered.

*

Eventually, the relationship between teaching-learning becomes ambiguous -- especially when (1) what is being taught and learned DOES NOT result in the activities promised by the teaching; and (2) when confirming evidence cannot be located anywhere regarding what has been learned.

This implies that although just about anything and everything can be proposed as teachable, LEARNING can be confirmed only by outcomes that significantly reduce ambiguities as to whether ANYTHING has been LEARNED via attempts to teach learning. Of course, one might exempt here the teaching and learning of useless things -- and which can include, as we will see ahead, the teaching and learning of ignorance.

TWO IMPORTANT DISTINCTIONS

I am of the opinion that most people already comprehend that the two distinctions I'm about to outline do exist -- but which they can observe others somehow managing to avoid for various reasons.

*

First, on average, the teaching-learning procedures in most societies (especially those of the Western world) seem successful enough. So there arises the assumption that there is a direct relationship between teaching-learning -- and that this relationship holds true in general AND for everything.

*

In actuality, however, there are (1) many different formats of "learning;" and, (2) individuals can be identically taught the same thing, but end up learning it in far different ways, and learning it on a ratio of "not very well" to "exceedingly well."

*

A partial explanation for (2) above is that all humans are not identical in all ways. Rather, they are independent systems which may be similar in many ways, but can be alien to each other in other kinds of ways. And so ahead the more exact nature of these "independent systems" will need to be commented upon in these present essays.

*

In the sense of (2) above, however, the direct relationship of teaching-learning would work best, and also be more obvious, regarding areas in which all humans are most similar -- and are more identical even though they are independent sensing and experiencing systems.

The direct relationship would become less steady, less predictable, regarding areas in which the independent systems ARE different, even though on the simplistic surface they might be recognized as similar.

*

For example, systems of human biobodies are "similar," roughly speaking, anyway.

But each individual system does have differences, as, for example, regarding their mental information processing grids.

Since this latter aspect is beyond argument, it becomes possible to comprehend that all humans probably will not process taught information in the same, or perhaps even similar, ways.

*

With regard to (1) above, it can be seen that the direct relationship of teaching-to-learning is most efficient only where tangible factors are involved -- and in which the necessity of deduction and/or inducing are not all that paramount.

*

In cases where only tangible factors are involved, teaching can become precise enough so as to enable formulas or exact procedures to be learned and followed -- with the result that more or less identical learning DOES occur, and which in turn DOES enable the production of more or less identical activity being derived from this kind of learning.

Thus, there is what can be referred to as the direct relationship of teaching to learning. It is very widespread, and might also be referred to as Model A of Teaching-Learning.

*

This is also the model most seek to superimpose on any prospective teaching-learning procedure -- and which model is easy and simple because it does not involve much in the way of the deduction-induction processes.

*

However, in those teaching-learning efforts that require the functioning of deduction and induction, we can easily say that there is NO direct relationship between teaching and learning -- because intervening in the relationship IS the need for those two twins (deducing and inducing) that are famously and notoriously indirect in the first place.

Thus, THIS kind of thing can be referred to as Model B of Teaching-Learning.

*

For clarity.

MODEL A can more dependably be seen as:

Teaching -> Learning -> that Stands a Good

Chance of Activity => Ability or Product Commensurate With

What Has Been Taught.

MODEL B can be roughly seen as:

Teaching(?) <-> Learning(?) -> that

May or May Not arouse Activity => Ability(?) or Product(?)

Commensurate With(?) What May or May Not

Have Been Taught or Learned.

Please note that the two formulas above are general, possibly inept, and for the following reason. While it is true that TEACHING can be rather straightforward, LEARNING is not and never is. Various elements to be TAUGHT can be organized. But LEARNING is a more complex endeavor -- in that, for one thing, learning can be seen to have occurred only by testing. The two Models above are given ONLY to help illustrate that within different circumstances there are differences in the relationship of teaching to learning. Indeed, there may be dozens of teaching-learning models.

TEACHING-LEARNING "DYNAMICS"

Moving briskly on, now, LEARNING in general is seen and generally accepted as the dynamic product of TEACHING, and this is seen as a FACTUAL relationship -- even though the factual relationship might be based in experiencing, and which then becomes the "teacher."

*

In any event, the general surmise of TEACHING is that information can be organized in ways that lead from basics to increasing detail and complexity, and that if this is done expertly enough, then LEARNING will result in students who subject themselves to those "organized ways."

*

In this sense, teaching is seen as the active measure while learning is seen as the passive something or other into which the active measure is to be duplicated or copied. Thus, one can find a rather largish literature having to do with the dynamics or ways of TEACHING (as will be illustrated in the next essay in this series.) However, although information about the dynamics of learning does exist, the nature of learning dynamics seems to be in its infancy.

*

In any event, the general process of teaching is generally seen as consisting of organizing and transferring information to the learner(s). This sounds simple enough -- and in some cases actually is. The general process of learning is generally seen as in-taking or absorbing the information that is transferred via the teaching. This, too, sounds simple enough. But whether it is or not seems completely to depend on a number of associated factors, the existence of which those who design the teaching of

information transfers cannot altogether predict.

However, this slight difficulty is usually gotten around in that a sufficient minority do learn enough to keep societies working -- at least for a time.

*

But indeed, although information can elegantly be organized in ways that can be assumed to effect the ease and speed of the transfer, it is highly doubtful that the information is in-taken in the SAME organized way, or in-taken in any organized way at all. The broad significance of this will, of course, be discussed throughout these essays.

A STABLE AND NON-STABLE BASIS REGARDING LEARNING PROCESSES

As already mentioned, the general surmise of the teaching-learning relationship is that the learner can duplicate the information being transferred -- and IF the information is transferred and duplicated by the learner, then he or she or it (as in the case of dogs and horses, but not often in the case of cats) will demonstrate phenomena appropriate to what has been taught.

*

This general surmise is somewhat workable if (again) tangible things and matters are the issue -- since both teacher and learner can refer to those matters or things as a STABLE BASIS for what is being taught and learned.

So, we can posit, for hypothetical illustration purposes, the following formula:

TANGIBLE STUFF =

TEACH <-> STABLE BASIS <-> LEARN

In this sense, then, there can be a mutual assurance between teacher and learner that they are dealing with the same stuff -- because it is tangible. The above formula, of course, refers best back to Model A of teaching-learning.

*

However, a contrasting formula also exists as:

INTANGIBLE STUFF =

NON-STABLE BASIS

or

TEACH <-> INVISIBLE BASIS <-> LEARN

THIS contrasting formula can sometimes (but not always) refer best back to Model B of teaching-learning. In any event, those who are perceptive can sense that there is a great gulf or abyss between the information-organizing processes of these two formulas. But I get ahead of myself here.

*

As it is, if a STABLE BASIS is not identifiable in tangible or concrete terms, then the teaching surmise that serves so well for Model A is not entirely, if at all, applicable to the teaching-learning situations characterized by Model B (and its plethora of variants).

THE SUPERPOWER FACULTIES OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

By definition, the superpower faculties involve phenomena that transcend the known laws of the tangible, and do so both as cause and effect, as source and result -- although the RESULTS of superpower phenomena can impact within the tangible.

And so a rather simple but obvious conclusion has to result: that teaching-learning ANYTHING regarding the superpowers does not have much of a tangible, stable basis that both teacher and learner can refer to and rely on as REALITY CHECKS regarding any mutually assurable certainty.

*

It is for this reason that some say, even some parapsychologists, that the superpowers CANNOT be taught -- in that "there is nothing to teach." This skeptical attitude is especially the case if IDEAS of WHAT to teach are erroneous and/or non-existent.

And, in a simplistic, superficial sense, this skepticism may seem true enough -- at least in the minds of those who assume that the intangible is "nothing," or that the non-tangible is something one cannot get hold of.

*

But the meaning here is a somewhat respectable one -- in that it IS generally true that IF a STABLE BASIS of some, or any, kind tends to be absent regarding any teaching, learning, tutoring (or even any

self-learning of the superpower faculties), THEN learning regarding the faculties is open to any number of opinions or beliefs.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

On the surface of these issues, there can be little doubt that teachers and learners are of equal importance. But just beneath the surface the teaching-learning relationship begins to exhibit strategic differences.

*

Although I cannot say it is the first difference, it is normally conceived that teachers are somewhat more important than the learners -- one simple phenomenology of this being that teachers sometimes posture as having more importance. However, if learners did not exist, then there would be no reason for the teachers to exist. But I'll leave it to each reader to sort this out.

*

A second strategic difference might be that while teachers usually have learned how to organize information in preparation for its transfer to learners, the learners usually have no idea of how information, per se, is organized in themselves. The assumption, then, among both teachers and learners is that the learner will receive the information in the way the teachers have organized it, and that therefore the learners will organize it in themselves in the same way. If something along these lines DOES ensue, then both the learners and teachers will be gratified, especially the teachers.

*

However, IF this assumption is transliterated into a more exact representation of its meaning, it means that the learners ARE SUPPOSED to receive the information in the exact formats it is transferred to them. At the very least, if the reception of the information is not all that exact, there is NOT supposed to be a wide latitude of variation or distortion within those having learned. However, whether this happens over all is somewhat speculative, while most certainly there is a ratio involved ranging from little failure to a lot of success -- or a ratio of from a little success to a lot of failure. As it is, though, somewhat more success can be predicted regarding Model A (discussed above) when deployed with respect to tangible, stable bases stuff.

*

Somewhere in all of these matters of relative importances between teaching and learning is the irksome detail regarding how many do learn how much -- and of WHAT they learn if they do. Perhaps some quantitative studies do exist along these lines, but I've not been able to locate them.

On the surface of things, though, it would seem that some few learn a lot while a larger majority learn little, or certainly not enough. But much beyond this observation, the per capita distribution of learners with regard to what they have learned or not learned seems up in the air -- and of little real social or scientific, philosophic or religious interest.

*

In seeking relative similarities and dissimilarities between teachers and learners, it turns out that they have one thing in common.

On average, most teachers have no idea of the mental information processes they have undergone in order to learn what they have, and to organize information so as to transfer it to learners.

*

Likewise, most learners have no idea of the mental information processes they have undergone in order to learn what they have, and especially have no idea at all how to organize their INFORMATION-RECEPTIVE qualities in order to expedite their learning.

*

In this sense, then, although I'll not insist on it, it would seem that whatever does transpire in the way of teaching and learning does so on a rather fortuitous, chancy basis.

Only one thing seems to have a higher ratio of certainty and/or predictability:

Many strive to teach -- and don't necessarily succeed.

Many strive to learn -- and don't necessarily succeed.

*

Failure along these lines is usually interpreted as embarrassing (although I don't really understand why this should be seen as such.) So, somewhat like some aspiring or ostensible psychics, some teachers and learners tend to emphasize their few successes -- while avoiding discussing their failures.

*

If asked to consider various teaching-learning issues -- for example, if either teaching or learning have the greater importance -- most might point up that teaching is the active measure, so it might be considered the most important.

Although I've been able to point out certain factors and factoids in this essay, I don't really know if teaching or learning is more important. But I do know that teachers and learners focus on what is being taught and learned, and that most of them know nothing of the fundamental LEARNING PROCESSES involved.

*

On the one hand, TEACHING PROCESSES are all well and good, of course, and needed. But if LEARNING PROCESSES didn't exist also, then ostensible teachers would have no one to teach anything at all.

So, TEACHERS are somewhat lucky that specimens of our species are freshly born in increasing abundance and all of which need to be taught something or others.

Encountering Disorder and Complicating Factors Without Recognizing Them As Such

Ingo Swann (15Oct97)

At some level of their awareness, almost everyone who knows anything at all about the superpowers realizes that knowledge about them is surrounded by factors that seem to complicate almost every issue that might pertain to them.

One can, of course, read and study a great deal about the superpowers, about their psychic, parapsychological and intuitional correlates -- and do so without necessarily having to delve into the nature and disorder of the complicating factors.

*

However, important distinctions can be drawn between merely reading up on something versus the processes necessary with regard to activating latent powers. It is quite well understood that the reading up on something might not also really activate a latent power -- if only because reading is an activity of the left side of the brain.

*

But even in the reading one might encounter disorder and complicating factors without recognizing them as such -- in which case the complicating factors might be viruses having entered into mental information processes.

Additionally, our species long ago discovered many USES for disorder and cleverly disguised complicating factors. Thus, there is a rather long tradition of installing disorder among or around this or that for purposes best known to those who expect to benefit from the disorder.

*

In our twentieth century time, misinformation might merely consist of innocent factual errors.

But disinformation is defined as deliberately installing misinformation in the guise of factual correctness, and doing so for an envisioned purpose.

However, both information and disinformation result in some kind of disorder.

*

If it might be supposed that cognitive activating of one or other of the superpower sets of faculties might require some kind of systemic functioning relatively free of misinformation, disinformation and disorder, then the nature and dynamics of that trio really ought to achieve the status of worthwhile interest and inspection.

*

One of the beginning points of take-off in this regard has to do with the differences between two easily recognized situations that have been established as historically existing in all fields of human endeavor.

1. The traditional armchair approach to learning, theorizing, and accumulating "knowledge,"
- and
2. Working in the real and actual field of what has been learned in the more or less intellectualized security of the armchair.

*

This, then, is to point up that important distinctions do exist between the armchair approach and entering into the realities of whatever is involved.

*

In the above context, it might be mentioned, for example, that no matter how much one learns via the armchair route, the sum of it is almost certainly to be found as reductive, and smaller, than Life itself.

In this sense, it can be said that Life is a composite of all possible things, known and unknown, recognized and unrecognized.

Armchair approaches, even the most elegant and comprehensive of them, select among all possible things and study them as separate factors among the composite of all possible things.

Thus, just about anything can be honed to gem-like quality within the scope of armchair thinking. But when the gem-like quality is replaced into the environment of all possible things, it can encounter and undergo what, blithely put, are "challenging" factors --

sometimes also known as "reality checks."

*

A major deficit in armchair approaches is that they tend to draw to themselves only what is thought to fit, and either reject what does not fit, or remain altogether unaware of it. But by far and large this is typical of human behavior overall, in that people prefer not to deal with anything indicative of possible or probable discomfort. Many analysts have dubbed this the head-in-the-sand phenomenon.

*

One of the great, but usually unrecognized, mysteries of the superpowers is WHY they are perpetually surrounded by trouble within the larger picture they represent and are part of. In this context, for example, both psychical research and parapsychology have TWO histories.

*

The first history has to do with the efforts at research and what has been discovered thereby. This history is fascinating to those interested in it, and several competent books have emerged detailing it.

It goes almost without saying it that it is via this first history that those interested seek to learn what they can -- not only with regard to what has been discovered, but with expectations that what has been discovered may enable an increase of functioning of their own superpower faculties.

*

The second history is comprised of what has been termed, somewhat superficially, as the "Resistance to Psi." Although the existence of the "resistance" is occasionally noted, any extensive and detailed history of it is functionally absent.

Thus, anyone perchancing to have an interest in the nature, reasons and dynamics of this second history cannot find a concise source that details it.

*

The second history, however, and in the long run, is as important, if not more so, than the first history.

The second history is the story and tale of how and why the first history has been assailed, deterred, and derailed within our present civilization's sociological formats -- resulting in a rather confusing sociological cocoon of disorder that seems to be self-perpetuating.

*

Thus, if anyone should perchance to activate some of their superpower faculties, in the end they can assuredly depend not only on functioning among the possible benefits of the activating, but are going to have to deal with the ongoing, dynamic sociological elements characteristic of the second history.

If, then, one does not have an advance and comprehensive grasp on the nature and dynamics which comprise the assailing second history, then like the armchair traveler venturing into all the possibilities of Life, one might predictably find oneself "challenged" by unrecognized, unsuspected and unknown pitfalls.

*

The central function of this Section 5, then, is to provide a larger overview of what, loosely speaking, comprises the assailing second history.

Some of the factors and elements to be pointed up are obvious, depending how perceptive and experienced one is. But others are not so obvious, and some of them are surprising.

The Superpowers and Their Relationship to Earthside Power Structures

In now reading what follows under the heading just above, this writer can only say that the context is NOT a matter of his fanciful speculating, or of unfounded conspiratorial imagining.

He has in fact been TOLD the context by a number of individuals highly placed with Agencies On High -- and whom thus presumably knew what they were talking about. But as with all the contents of this database, each visitor to this website is invited to consider this context only in the light of what it might suggest.

*

It is well known that organized research since 1882 regarding psychical phenomena and parapsychological experimenting rather consistently has met with organized resistance and skeptical ridicule.

It is also understood that the organizers of the resistance and ridicule have presented supportive reasons and justifications that seem logical and reasonable.

But there is more to this overall situation than the mere mix of Psi research and discovery versus mere resistance and ridicule. This is to say that there is a principal reason why the controversial mix exists in the first place.

This principal reason is easily understandable -- once it is delineated and given cognitive

substance.

*

My own interests in the Psi phenomena began very early. As this interest expanded, within my pursuit of reading it was possible to discover the existence of various resistive attitudes toward Psi.

Like most, I assumed these resistive attitudes were formulated at the individual level by those who merely felt that Psi did not fit into their philosophical or scientific realities.

*

As many writers had pointed up (both in the pro and anti Psi camps), the chief factor here was that the so-called non-material aspects of Psi could not be made to fit with the philosophical and scientific contexts of Materialism.

I felt that this "conflict" was self-evident -- even understandable. But I, as well as most Psi researchers, felt that if parapsychology continued accumulating facts via confirmed experimentation and discovery, then the facts would automatically shift the picture more in favor of Psi.

*

It was quite easy to accept this explanation in an unquestioning way, since THIS was what the explanation was said to consist of in many sensible statements and publications. And, I think, this is still the major prevailing explanation today.

*

But even so, a slightly noticeable mystery remained.

Even when researchers and parapsychologists did present good evidence incorporated by scientific procedures otherwise accepted in all echelons of science and philosophy, the good parapsychology evidence was NOT accepted anyway.

In fact, it was derailed AS scientific evidence -- usually by means that equated, by any consideration, to rather dirty counterpropaganda tactics.

*

The whole of this equated to unfair treatment. So when by fortuitous chance I had opportunities (beginning in 1971) to function as a Psi test subject, I was doubly enthusiastic about the Work.

I was soon to discover, however, the Work consisted of two situations.

The first situation consisted of the lab work and experiments with many leading

parapsychologists of the time, and most of which went reasonably well.

The second part, however, consisted of how the Work was responded to in the larger domains of Life, specifically with emphasis on all possible domains of human activity -- otherwise known as the "open field" of all sociological human activity.

*

This shift of venue, so to speak, from parapsychology-cum-science into the "problem" of general sociological activity tweaked my original interest in the latter.

After preliminary excursions into this "problem," it could be shown that the Resistance emanated, for the most part, from those sociological entities we refer to as mainstream ones -- especially including the hard and soft sciences, the major media, and the manufacturers of text books, encyclopedias and dictionaries.

*

Whereas the so-called "average" citizen was prepared to consider the existence of Psi (as later polls confirmed), the mainstreams were not. In fact, it could be shown that the mainstreams seemed to work overtime to prevent easy access to real and solid Psi evidence.

And if not that, misinformation and disinformation tactics were utilized to make the real evidence appear either as questionable, ambiguous, or threatening to the sanity and welfare of the species.

*

The nature and tactics of this resistance ranged from fatuous and silly to ugly and tragic -- the whole of which led to a most astonishing result.

Via this resistance, mainstream propaganda and spin doctors actually derailed discovery of the sensitivity mechanisms of our species that can account for psychical and parapsychological phenomena.

And this achieved, so it was said, to protect Science from so-called pseudoscience.

*

At this point, it should be mentioned that where the existence and use of TACTICS can be identified, it is logical to suspect the existence of a centralizing STRATAGEM on whose behalf the tactics are deployed.

*

Most dictionaries define STRATAGEM as "an artifice or trick in war for deceiving and

outwitting the enemy." Of course, stratagems are also characteristic of business, competition, politics, and etc., the whole of which can also be referred to as needed or necessary strategy and so forth.

*

In the sense of the resistance to Psi, the tactics could be identified (if only by astute observers), but the locus of the centralizing stratagem remained illusive. Thus, an additional mystery made its appearance. It can be summarized via the following: Since the early, basic, principal, and broadly announced goal of SCIENCE was to investigate and study ALL PHENOMENA, the scientific exclusion of Psi Phenomena actually constitutes a defacement by mainstream scientists, or their minions, of the principal purpose of mainstream science itself.

*

However, this larger overview was not (and still is not) grokked by many, because since 1882 any number of pseudo-logical and pseudo-rational explanations have been put forth -- and accepted as reasonable by the most influential powerholders of the mainstream populations.

*

As but one pseudo-logical example, mainstream science has rejected all connection to Psi research on the grounds, believe it or not, that Psi phenomena are unscientific to begin with -- and thus not a proper topic for science.

*

This paltry excuse has been accepted as rational and logical not only within science proper, but within academe, and by the major media -- WHEN, in fact, EVERYTHING is found in an "unscientific" condition before the mighty organizing powers of science make scientific order of them.

*

By late 1972, I had gotten this far with my "investigations." And at that point I still believed that the fundamental "explanation" had to do only with scientific and philosophical difficulties. I still felt that these difficulties would be cured or ameliorated in the future as discoveries about Psi continued to accumulate.

*

However, and as time would soon tell, I had completely failed to incorporate into my investigations one significant strategic context.

And if certain important analysts at highest levels had not pointed out this overall strategic context, I might have wandered down through the years blissfully unaware of it.

*

Before getting into this significant context, it is worthwhile at this point to reprise the general definition of what the superpower faculties appear to consist of, based on all available evidence.

*

The "superpowers" have been discussed in other essays already placed in this database. But to reprise them for convenience, they appear to consist of those faculties within our species and its specimens that can deal with the kinds of information transcending physical facts, and the "laws" of matter, space, time and energy (as so far understood). The factual existence of the superpowers is determined by noting the spontaneous occurrence of them throughout history.

*

However, spontaneously occurring and deliberate, controlled activation of the superpowers (as might occur via scientific knowledge of them) represent two different matters indeed.

Spontaneous occurrences of the superpowers can be considered merely as transient events in the general web or fabric of human sociological existence.

However, if certain superpower faculties could become activated and enhanced in controlled ways rather than just via spontaneous manifestations, then a number of human affairs considered normalized and controllable would have to undergo adjustments.

*

And so the "arising," so to speak, of enhanced superpower activity would present unfamiliar difficulties -- especially to the average run-of-the-mill power structures that function within the known limits of normal powers.

*

In November, 1972, I was invited to Washington for a sort of covert meeting. During that meeting a top analyst of a familiar intelligence agency in our nation's capital TOLD me (I

paraphrase):

You know, no significant advance in Psi will ever be permitted by those who govern -- because it MIGHT upset or alter all power structures on Earth. Even if you and your colleagues at Stanford Research Institute succeed, even in part, ways and means behind the popular and open scenes will ultimately follow to erase and discredit the work.

*

I clearly remember being stuck speechless, not only by the shocking statement, but because of my own abysmal ignorance in not recognizing what was immediately made SO OBVIOUS.

I immediately grokked the entire reason behind the "Resistance to Psi," along with all of its ramifications.

*

For clarity here regarding only some of those ramifications, the first and principal one is that IF any of the superpowers could by volitional training be developed for so-called practical applications, then there would be vivid implications for almost all existing Earthside power structures and the way power games are played.

*

In THIS context, as viewed from the heights of existing power structures and power makers, the deliberate cognitive enhancement of the superpowers would be viewed as a rather hideous development -- made doubly frightening upon the possibility that secrets and minds could be "read" and revealed.

At the very least, such enhancement could result in "competitive edges" in a number of human affairs -- such as within capitalistic forays, take-over plans, and transactions.

*

In any event, from the perspective of invested POWER it is certainly understandable that a NEED could easily be perceived for the resistance to the emergence of enhanced superpower proficiency.

It is also easy to see that the perceived NEED for the resistance would trickle down from the most powerful top and infest all echelons of society involving power, who was to succeed in obtaining it, and why and how.

Another ramification concerns what is fondly referred to as "fair competition." Grok it, if you can.

*

Now a factor needs briefly to be pointed up that dwells in consistent invisibility. It is this. Practically everyone can intuit or imagine some kind of practical application for any of the superpower faculties. But at the same time, if there existed any reason to shoot down the superpower faculties, or to prevent their constructive germinating, this is surely the reason.

In a forthcoming essay in this Section 5, I'll review some illuminating aspects of this situation as revealed in the book EXECUTIVE ESP: THE PROVEN LINKS BETWEEN "HUNCHES" AND SUCCESS -- AND HOW BUSINESSMEN EMPLOY ESP ON A PRACTICAL BASIS (Dean, Mihalasky, Ostrander, Schroeder, 1974).

*

The relationship of the superpower enhancement to Earthside sociological and power structures can briefly summarized as having five identifiable aspects. In the past, I read more than one overall assessment of "the implications and threats of Psi," and it is somewhat from these that the five identifiable aspects have been distilled.

1. Our species possesses sentient attributes that are quite extraordinary -- among which are powers and superpowers of various kinds. These exist among all specimens of the species in some kind of innate and potentializable formats -- providing the requisite sensitivity parameters are "open" naturally, or nurtured into "openness" via some kind of tutorial-experiential methods that enlarge sensitivity contact.
- 2.
3. Also innate within our species are the contexts for constructing the various elements and formats usually referred to as "social organizing," ostensibly so that the specimens of the species can survive better as group-collective entities.
- 4.
5. However, the same collective social survival-goals usually turn out to be pyramidal "power structures." The greatest amounts and kinds of power are held by the relatively few power specimens populating the apex -- while the rest of the inhabitants of the pyramidal power structures are presumed to benefit and survive as a result of being led or governed by the power governing, decisioning, or dicta of the few.
- 6.
7. The most solidly accepted basis for acquiring and perpetuating power is very closely related to the physical aspects of everyone's existence. Thus, most formats of large power holdings usually come about by achieving dominion over obvious and subtle aspects of physicality (and/or via the dominion of the surrogate of physicality -- money).

8.

9. In a direct sense, power structures are almost always dependent on stability, predictability, and upon what is visible and tangible to the majority of everyone. Thus, most power-structure arrangements CANNOT permit Psi-determined "wild cards" of any kind, much less encourage them to come into existence. So, while the superpower faculties of our species can be seen as astonishing and marvelous, they also represent "threatening" wild cards to existing power structures.

The Superpowers as "Wild Cards" Within Sociological Power Systems

Considering the five aspects briefly enumerated above, it becomes quite easy to comprehend, at least theoretically speaking, why any REAL development of the superpowers cannot be permitted.

In the bigger power picture, then, the overall response MUST advocate the non-development and non-enhancement of the superpowers.

The General Superpower Problem and the Way It Is "Taken Care Of"

The ONLY problem regarding the superpower faculties is that they exist naturally and as concomitants of our marvelous species.

In this sense, they tend occasionally to emerge spontaneously through each successive generation, and as somewhat highly "developed" in certain individuals -- known, in the twentieth century as "psychics," if they are real ones.

*

Analysts recognize this confirmed, "unfortunate" but natural occurrence. Since, then, the species does possess the superpower faculties, or at least rudiments of them, the (almost) only way to "contain" the superpowers is to make an impenetrable mess around any possible real knowledge of them -- especially as regards any constructive, and hence applicable, formats.

*

And so it is thus, more or less anyway, that we find any accurate comprehending of the superpowers cocooned within various messes of distractions, deterrents, derailments, demolitions, deconstructions, pismires, and droolings.

*

The making and maintenance of the messes is seen as necessary because many adhere to the concept that the introduction into power games of wild cards emanating from real superpower sources would not only put the usual concepts of power at a disadvantage, but also could shift the concepts and balances of power as well.

*

To get a start-up grasp on this, we have only to consider the element of secrecy involved in all power structures.

If, for example, it is believed that all formats of secrecy can be penetrated by superpower "espionage," well, this is surely one reason to PREVENT any attempts to develop any superpower faculties in a predictable and proliferating way. No one really would want to develop any sources from which would flow a river of wild cards.

*

So, the best way to prevent anything of the kind is to pollute the clear river of superpower understanding and infest it with log jams -- in the form of distractions, deterrents, derailments, demolitions, deconstructions and pismires -- all the while disguising these in formats of acceptable logic and reason and various kinds of droolings philosophical or otherwise.

*

It is my personal suspicion, based upon many years of direct experience, that our mainstream social-power structures WILL NEVER permit much in the way of open mainstream supported research and development of real superpower proficiency -- with one possible exception.

*

IF our species would find itself "threatened" by an extraterrestrial something or other which possessed active superpower functions, then OUR species superpowers would have to be developed to attempt to cope with the Spaceside "threat" in this regard.

In such a case, completely hypothetical to be sure, swift mainstream agreement would be reached to develop practical human superpower applications in order to add these to Earthside armaments.

*

A number of loose ends have been left open in this first essay of this section -- because they are better dealt with via substantive contexts to be discussed in subsequent essays of this Section 5.

TEACHING AND LEARNING REGARDING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (17Oct97)

PART 1

ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

It would be wonderful to organize information about LEARNING by following the step-by-step method that can be so effective regarding other areas of information.

Within a superficial approach to learning, or within a cursory glance at what's involved, it might seem that learning is straightforward, and that the steps involved are only one -- and which step consists of STUDY, study of simple stuff first, and then increasingly difficult stuff anon.

*

It is quite surprising how this idea of learning hangs on, and more or less is endlessly preached; surprising in the face of the familiar fact that someone can study something -- and end up not learning much or any of it.

*

When lots of study ends up in minimal learning, educationalists like to introduce matters such as the student's questionable motivation, snarled learning skills, memory retention lapses, early nurturing that was somehow deficient, and etc., until it becomes clear to everyone, including the student, that the fault is with the student for reasons both visible and invisible.

*

It if were not for the fact that one can sometimes encounter someone who HAS learned a good deal, but studied very little, then it might seem that failure to learn is somehow a student's fault.

*

Whether this kind of situation is perceived as important and significant by this or that reader of this essay, I'll simply say, at the risk of making a categorical pronouncement, that it IS important and significant. I'll even offer up three suitable reasons:

1. Study and learning are two different species of processes;
2. Learning is always judged against WHAT is being taught, and if one fails to learn, well, what has been studied might be at fault, not the learner.
3. True learning (so called) is also always judged against what has been taught by a teacher or some teaching system. In other words, true learning requires a teacher. Thus, if someone manages to learn something WITHOUT having been submitted to teaching procedures to learn it, well, he or she is considered as yet among the unwashed and unlearned.

*

Of course, 2 and 3 above may be products only of what is referred to as civilized cultures and societies in which the STATUS of teachers and teaching systems whose monopoly over teaching AND learning need to be protected. So within such civilizing aspects it doesn't really matter what one learns. It only matters that one has been taught it, and thus the actual meaning and value of diplomas and higher sheepskins.

Thus, in such kinds of systems, learning per se is not considered as meaningful -- since one can learn only what is being taught, and if whatever is learned has not been taught then it also is not considered as learning.

*

Also in such kinds systems, one usually can discover the existence of approved and disapproved learning, or tolerated and intolerated learning -- this being a subject I'll expand on here and there ahead while attempting not to drool too much venom.

*

I'm not merely bitching here, but am indicating that learning almost always is seen as an extension of teaching -- and in which context a certain number of students are expendable, or constitute permissible learning failures.

But I'm also hinting that teaching could be considered an extension of learning -- since if the need or desire to learn didn't exist, then there would be no occasion at all for teachers or teaching systems come into existence and flaunt their knowledge, mind-shaping wares, snake oils and other educational whatnot.

*

It has also been necessary to expand a little on 2 and 3 as itemized above, since those two contexts have a great deal to do with 1 as itemized above.

Or, perhaps, it might be said: have a great deal to NOT DO with 1 above.

*

To clarify a little. IF the processes of learning and the processes of teaching are different species of processes, then it might follow that the processes of teaching should be formulated within the light of the processes of learning. IF learning IS the goal.

*

However, IF learning IS NOT the goal, then the processes of teaching need never take into account the processes of learning.

In such a case, no one (including both teachers and learners) need know anything about the processes of learning. So, if someone manages to identify some of the different kinds of learning processes, well, these can be ignored, played down, eradicated, etc. -- or safeguarded from public access by machinations of mind-programming operations.

*

In any event, if we examine some terms and their definitions, we shall be able to note a rather curious thing as a result.

T E A C H

Our English term TEACH is taken from a Middle European term, TECHEN, which meant "to show." In English it means "to cause [someone] to know a subject," and "to cause [someone] to know how."

*

Here we immediately, and unfortunately, encounter a gross fundamental difficulty. The difficult, in the most simple words possible, is this: "to know a subject" and "to know how [to do or effect something]" are radically different activities. But both activities are included, and somewhat obfuscated, within the contexts of the same descriptive term.

*

Additionally, most dictionaries defining TEACH somehow manage NOT to refer to the concept of "to cause [someone] to learn."

*

Thus, at first official nomenclature contact with the term TEACH we find as follows:

T E A C H

.

.

to cause

.

.....^.....

...

to know to know how to learn(?)

*

Moving on, then, the term TEACH is usually broken apart into active measure nuances:

INSTRUCT: methodical or formal teaching.

EDUCATE: attempting to bring out latent capabilities.

TRAIN: stresses instruction and drill with a specific end in view.

DISCIPLINE: implies subordination to a master for the sake of controlling.

SCHOOL: implies training or discipline, especially in what is hard to master or to bear.

TUTOR: to teach or guide, usually in a special subject or for a particular purpose.

GUIDE: to provide with guiding information, to direct a person in his or her conduct or course of life, to superintend training or instruction.

*

Thus, including TEACH we can quickly encounter EIGHT categories all relevant to teaching -- and in whose basic definitions the term LEARN is not mentioned.

LEARN

Our English term LEARN is akin to the Old High German LERNEN -- and which apparently meant "to acquire knowing," this later evolving into "to acquire knowledge."

*

Thus, in English, LEARN came to refer to "to gain knowledge or understanding of or skill in by study, instruction, or experience.

LEARN also refers to "memorizing," but beyond that the term is not broken down into more refined categories as is TEACH.

STUDY and STUDENT

Our English term STUDY is taken from the Latin term roughly meaning the same thing, with the exception that the Latin STUDERE either did or did also refer to "contemplation."

In any event, our term STUDY is defined (get this) as "the application of the mental faculties to the acquisition of knowledge; a careful examination or analysis of a phenomenon, development, or question; something attracting close attention or examination; also, the activity or work of a student."

*

Our English term STUDENT is defined as: one who attends a school; one who studies; also an attentive and systematic observer.

Most dictionaries allow the term LEARN to somehow be pendant to a CONCEPT of STUDENT, but that term is not included in most of the formal definitions.

Beyond that, a STUDENT is presumably one who proposes to attempt the application of the mental faculties to the acquisition of knowledge, a careful examination or analyses of something, even if only regarding whatever attracts close attention or examination.

Whatever is involved is then the student's WORK or ACTIVITY.

KNOWLEDGE

(1) Cognizance.

(2) The fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association.

(3) The fact or condition of being aware of something.

(4) The range of one's information or understanding.

(5) The fact or condition of having information, or of being learned.

(6) The sum of what is [was(?) or can be(?)] known and which consists of the body of truth, information, and principles acquired by mankind.

*

I might add that the body of truth, etc., presumably includes what was once known but forgotten, rejected, or avoided.

*

In dragging the reader through the foregoing nomenclature bytes, I have reviewed what would seem to be the major constituents of teaching and learning. Some might assume that these constituents are all that is needed in order to undertake expeditions into teaching and learning.

*

But while I suppose that most of the major constituents of teaching are included (at least regarding superficial formats of teaching), it seems to me that the idea of LEARNING seems to hang about as sort of a vaporous fantasy.

True, people assume that learning will occur because of teaching. But it can be noted that whatever the elements of learning might be, they are rather vague within the contexts of the nomenclature considered above.

*

Anyhow, the nomenclature autopsy is concluded (for now.) And this frees us to move expeditiously on to another matter.

There can be little doubt that teaching and learning are among the most important attributes of our species -- and indeed of almost all social groupings within it.

*

As it is, our species seems to HAVE TO LEARN what it takes to survive.

Which is to say that specimens of our species are not born completely or even partially programmed with broad-band survival knowledge -- a type of knowledge once referred to as NATURAL,

INDWELLING INSTINCTS as regards other life forms.

*

Since the above idea IS the case, it would then seem that the necessity of teaching and learning might have achieved enough conceptual importance to have become included as significant topics within the scope of philosophical inquiry and discussion.

*

I will now refer to THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY compiled under the editorial auspices of Paul Edwards, and published in 1967 by Macmillian Publishing Co. in New York, and by Collier Macmillian Publishers in London.

I have already referred to this encyclopedia in the course of other essays in this database. Although this encyclopedia was published in 1967 (thirty years ago as of this writing,) it represents an excellent compilation of philosophy up until then, and how things were considered.

Additionally, in my own estimation the year 1967 more or less signaled the end of what had been called the Modern Age, and so the encyclopedia serves as a kind of summarization of philosophical thinking as of the end of that Age. Whether anyone will agree with me on this estimation, most certainly after 1967 overall human affairs did depart into directions and necessities so new that former philosophical approaches to things and stuff grew increasingly useless.

For one thing, as human affairs went into the 1970s, interest declined in, of all things, PHILOSOPHY -- with the result that philosophical curricula began to be curtailed, and some institutions of higher learning canceled such courses and departments altogether.

*

Now, PHILOSOPHY was once thought of as "the search for wisdom."

However, when WISDOM proved either too elusive, complicated or inconvenient, the definition was shifted to "a search for truth through logical reasoning rather than factual observation." I invite you to consider this definition with some care and interest.

*

On average, though, one of the central ideas of PHILOSOPHY was to consider the meaning of things, especially if they were important not only to human thinking, but to survival, progress, understanding, and the accumulating of that stuff referred to as "knowledge."

In this sense, then what is NOT included in the 1967 encyclopedia may be as important as what is.

*

The concepts of TEACHING and LEARNING are not found in the encyclopedia as worthy of identified

entries.

In that the concepts of teaching and learning might be included in other entries, one of course consults the encyclopedia's index to discover if this is so.

*

In the Index, one finds only one reference to the topic of TEACHING -- and which reference regards "teaching machines."

*

The topic LEARNING fares a bit better.

First, the Index refers to "Learned Ignorance" as found mentioned in the entry for one Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464), a theologian, philosopher, and mathematician.

Apparently, this Nicholas of Cusa held that "a man is wise only if he is aware of the limits of the mind [his own?] in knowing the truth."

*

This Nicholas of Cusa, having said this, it is then of little wonder that no one has ever heard of him -- largely because his statement is sort of worrisome to the idea that "knowledge is Power," this a much more popular concept.

This Nicholas also wrote DE DOCTA IGNORANCE, a treatise in which he proposed that "Knowledge is learned ignorance." The idea that there may indeed exist doctrines of learning how to be ignorant would clearly be unpopular, all things considered.

*

In any event, the 1967 encyclopedia also mentions "learning" in connection with the entries for Perception, Psychological behaviorism, and something called the "Learning of the Mind School." The term "learning" is also mentioned in connection with the entries for to individuals, one Maine de Biran, and Jean Piaget.

*

So, as it turns out there is no formal entry in the 1967 encyclopedia for teaching or learning. The index mentions teaching in only one context, while learning is mentioned six times (only).

*

Before moving on, it is of some minor interest to discover that the 1967 encyclopedia DOES have an entry for "Laws of Thought." This is worth minor interest in that it might seem that TEACHING and

LEARNING might have some relationship to the Laws of Thought, or vice versa. At least my humble self can't really conceive that teaching and learning somehow DO NOT involve THOUGHT, whether lawful or lawless.

*

In any event, regarding the Laws of Thought, the 1967 encyclopedia indicated that such laws consisted of three principles "frequently discussed from the time of the Greeks until the beginning of the twentieth century [at which time] the term has become obsolete."

The three principles are noted as "the principles of identity, of contradiction, of excluded middle, and occasionally [presumably as a fourth principle] the principle of sufficient reason." Now, "reason" in this instance, refers to the sister of "logic" -- the two otherwise known as logic and reason.

The implication here is that it takes a certain amount or quota of reason to be able to deal with the laws of thought, and so interest in the Laws of Thought became "obsolete" at the beginning of the twentieth century.

*

Earlier above, I have introduced the term KNOWLEDGE.

The 1967 encyclopedia does not have an entry for KNOWLEDGE as a "thing" in its own right. The encyclopedia, however, does have three entries regarding knowledge as:

The Sociology of Knowledge;

The Theory of Knowledge;

Knowledge and Belief.

*

Regarding KNOWLEDGE, at the beginning of the entry KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF we find: "The nature of knowledge has been a central problem in philosophy from the earliest times. . . .

"The problem of knowledge occupies an important place in most major philosophical systems. If philosophy is conceived as an ontological undertaking, as an endeavor to describe the ultimate nature of reality or to say what there really is, it requires a preliminary investigation of the scope and validity of knowledge. Only that can be said to exist which can be known to exist.

"If, on the other hand, philosophy is conceived as a critical inquiry, as a second-order discipline concerned with the claims of various concrete forms of intellectual activity, it must consider the extent to which these activities issue in knowledge."

*

Well, I dare mention that few will consent to a preliminary investigation of the scope and validity of THEIR OWN PERSONAL knowledge -- and so whether knowledge is ontological or a second-order discipline is more or less relevant.

*

Regarding BELIEF, in the entry for KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF we find: "Belief has had less attention [than knowledge] from philosophers. It has generally been taken to be a more or less unproblematic inner state, accessible to introspection. But there has been disagreement about whether it is active or passive."

*

Well, insignificant little Moi might observe that the world turns more on belief than knowledge.

*

As it is, though, the 1967 encyclopedia more or less might agree with my comment above, in that in the KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF entry, THE DEFINITION OF KNOWLEDGE is given, and I quote:

"According to the most widely accepted definition, knowledge is justified true belief."
Ergo, it must follow that "true belief" is "knowledge." And which means that our species, although extant, is lost (or at least quite confused) -- and it is of little wonder that the finer points of teaching and learning have been irrelevant all along.

TRENDING AWAY FROM THE PARAPSYCHOLOGY PARADIGM TOWARD A NEW PARADIGM OF SUPERPOWER PERFORMANCE

Ingo Swann (24Nov97)

NOTE OF EXPLANATION: During the last two years I've received an increase of media requests concerning ESP and related matters. It became apparent that the interests and requests were based in concepts of ESP, Psi and parapsychology that are broadly shared, but are dated and backward looking if viewed in juxtaposition to advances in other science areas.

These other science areas have been in process of providing new facts and information relevant to various human processes that directly increase comprehension of ESP phenomena that have not yielded to resolution in parapsychological terms. This new information is accumulating outside of parapsychology, but is not being incorporated into parapsychology in any significant way. A strange situation has thus resulted. A paradigm shift relevant to "Psi" is taking place outside of parapsychology.

The most probable meaning of this paradigm shift external to parapsychology is that at least some significant part of parapsychology will soon become acknowledged as obsolete, being replaced by some kind of new perspective based on discovery in other scientific fields.

It has proven difficult to discuss this mostly unrealized paradigm shift with media and other people because a broad reality basis (including appropriate concepts and nomenclature) is still missing. I got tired of trying verbally to discuss this, and therefore began providing short written position statements as handout materials. I combine and expand these into this larger handout document for the edification of those interested in this somewhat non-visible situation.

NOTHING STAYS THE SAME

Because I'm about 65 per cent conservative I am particularly sensitive to change. There are many things I'd like to see stay as they are, or were. But alas for little me, change is continuous. Change rolls on and on, and also rolls over many things.

With regard to parapsychology and Psi, anyone even somewhat familiar with that research realizes that

it is now about 120 years along. Many might also realize that mainstream science rejected psychic matters from the outset of organized research in about 1882, and that the scientific rejection of Psi is still on-going today.

*

None the less, several vital forms of psychic research formulated external to science proper. Since about 1935, psychic research has collectively been referred to as "parapsychology." Parapsychology has brought into existence concepts, ideas, nomenclature, and frames of reference -- all combined into a sort of parapsychology-speak or lingo. I'll shorten this to "para-speak," and indicate that it is appropriate to parapsychology but not to any other mainstream scientific fields.

THE SOCIO-CULTURAL DIVISION BETWEEN THE MAINSTREAM SCIENCES AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY

In other documents in this database, I have referred to the exclusion of parapsychology from science as the "ghettoization" of Psi and parapsychology. I have also stipulated that the ghettoization is the fault of the mainstream sciences, and that its mandated basis was mounted on philosophical rather than scientific grounds.

*

Because of this, parapsychology and para-speak developed more or less independently of science proper -- with the result that several further and quite subtle separating phenomena ALSO came into existence, but which phenomena were seldom realized, discussed, or acknowledged as existing.

*

As but one of these subtle phenomena, the study of the sociology of science and of scientists and their brotherhoods easily reveals that the brotherhoods forbid the introduction of parapsychology concepts and nomenclature into the main sciences.

This embargo was enforced -- to the degree that mainstream scientists would experience professional damage to their careers if they proposed any cross-over concepts. This embargo is still in effect.

*

Several social affects came about because of this.

(1) The mainstream sciences do refer to psychic phenomena, but only under terms pejorative terms such as superstition, abnormal, hallucinatory, and in psychiatry as illness-like mental phenomena emanating

from deranged or diseased psycho-physical causes.

(2) The mainstream sciences have remained sanitized of any non-pejorative concepts and nomenclature redolent of anything psychic, paranormal, or parapsychological -- and so the language and nomenclature of non-pejorative connotations is para-speak.

(3) The cross-over of para-speak into the mainstream sciences is not permitted -- and so mainstream scientific papers whose contents might touch upon Psi in any way have to be written in a manner that does not suggest a cross-over.

(4) When the public, or anyone, wants to refer to the so-called paranormal in non-pejorative ways, they are obliged to utilize parapsychological concepts and nomenclature.

*

One of the principal fall-outs of this four-part situation is that that the mainstream sciences and parapsychology were and still are viewed as mutually incompatible -- or, at any rate, no cross-over of concepts and nomenclature is permitted by the major sciences.

*

And, as with all mutually incompatible social factors, another very important fall-out has been a DECREASED rate of mutual information-exchange between science proper and parapsychology.

*

Thus, it was, and still is, largely assumed that discovery, if any, about the paranormal (so called) would take place in parapsychology -- meaning external to the main sciences themselves.

The obverse to this was that the main sciences would not make any discoveries pertinent to the parapsychology paranormal -- because the main sciences had neither the desire, commitment nor tradition of working along such lines of scientific inquiry.

*

And so on the surface of these matters, the whole of this has taken on a somewhat non-changing vista -- parapsychology for parapsychologists -- science for scientists -- and neither shall meet at any point. BUT! Nothing ever stays the same, AND all things do change.

SOURCES OF CHANGE VIS-A-VIS MAINSTREAM SCIENCE AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY

Whatever one might elect to think of them, the main sciences ARE vital sciences, capable of on-going discovery. They have their ups and downs, their stagnating periods, their blind spots. But over time they do accumulate data and information, and also undergo their own paradigm shifts.

In my own possibly wobbly estimation, the rate of discovery in the main sciences since the 1950s has been large and accelerated -- so much so that the implications of the discoveries probably cannot be adequately digested in many areas.

Additionally, many of the implications lay outside of established frames of reference, not only scientific frames of reference, but social and cultural ones as well.

*

If we permit ourselves to think about this escalating accumulation of mainstream scientific knowledge it is almost impossible to think that those sciences would not somehow trip across discoveries that are entirely applicable to the so-called "parapsychology" processes of our species, somehow applicable to the central hypotheses of parapsychology.

*

Considering, however, the stalwart and long-enforced separation of parapsychology from the main sciences, we can well imagine certain professional difficulties arising in linking mainstream discovery to the forbidden parapsychology.

*

If, however, the linking of mainstream science discovery to parapsychology vistas was to be made, then there is little doubt that parapsychology WOULD HAVE TO CHANGE -- if for no other reason than the main sciences are gargantuan compared to the exceedingly small fraction of effort of which parapsychology is representative.

*

It is not entirely out of the question that Modern Parapsychology, as a ghettoized field (small) could vanish if discoveries pertinent to the "parapsychology" realms of human functioning were seen as such within the main sciences -- and, as I suppose it needs to be said, were ADMITTED as such.

*

I will give one possible example. In parapsychology, the perceptual forms of Psi (telepathy, clairvoyance, etc.) are seen as some kind of particular mind-psychological formats -- which is to say, seen as problems of mental perception.

Through the decades, a great deal of research has been undertaken to establish what kind of parapsychomental phenomenology and/or criteria cause, trigger, bring about, or accompany those forms of Psi.

I personally conclude that a great deal of progress has been made along these lines, but that parapsychologists jettison a great deal of it because it can't be seen as directly applicable to the central hypothesis that Psi is a function of the human para-mind.

So, in general, it is said that the accumulated parapsychological results are "not very robust" and are not amenable to "the repetitive experiment." Thus, in it's parapsychological context, Psi remains "elusive" -- while within parapsychology itself theories about it are exceedingly inconsistent.

*

Continuing with my one possible example. One notable aspect of parapsychology's Psi perceptual phenomena is that whatever their para-mental source or cause, those phenomena clearly also involve matters of information transfer, information acquisition, and information processing.

Thus, while the para-mental hypothesis certainly cannot be discounted, what if the more vivid and more easily dealt with Psi-perceptual problem consists of information processes?

*

Psi as mind and Psi as information, however, are two completely different arenas of expertise -- while the small field of parapsychology is not very thickly populated with information theorists.

*

However, the field of Information Theory and Applications is exceedingly Big Time in the main sciences. In that VERY mainstream field, the existence of receptors, transducers, the signal-to-noise ratio, and etc., are clearly understood -- and all of which are exceedingly relevant to information acquisition, etc.

*

In yet another VERY mainstream field, that of neurobiology, it has been discovered that the human systems are themselves composed of receptors, transducers, signal-to-noise decoders, and etc., and some of which seem to account for Psi-like information acquisition.

*

In other words, and in some special aspects, neither the field of information theory or the field of neurobiology has anything to do with parapsychology.

But discoveries in those two fields are speedily encroaching upon parapsychology "territory." And in some cases, it is only the dissimilarity of the NOMENCLATURE that is keeping them apart so far.

*

And, indeed, it is only if one doesn't know about advances in information theory and neurobiology that one can remain content (and ill-informed) to discuss Psi phenomena ONLY WITHIN the circumference of parapsychology itself.

*

According to usual logic, if parapsychology was going to undergo a paradigm change, one would suppose that it would come about because of advances in parapsychology itself. That has not happened. However, when the main sciences learn more about Psi phenomena than parapsychologists have or can, then parapsychology will become part of a paradigm change that might roll over it altogether.

*

There are many aspects that now need to be discussed, and many of which have already been entered into discussion in this database.

One of these is that certain phenomena occur as a paradigm shift comes into existence and gains momentum.

One of the first of these phenomena is that widely used words (terminology) that packed power within the retiring paradigm begin to lose that power as the contours of the new paradigm begin to take on form.

Sometimes it doesn't take much time at all for very popular terms to end up on the trash pile of forgotten nomenclature. Not only do the mind-sets that used the terms disappear, but the terms themselves fall out of usage and vanish.

*

This type of change represents much more than whether terms are "in" or "out," or "politically whatever." Terminology represents a kind of knowledge package. Or, put another way, knowledge is structured in a particular way within a paradigm -- and the term signifies not only what it means itself, but the way the knowledge package is structured.

When, then, advances or discoveries make it necessary to restructure knowledge packages, well, the old terms cannot be utilized any longer since they represent the former knowledge package.

All knowledge packages are characterized by key words -- these being terms that are direct intellectual extensions of the knowledge package. And the knowledge package is in turn a particular format within which knowledge is structured in a particular way.

*

In any event, terms fall out of usage and disappear because the way knowledge is structured undergoes change -- usually because new discoveries require that former knowledge packages be restructured into new formats so as to incorporate the new knowledge.

When this process becomes so all-encompassing, it can result in a complete paradigm shift -- and in this

case, of course, the old knowledge usually gets relegated to the trash pile of forgotten knowledge formats.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE CONCEPT OF EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION (ESP)

The term EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION is clearly the major key word within the parapsychology conceptual contexts of the twentieth century.

The common use of that term (as ESP) is so wide-spread that it is difficult to imagine that it might disappear. But indeed, it is hardly utilized today except by an hype-word within an uninformed media and by certain parapsychologists whose basis for conceptualizing is out-dated and inefficient.

The major reason why the usage of ESP is on its way into historical oblivion is that very much overall is in process of being discovered about all kinds of human functioning. The general knowledge packages prevalent during the 1930s (when Dr. J. B. Rhine introduced the term ESP) are long gone. Many new knowledge structures have been erected. While phenomena similar to what ESP once meant can be treated in those new structures, the phenomena cannot be referred to as EXTRA-sensory.

The principal reason here is that the hard sciences have discovered subtle SENSORY receptors that were not known to exist when the term ESP came into vogue.

*

A great deal can be said and written about ESP. But even so, not very much was actually known about it. One of the results was that parapsychology, which studies Psi and ESP, was often referred to as the "elusive science," since ESP discovery and knowledge have remained elusive.

This elusiveness probably accounts for why methods designed to teach and enhance ESP don't work very well. After all, it is difficult to teach something about which not much is known. Indeed, if such methods DID work well, then our planet would already have become populated with highly achieved psychics.

*

The comments just above have been necessary so that a particular question can be asked. Organized research into various ESP phenomena has been in existence for about 130 years by now -- with the result that the research is more notable for elusiveness than for discovery.

The question, then, is why is this the case, why is this the outcome after so many decades?

*

Between 1973 and 1985, I was part of a well-funded and serious effort to examine human potentials directly associated with ESP. The plight of parapsychology was already recognized as early as 1973 -- so much so that some observers felt it moribund or dead in the water. Why this was so needed to be examined and accounted for if possible, and so a multidisciplinary inquiry was mounted to which numerous professional experts contributed.

*

Among other factors brought to light was the discovery that not only was parapsychology an elusive science, it was also an isolated science. It was also incorporated (or trapped) within its own infra-social parameters. Those parameters did not interact, or were not permitted to interact, with the much larger global-sociological segments of science and philosophy. Further, parapsychology could be seen as an introverting paradigm of and unto itself with its own special functions -- such as nomenclature, concepts, theories and behavior patterns.

*

There can be no doubt at all that the basis for this self-isolating paradigm emerged from the early rejection of Psi research -- a rejection that was ardently prosecuted and maintained by science proper. It was certainly the intent of the early researchers to integrate Psi phenomena into science proper. And this integrating project is still on-going in contemporary parapsychology today. It was science proper that did not want that integrating to take place.

*

The long-term result of this was that parapsychology and psychic research were alienated from the scientific mainstreams, and as such had to, or at least did, establish its own paradigm approach to ESP phenomena. This paradigm was formulated roughly after World War I, and was concretized during the 1950s -- with not a great deal of change since then regarding basic and fundamental premises and concepts.

*

Over the long-term, this alienation meant that routes of information exchange did not form between the isolated parapsychology paradigm and the greater and far larger other scientific fields. This obviously meant that science proper did not access developments occurring in parapsychology. But it also meant that parapsychology did not itself access and integrate developments in the other sciences. This is to say that vital information exchange links between on-going science and isolated parapsychology has not really been established.

*

As but one example, somewhat amusing. Although ESP is the acronym for extra-sensory perception, parapsychology does not study perception per se. That kind of research is the fold of perceptual researchers in the proper sciences, but which do not study extrasensory forms of perception. So, parapsychology studies the ES part, but not the P part, while other sciences study the P part, but not the ES part.

In other words, while perception is an element common both to parapsychology and the mainstream sciences of perception, there are no direct routes of information integration between the two.

*

The extent of this little difficulty is actually quite gross. For one thing, the two fields, isolated and barricaded from each other, have evolved different nomenclature and theories for a number of phenomena that are identical in both fields.

*

Additionally, science proper probably has made more discovery relevant to extra-sensory perception than parapsychology has.

*

However, proper science does not permit the introduction of terms redolent of ESP. And so it is difficult for the average person to realize, for example, that when neurobiologists talk of "bio-magnetic receptors" they are actually talking about a functional biological basis for dowsing, while dowsing itself is thought to be a form of ESP.

*

But the going here gets even a little rougher. Most of the major structural ideas and concepts that continue to govern parapsychology thinking were formulated before, say, 1955. And one of those major concepts was the idea that only five physical senses existed, an idea that was more or less held in common agreement by everyone. So, one of the dominant ideas in parapsychology regarding ESP is that ESP does not have a biological basis in any of the five major physical senses -- and so it was necessary to coin the term extra-sensory perception, referring to perceptions that did not have a physical, biological basis. And so this is why ESP was called "extra-sensory" -- or outside of the normal senses. And, as well, this was why ESP was considered as originating from some cause or source independent of the material aspects of the human biobody.

*

It is now important to state that although parapsychologists HAVE presented significant and copious

evidence that the human biomind can deal in information acquisition and transfer, they have done so within the contexts of the information being EXTRA-SENSORY -- that is, outside of, or independent of, the capacities of the human sensing systems.

This is to say that although it can be shown that the information acquisition and transfer exist, the fact of the existence does not at the same time prove the theory of EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION, or that the acquisition and transfer involve extra-sensory biomind equipment.

*

Indeed, the idea of EXTRA-SENSORY perception was only minimally permissible back in the days when sciences were convinced (erroneously) that the human systems possessed only five physical senses. However, it is known that the human systems have very many more than a mere five physical senses, the many more being physical as well.

In this lately developmental sense, then, it can be observed that the concept of extra-sensory perception probably was oxymoronic all along. In any event, many earlier parapsychologists (and a whole lot of scientists) objected to ESP on the grounds that ESP WAS an oxymoron.

*

I'm not quite sure yet what the replacement concepts for ESP will be, but it is quite certain that such replacement concepts WILL come into existence, as they already are. The evolving concepts will almost certainly focus on the concept of subtle, multiple and recombinant receptors. Some ideas about these replacement concepts will be discussed in a future essay.

ELEMENTS OF A TENTATIVE CONCLUSION

New, and more efficient, knowledge structures cannot become visible if their information is filtered through old knowledge structures -- simply because the old is structured in ways that usually prohibit recognition (or acceptance) of new information.

It is, I think, rather well established via countless psychological studies that knowledge structures can access only what they can recognize -- and that what ever else is present but can't be recognized is rejected, deflected, resisted or merely dumped.

*

The average media or public awareness of the astonishing elements of the human biomind continues to consider those elements only via the limited and out-moded parapsychology formats.

*

The main sciences have made copious discoveries regarding increasingly refined elements of overall human processes.

Many of these discoveries are entirely applicable to mysteries and problems of extended biomind perceptions and functions. This can only mean that a paradigm shift is in the offing, or is already taking place -- even though media and the lay person is not aware of the shift.

One really should start thinking in terms of biomind receptors rather than in terms of ESP. The paradigm shift currently underway will be fleshed out in subsequent essays.

Contaminants and "Noise"

Ingo Swann (12Dec97)

The central purpose of this Section 5 is to address the possibility that certain sociological situations keep knowledge about the superpowers as perpetually degraded, inadequate, and even undiscovered.

Since individuals, knowingly or unknowingly, may participate or be dragged into the sociological situations, it's worthwhile to attempt to examine whatever aspects one can manage to identify.

*

The chief, or bigger picture, sociological situation may consist of the one that has been briefly summarized in the Introductory as the relationship of the superpowers to Earthside power structures.

*

One can accept or reject this possible bigger picture reason. But either way, it can easily be shown that knowledge about the superpowers clearly suffers within the descriptive contexts of the terms selected for the heading of this Section.

*

Furthermore, it can also easily be pointed up that just about all human activities are accompanied by their share of distractions, deterrents, derailments, etc., and that many human activities end up becoming pismires personified.

Organized research into creativity, for example, usually suffers from derailments and deconstructions. Research addressing the enormously important topics of human sentience and sensitivity are almost non-existent.

*

If one accepts the existence of "human nature," then it can be adduced that the descriptive

terms of this Section are inherent in human nature fabric -- and the workings of which are delightfully seized upon and elaborated in espionage, political and sociological thrillers, and in soap opera formats.

But even without the context of human nature, the descriptive elements of this Section's title are anyway everywhere redundant and thickly scattered throughout human history.

*

In any event, any potential aspirant wishing to activate his or her latent superpower faculties might as well get ready to deal with the superpower preventives -- if only to be able to recognize them when encountered. After all, if one interprets disinformation as information, then one might have only oneself to blame when one finds oneself in some contaminating kind of pismire the disinformation has led one into.

*

In order to approach the two central topics (Contaminants and Noise) of this present essay, it seems necessary to start at some distance and then drawing closer to them.

Two Major Pathways to Learning

The first and preferred pathway of learning how to understand and develop something is to consult all information about it -- and then to more or less duplicate the information in one's mental information processing grids.

An extension of this first pathway is to make new discoveries if existing information and knowledge proves to be insufficient, inefficient or non-existent.

This first pathway is usually very workable, and the history of our species developmental aspects is quite firmly and broadly based on it.

*

When, however, one has given the first pathway a good workout and found that what one thought one would achieve by doing so has not in fact been achieved, then one might realize two things:

That the goal may have been illusory all along; or

That the first and preferred pathway is cluttered with accumulated junk, garbage, bullshit, and misinformation.

*

If this is the case, then one may be obliged to launch upon a second pathway regarding

learning and developing whatever is involved.

Briefly put, the second pathway consists of divesting the first pathway of the accumulated junk, garbage, bullshit and misinformation.

*

The divesting process, however, can be very complicated in that it is often difficult to tell the difference, for example, between fact and bullshit, or between information and disinformation.

And indeed, if accepted social forces are perpetuating disinformation as real and valid information, then the ways and means of recognizing the disinformation can themselves be very difficult to discover.

*

However, there is a salient fact that can be emphasized. It can easily be shown that understanding and developmental approaches normally do not speed onward to success if the learning pathways are littered with bullshit and disinformation.

And this is especially the case where the goal to be reached is really meaningful -- especially if the goal has connotations of power.

*

Since any of the superpower enhancing methods are suggestive of power, one can perhaps intuit the multitudes of strata of bullshit and misinformation superpower aspirants might expect to encounter.

But even if this power thing is NOT the problem, superpower aspirants will encounter bullshit and misinformation anyway -- if only because many specimens of our species like to entertain and dazzle everyone with bullshit -- and which can easily be elevated to an art form.

The Real Reality of the Superpower Preventives

Many seem to feel that bullshit and disinformation go away if and when they are seen through. In this regard, they are seen as kind of impermanent, and therefore of lesser importance, than what is permanent. In this sense, they do not deserve clinical examination or research.

However, bullshit and misinformation, etc., are not merely subsidiary factors, or tangential elements, that have accumulated by mere chance, ignorance, stupidity, or blindness.

Rather, the factors and elements represent a combined, interacting series of phenomena

resulting in a Situation that has breadth, depth and dimensions in its own right.

Avoidance of the Second Learning Pathway

Generally speaking, it has been my experience that most people avoid a consideration of the second pathway because it can be seen as consisting of "negative" factors many don't want to get dirtied by.

In the sense of that avoidance, then, the desired pathway is the first one. It is thus pursued under the generally shared conviction that if one focuses principally on the "positive," then the "negative" will automatically become eliminated at some point.

There was a once popular song called, if I remember correctly: Accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative.

*

Also, in my childhood people were fond of quoting the three monkey thing: See no evil, hear no evil, do no evil. So I used to ask: if one never sees or hears evil, then how is one supposed to recognize it?

*

Likewise, I fail to see how one can "eliminate the negative" if one cannot recognize what it consists of, where it's at, and what it's doing.

Thus, the so-called sweetness-and-light-only thing, i.e., where ONLY the positive is pursued, is somewhat silly even if temporarily comforting.

*

So, the generally shared conviction of pursuing the positive, ignoring the negative, is somewhat philosophical and idealizing in vaporous kinds of ways, and some aspects of it can be compared to the creature with its head buried in a hole in the ground -- or in a pismire.

*

There is one principal reason why this generally shared positivistic conviction may be vaporous and empty of any long-term constructive merit.

Our species, as fabulous as it is in many ways, demonstrates a quite long RECORDED history of being completely willing to deal in information AND misinformation/ disinformation -- as well as in lies, cheating, trickery, obfuscating and worse.

*

Thus, while our species and its variety of societies have set up and instituted centers of information collection and teaching, it can also be shown that methodologies for establishing misinformation and conducting disinformation have become equally institutionalized.

And along these lines, a significant but little noticed aspect can be pointed up: That the public is invited to partake of the "knowledge" made available through centers of education;

The same public, however, is excluded from partaking in studies and methodologies of how to misinform and disinform.

*

This is to say, then, that we can view the junk, garbage, bullshit and misinformation stuff via two ways:

That the stuff might have accumulated merely by unfortuitous chance; or

That the stuff might have been more or less deliberately set up, effected, and thence cleverly managed.

*

In this sense, then, misinformation stuff that arises merely from stupidity, ignorance, etc., can be corrected by attempts to cure whatever is involved, or by making new discoveries.

*

If, however, the bullshit, junk and misinformation has achieved its destructive or contaminating factors by deliberate disinformation, then the contours of the resulting Situation become meaningful in quite different ways -- especially when it comes to trying to recognize and cure them.

*

The purpose of this Section 5, however, is not to bitch and moan about the existence of bullshit, & etc., or to luxuriate one's imaginative faculties in the dramas of conspiracy aesthetics.

The purpose is to try to give some dimensions to the second pathway of discovering what PREVENTS progress, understanding and development.

Those dimensions not only constitute a legitimate topic for discussion, but a necessary one with respect to the superpower faculties.

The nature and potential superpower activity of our species has clearly been surrounded

with bullshit, infested with deterrents, junk thinking and contaminants, and limelighted with bad mainstream press and propaganda.

*

It is now helpful to discuss some of the most identifiable sociological inhibitors of the superpowers from TWO larger picture angles. This is to say that the same inhibitors will be discussed from two separate points of view -- as CONTAMINANTS and then as NOISE.

Contaminants Regarding the Superpowers

The terms used for the somewhat overblown heading of this Section represent a variety of factors that act as eroding contaminants with regard to achieving better understanding of and contact with the superpower faculties.

In large part, these contaminants are more active in sociological contexts than in individual or personal activity -- unless one has knowingly or unknowingly chanced to have duplicated them in one's mental grids.

If one has duplicated them, then one can say that one's grids are infested or contaminated with them.

But since individuals can knowingly and unknowingly be influenced by social processes, any distinctive boundaries between self and social-shaping forces are often hard to detect.

*

The superior goal in this regard is NOT to complain and blame anyone or anything as the source of cause of the bullshit or disinformation.

The superior goal is to recognize the existence and dysfunctional nature of whatever is involved.

*

Putting this another way, if one thinks that the goal is to cure and prevent bullshit, then one is laboring under a rather first class illusion. You see, Bullshit HAPPENS -- because it IS a full part of our dazzling species.

The superior goal, then, is to somehow avoid stepping in it.

*

As will unfold ahead in the few essays that will ultimately comprise this section, the contaminating factors range from silly to gruesome. But this is to say, they produce silly

to gruesome effects within those affected by them.

*

Within the two sentences above, there is a distinction that is difficult to articulate. In an attempt to articulate, we can say that social forces exist, and that some of them range from silly to gruesome.

From these forces we can expect at least two basic kinds of situations to emerge:

1. If we are UNAWARE that the contaminating social forces exist as such, then the probability might be high that they will become incorporated into individual information grids. The reason for this is that we DO program our thinking patterns to conform to our social environments in order to fit our behavior and activity into them.
2. If we are AWARE that the social forces ARE contaminants, whether silly or gruesome, then because of the awareness they may not affect us directly -- unless one is of the scumbaggy types that want to utilize the contaminants for one reason or another.

*

In any event, it has been shown, and broadly accepted, that awareness of contaminants acts to put some kind of perceptive or psychological DISTANCE between us and the contaminants.

But even so, the contaminants still exist in the social environment, and we may occasionally have to deal with them as such.

This is to say, then, that perceiving or knowing that the contaminants exist serves at least as a partial protective measure against being sucked into the dynamics of the contaminating factors in a wholesale and completely unknowing ways.

Sources of the Superpower Contaminants

It is tempting to try to point up the major sources or causes of contaminating factors in relationship to processes of thinking, perception and analysis. But very little in the way or organized research has taken place along those lines. So it is difficult to refer to documents containing the needed data and theoretical or factual discussions.

Here is yet another knowledge vacuum -- one that exists possibly because most of us believe that how we think is not the result of our mental information processing grids having become contaminated.

But one indeed can accept that the contaminants exist, that they are undesirable, but that they are often also USEFUL for various purposes.

*

However, in the past it has often been observed that Human Nature is comprised of both positive and negative aspects. Additionally many past human nature researchers considered that while the social and informational contexts might change, that the basic rudiments of human nature did not.

For example, greed remained greed, lust remained lust, the urges for power remained as such -- and did so throughout generations and whatever changes that societal, religious, economic, philosophic or scientific factors brought about.

*

In any event, wherefore and why the contaminants and preventives exist is an interesting matter. But there is another interesting matter: i.e., how they function within individuals and in their societies.

One way of defining how they function is to call them viruses of mind -- a topic that occasionally will be addressed in this database.

Meanwhile, a quite large perspective on mind viruses can be found in a book entitled VIRUS OF THE MIND (1997), written by Richard Brodie, the original author of Microsoft Word, one of the world's best-selling computer programs.

Identifying the Major Contaminants

The terms utilized in the title of this Section Five have been selected because their meanings are not dependent on social perspectives that come and go.

This is to say that the meanings of the terms are time and culture transcending and can be applied as regards the past and the future as well as any given present.

In this sense, then, the process dynamics of deterrents and demolitions are just as much a part of basic human nature as are the dynamics of gossip.

*

The terms have also been selected because, for example, HOW TO IMPLEMENT deterrents has been studied and the functional dynamic process of deterring are thus well known. Much the same can also be said for the other selected terms.

Of course, we will add other concept terms in essays ahead -- such as "pissing contests."

*

The accepted, and quite understandable, definition of CONTAMINATE refers to factors

"that soil, stain, or infect by contact or association."

The term also refers to "making unfit for use by introduction of unwholesome, undesirable, erroneous or inappropriate elements."

*

Three synonyms are usually given for CONTAMINATE:

TAINT -- implies that corruption and decay have begun to take effect;

POLLUTE -- stresses the loss of purity, clarity, and cleanness through contamination;

DEFILE -- implies a deliberate effort of befouling of what ought to be clear and pure, and suggests a violation or desecration.

*

CONTAMINATE itself is an incorporation of the meanings of the three synonyms, but specifically refers to intrusion of or contact with an OUTSIDE source as the cause.

*

These meanings are certainly functional ones. Admittedly, they are usually linked only to PHYSICAL phenomena. But they can just as well be comprehensively linked to the five terms brought together as the title of this Section. For example, most people realize that one form of thinking or information etc., can contaminate another form of thinking or information, etc.

Employed Active Measures of Contaminating

- **DISTRACT**: to cause to turn aside from.
- **DETER**: to cause to turn aside from, to discourage, or to prevent from acting (as by fear or by misdirecting).
- **DERAIL**: to cause to run off the rails, to throw off course.
- **DEMOLISH**: to tear down or to destroy completely, so as to make vanish.
- **DECONSTRUCT**: also to tear down, but by the methods of undoing and devaluating so that sense or function is terminated or lost.
- **PISMIRE**: formally refers to urine + ant, i.e., ant piss, pungently smelling of formic acid; this term was adapted some time ago to refer to certain types of thinking that are PISIFORM in nature, PISIFORM referring to something the size of a pea.
- **DROOL**: refers to DRIVEL, in turn meaning nonsense; but also meaning saliva leaking from mouth.

Critical Implications

Although some of the early researchers of human nature in the past (c. 1500-1920) managed to construct convincing "maps" of its major attributes, to my knowledge no one ever found out how to change any of the attributes in our species as a whole.

The sum of human nature wisdom has always held that human nature is not very readily changed -- and therefore the wisdom part consists of knowing as much about human nature as one can and thereafter ALWAYS utilizing the knowledge in consideration of anything.

*

The dynamics of distractions, deterrents and demolitions, for example, will never "go away" or even be permanently eradicated or corrected -- because they are useful, perpetually useful.

This is to say that they are not merely defects of misguided thinking, but functional attributes within human nature when it comes to competitiveness -- and which attribute is one of the most clearly defined human nature attributes of our species as a whole.

*

Indeed, throughout recorded history there is hardly a human societal activity that is not laced through and through with competitiveness -- and its major functional armaments including tricksterism, cheating and deceit.

*

The overall meaning being attempted here is that the elements and factors of contaminants are probably permanently with us -- whether we like it or not.

Even if they were extensively studied and researched, few would really want them to be obliterated -- because their functions and dynamics are useful in all sorts of competitive arenas.

*

However, the idea that the dynamics of contaminants should be ignored because they are here to stay and won't go away is foolish -- except if one is a confirmed "sweetness and light" type (sweetness and light being one type of distracting drooling).

All of this might be expressed another way: "shit happens" -- and somewhat to avoid having it drop on one, or gum up one's thinking processes, it's perhaps the better part of wisdom to at least be able to identify contaminants.

After all, contaminants ignored will contaminate. With contaminants perceived and identified, there is at least the possibility of seeing through them.

*

And indeed, it can be shown that one of the secrets of achieving power of any kind is to see through contaminants. Thus, what we today call "empowerment" is somewhat related to developing skills with regard not only to seeing through contaminants, but to perceiving their functioning dynamics.

*

In this light, it can clearly be understood that if one's cognitive routes to one's own superpower faculties are cluttered with unrecognized contaminants, then one should not be surprised that one's superpower faculties might fail to activate.

*

By way of analogy here, if one's radar or sonar scanning systems, or one's computer hardware and software, are cluttered with unrecognized contaminants, the one will have to be content with products that are a mix of contaminated functioning. This is more or less in keeping with the very ancient adage that what goes in also comes out -- at some point, anyway.

*

Even if one manages to activate a superpower faculty in the midst of unrecognized contaminants, the combined, the frustrating mixed result might not be very spectacular -- IF there is a result.

There are two essential, or principal aspects of these critical implications. The first of these is easy enough to articulate.

It has to do with the first and second pathways, as already mentioned, that can lead to fuller understanding and development of the superpower faculties.

*

The first pathway, the preferred one, has to do with obtaining information and knowledge about the superpowers, with the expectation that if such is taken on board then proficiency and efficiency regarding the superpowers will result.

But! One aspect of this first pathway few realize exist is that one also has to learn how to negotiate one's way through all of the information and knowledge available.

This is to say that if the REAL, so to speak, information and knowledge is not negotiated through in some proper way, then it is unlikely that any crucial alignment will take place within the mental information processing grids of individuals, groups, or societies.

*

If and when one realizes that it is necessary to enter into the second, less preferred pathway, in order to discover what deterrents consist of, one is then faced with the same problem of negotiating one's way through the deterrents. But to achieve anything of the kind, one first has to find out and recognize what the deterrents consist of.

*

All of this is the same as saying that one cannot negotiate one's way through anything unless one can learn to identify what it is that one is supposed to negotiate through. Thus, for example, if one is obliged, for some reason or another, to negotiate one's way through a MESS, one can no longer treat the mess AS a mess. One has to break it apart, break it down, into its recognizable constituent elements -- this in order to perceive how to negotiate through it.

*

And here, rather inadvertently it seems, is revealed the most efficient and workable way to institute, apply and manage misinformation and disinformation: i.e., to make such a mess of something (such as the superpowers) that few will ever be able to negotiate their way through it.

Contaminants as "Noise" -- "Noise" as Contaminating -- Contaminants and "Noise" as Virus of Mind

Having said this much, it is now necessary to attempt to distill and clarify what, for example, correct and incorrect information add up to regarding the superpowers. This is best done via a kind of chart:

"SIGNAL"	"NOISE"
Correct Information -- versus	Incorrect Information
Information -- versus	Misinformation
Truth / Facts -- versus	Lies / Deceit

Valid Directions -- versus	Invalid Directions
Uncontaminated -- versus	Contaminated

All of the above equate to...

SIGNAL versus NOISE

*

Thus, regarding the first, and more enthusiastic pathway of learning, one hopes to get onboard and negotiate one's way through SIGNALS.

Regarding the second, and less enthusiastic pathway of learning, one hopes to negotiate one's way through NOISE, so as to be able to identify and circumvent it -- or, with something akin to high hopes, eradicate it.

The Signal-To-Noise Ratio

Perusers of this website will already have come across an [essential essay on the Signal-To-Noise Ratio](#) already placed herein some time ago.

But for easy reference here, NOISE refers to whatever distorts, interferes with, or obscures "SIGNALS." In giving definitions of NOISE, most dictionaries indicate "an unwanted signal in an electronic communication system, or whatever is spread by rumor or false report."

For our purposes here, NOISE and contaminants are roughly the same if the results of them are taken into consideration.

*

SIGNAL refers to a detectable quality or impulse by which messages or information can be transmitted efficiently, clearly or unimpeded, or to whatever constitutes a characteristic feature of something.

*

In its original sense, the concept of the Signal-To-Noise Ratio admittedly is drawn from problems of electrical engineering.

But the Ratio has also, and quite appropriately, been extended as entirely workable into

the realms of information theory and communications.

But even so, the Ratio is easily taken into other areas of activity themselves characterized by topics, subjects, or environments that possess constituents of information, misinformation and disinformation.

*

In the largest sense, then, we might be talking of humanity, of our species -- certainly of its sociological patterns, and of the competitiveness which might be the chief hallmark of ours species, with the ability to think coming second.

*

In computer lingo, the Noise part of the Ratio is often the principal constituent of GIGO -- i.e., garbage in, garbage out.

*

The point of possible enlightenment being led up to by all of the foregoing is that a noisy information and sensing system, whatever it is, probably will produce noise. And so if we now consider that the superpower faculties are SENTIENT systems that deal with identifying certain signals among billions of all possible signals, then we can grasp the concept that if the superpower faculties might not function well if inundated by or overwhelmed with noise.

*

This is then to say that if one wishes to activate one's superpower faculties, one is ALSO equally obliged to learn to identify signal AND noise. And so it can be considered, hypothetically at least, that the superpowers constitute an arena of human functioning where noise is just as important as signal. Therefore, if one wishes to attempt to activate their superpowers, from the ground up one must become just as much a noise expert as a signal expert.

*

In this regard, now somewhat obvious perhaps, one cannot hope to get very far regarding the superpowers by following only the first, and most preferred pathway. You see, and somewhat metaphorically speaking, the superpower faculties "inhabit" both the signal and noise universes.

*

Indeed, the aligning of KNOWN knowledge and information so that others can benefit from it is the dominant basis of most Earthside educational formats. If new discoveries come about, then these are incorporated into the prior existing knowledge base.

When, then, people want to learn something about the superpowers and how to develop them, they usually attempt to utilize the first and preferred learning pathway either as self-learning or taught learning.

*

However, something enlightening can be said about the first and preferred pathway: That it works and succeeds best with regard to whatever falls into any kind of physical parameters, or with regard to human activities which in large part involve physical aspects. The principal reason why the first pathway works best regarding physicality is that physical stuff, being the stubborn stuff that it is, sooner or later provides its own reality checks.

Physical stuff is also suggestive of its own rules and laws, and which scientists set about to discover some time ago. But even if the average person doesn't grok the laws and rules of physicality, they can nevertheless learn a lot merely by trial and error -- and which is what most scientists have learned from, too.

*

Now, there are quite a number of human activities regarding which outside physical variables do not provide easily accessible reality checks.

One of those activities is THINKING per se. And thinking is perhaps the biggest of the big time activities of our species after competitiveness.

If there is not some outside variable, usually physical, against which human thinking can experience some kind of reality check, then the human thinker has to attempt to self-identify such reality checks.

*

And with this we come up to a rather amusing situation, but one of large dimensions and import, that needs some discussion. This discussion, however, will be postponed until after certain other topics have been addressed.

The following essay in this Section will attempt to deal with the topic of power structures within contaminants and noise.

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (01Mar98)

PART 5: SENTIENCY AND SENSITIVITY

During the last twenty-eight years, one of the questions most commonly asked of me had to do with what people might read or study that would help them develop their "psychic powers."

If I was in a sardonic mood at the time, I'd point up that a great deal has been written, and most of which is very interesting. None the less, the undeveloped psychic powers, in any activating sense, have stubbornly remained more or less undeveloped.

In other words, the great heap of the whole that has been written and studied has not yet resulted in the world becoming thickly populated with developed superpsychics.

AN ADMITTEDLY FRUSTRATING ISSUE

If one observes this frustrating issue as calmly as possible, it would appear that there is some subtle difference between reading and studying about the powers on the one hand, and the actual, real-time activation of the powers on the other.

That one can read and study (even undergo some kind of training) and still not have their superpowers activated can easily be interpreted as evidence that the powers don't exist in the first place.

IN-PUT OF INFORMATION/OUT-PUT OF PROFICIENCY

People automatically expect to positively benefit from what they read and study. Indeed, the way that teaching and learning have been institutionalized in the modern West leads one to assume as much.

One of the most central computations of Western styles of teaching and learning is based on providing the intellect with organized formats of information, usually in step-by-step ways -- after which various states of competency can be expected to manifest.

In other words, the Western styles of teaching and learning postulate that there is a direct and automatic relationship between in-take of organized information and out-put of competency and efficacy.

There can be little doubt that this in-put/out-put schematic DOES yield high results in very many areas of endeavor -- so much so that it is taken for granted that it will work regarding all things.

But one verifiable fact about this schematic is that it works best where some kind of rote learning is involved. It doesn't work very well, or not at all, where, for example, creative development is involved.

One of the major, but subtle, constituents of rote learning is that the in-put proceeds via organized in step-by-step ways that do not require the in-put information to be recombined. Indeed, the efficiency of rote learning can easily suffer if it is messed about.

One of the major, but subtle, constituents of creative learning is that the elements of all in-put information need to be recombined -- to the degree that if not then creative manifestations might be very minimal.

In other words, creative learning involves high mobility of recombinant factors -- whereas rote learning generally does not.

There is no intended attempt here to imply anything negative about rote learning. The intent is simply to indicate that two different areas of learning activity do exist. In fact, an important third category of learning also exists -- but which will be addressed in other forthcoming essays.

RECOMBINANT INFORMATION

RECOMBINANT is a term principally arising out of genetic studies, and refers to "the formation of new combinations of genes via cross-overs through fertilization."

In the sense of information theory, then, recombinant refers to the formation of new combinations of information via cross-overs through what may best be called "inspiration."

An important characteristic of rote learning is that all information specifically meaningful to the learning is identified and included in the teaching-learning package. This is to say that rote-learning is pre-packaged, and does not require cross-overs. In fact, the efficiency of the rote learning completely depends upon this.

The chief characteristic of creative teaching and learning is two-fold: it breaks apart various categories of pre-packaged information in order to recombine the manifold elements; and it also recombines those elements with cross-over information best acquired by original deduction and/or "intuitive insight."

But there is a quite large problem involved with creative learning.

This has to do NOT with what information IS available to be reintegrated into new formulations.

Rather it has to do with the absence of information whose participation is needed to help in cross-over fertilizations -- and thus to achieve effective levels of functioning.

For example, if it chances in genetic recombining that the genes responsible for eyes, ears or genitals somehow drop out of the cross-over fertilizing process, then the resulting product will not "develop" those important organs.

It can easily be said that activation of any of the superpowers falls into the creative type of teaching and learning. But it could benefit even from the pre-packaged rote type of learning -- IF that type included all that was needed to aid in effective cross-overs of recombinant information.

THIS database is somewhat filled with categories of information that are nowhere included in the typical rote-learning concepts of "psychic empowerment."

The function of this particular essay is to introduce yet another set of information that has fallen into absence not only with regard to the substance of this database, but with regard to just about any kind of awareness and thinking.

SENTIENCY & SENSITIVITY

This information has to do with SENTIENCY from which various levels of SENSITIVITY are dependent. The concept of sentiency has, as it might be said, more than almost completely vanished within all modernist contexts. Indeed, there is no rote learning package regarding "psychic development" that even mentions the term.

But it can surely be said that if one wishes to develop any of their superpower faculties, it must be taken

for granted that unless one expands or extends their sentiency thresholds not much is going to happen.

To be effective, however, the vital topic of sentiency needs to be entered into rather obliquely at first.

"DOORS" OF SENTIENCY

The development or enhancement of any human faculty appears to be almost completely dependent on two primary factors.

It is somewhat difficult to articulate the more exact nature and elements of the two factors -- largely because of a lack of concepts and terminology that would be precise enough to reduce ambiguity and induce clarity.

However, we can utilize the device of a metaphor to help arouse at least a general, if still quite gross, recognition of the two primary factors.

Thus, the two factors might approximately be described by leaning on the metaphor having to do with "doors" of perception, and which indirectly carries a four-fold connotation:

- (1) whether the doors are open;
- (2) whether the doors are shut;
- (3) what opens the doors;
- (4) what keeps them shut.

However, although this "doors of perception" metaphor is suggestive, it has something of a passive quality -- if compared with another useful metaphor: that of a sentient dynamo.

This additional metaphor again can carry four-fold connotation, to wit:

- (1) whether the sentient dynamo is on line and working;
- (2) whether it is off line and closed down;

(3) whether it has been kept well-oiled and in good working order;

(4) whether it has been shut down, allowed to rust, or has been wrecked by any number of wrecking possibilities.

In the sense of these metaphors combined, the two primary factors that can lead to development and enhancement of human faculties concern whether whatever is involved is: (1) open and active; or (2) closed and shut down.

However, these two metaphors, although useful, still don't quite incorporate two additional nuances that are entirely meaningful. These nuances have to do with how the faculties (whatever they are) have been treated within larger-picture sociological scenarios, circumstances or environments people find themselves.

SOCIAL VECTORS

In the sense of such larger-picture situations, one will always encounter the phenomena of tolerance-intolerance, and the phenomena of constructivity and destructivity.

In the sense of all of the above combined, the two primary factors regarding development or enhancement of any given human faculty can roughly be identified as:

The human faculty:	The human faculty:
Constructively dealt with.	Destructively dealt with.
Open.	Shut.

On line, producing	Off line, closed down.
Tolerated.	Not tolerated.

Here we now see two line-ups which seem easily recognizable as the traditional dichotomies of:

good vs. bad

pro vs. con

positive vs. negative

THE VANISHMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF SENTIENCY

One of the most fundamental constituents of our species is that it is a sentient one.

Indeed, the existence of our sentience precedes any and all concepts that become possible because of it -- such as awareness, consciousness, sensitivities of all kinds, perception, and last, but not least, powers of ANY kind.

None of these can exist in the absence of the fundamental foundations of sentience.

If this is understood, then it is rather mystifying to find that discussions regarding sentience and its awesome potentials are so minimized as to be nil in such important studies as science, philosophy, religion, creativity, and empowerment.

By far and large, this can only mean that the vital issue of sentience has been plunged into such intolerance that it figures not at all within anything -- to the degree that it is not even **RECOGNIZABLE** as the vital topic that it obviously is.

Sensitivities of all kinds download from species-generic sentience. But sensitivities can be "contained," as it were, by societal strictures -- meaning social systems can determine what sensitivities are permissible or not permissible. This is to say, that the extent and functioning of sensitivities, both quantitatively and qualitatively are linked to various social perspectives.

But sentiency, as a species-wide generic phenomenology, can, by THAT its very nature, easily prove to be trans-societal, trans-cultural, and trans everything else as well.

That this observation might at first seem odd is to be expected -- but only because the topic of sentiency has never been opened up, while various social maneuvers have closed down any approaches to it. Thus, although the term can be found in dictionaries, it is not in common parlance -- except in some science fiction movies.

As a result, inhabitants of various societies might feel they have sensitivities. But that they are also a sentient life-unit can be quite alien within their thinking processes, and within any rote-learning or creative enhancing activities.

SENSITIVITY

However, since various formats of SENSITIVITY are experienced far and wide, it is useful at this point to refresh the major WESTERN definitions in order to clear the way to a consideration of SENTIENCY.

SENSITIVITY:

Receptive to sense impressions;

Subject to excitation by external agents;

Readily fluctuating;

Capable of indicating or reacting to minute differences or qualities;

Readily affected or changed by various agents, or by exposure or proximity to external factors" -- such as, for example, social tolerance and intolerance.

If the above definitions of SENSITIVITY are correlated with various human faculties and activities, we can plot the faculties along a spectrum ranging from less sensitive to hyper-sensitive.

And so we can begin to spot, hypothetically, two general kinds of human faculties that are identifiable,

so to speak, by their internal apportionment and need of sensitivity.

This is to say, then, that those human faculties requiring the LEAST amount of sensitivity will probably develop and survive come Hell or High Water. Thus, in each society there will be found, so to speak, a sensitivity norm which can be treated with the aplomb of tolerance -- because it IS the norm.

It would be somewhat recognizable, then, that those human faculties needing the least quotients of sensitivity skills are those that tend to be most precisely well-developed among our astonishing species.

However, if we move along the spectrum or scale of faculties needing increasing sensitivity, we can begin to enumerate faculties that are dependent upon a high-signature of sensitivity.

It would be unarguable that the better functioning of such sensitivity-oriented faculties depend on increasing quotients of sensitivity skills.

Thus, as we move along the spectrum of human faculties, we can begin to recognize faculties that need higher or larger sensitivity development and support.

PANORAMIC SENSITIVITY

Finally, we can encounter faculties that absolutely need what might be called "panoramic sensitivity" if they are to function AT ALL.

And among such panoramic sensitivity faculties we would itemize the superpower faculties -- almost all of which are understood to be not only hyper-sensitive, but omni-sensitive.

But the ideas of panoramic, hyper- and omni-sensitivity draw increasingly close the extremely wide scope of our species-generic sensitivity.

Indeed, it can be assumed that most of the superpower faculties are those particular faculties somehow DESIGNED for omni- and panoramic sensitivity.

THE LACK OF RESEARCH REGARDING THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF SENTIENCY

A rather exhaustive search for documented modern research into the nature and functions of sentience reveals something akin to a vacuum -- a research vacuum apparently so ingeniously engineered that hardly anyone notices it.

Some work along these lines was attempted during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth. This seminal work, however, was not pursued much past 1932. And so it can be said that our sentient species does not, as it might, research the nature and extent of its sentience or the many fabulous echelons and combinations of them at the individual sensitivity levels.

We might grasp around for an explanation of this vacuum. One explanation might be that various increases of applied and functional sentience have to do with increases in power.

If this explanation is a viable one, even in some small aspect, then the knocking down or wrecking of sentience development in others is seen as a way to eliminate them as power competitors of one kind or another.

In this possible light, the best way to decrease or suppress increases of applied sentience, would be to surround the topic with as much ignorance and ambiguity as possible.

SENTIENCY AND SENSITIVITY AS "SMART SYSTEMS"

In this essay, the concepts of SENTIENCY and SENSITIVITY have, by direct implication, been attached to the so-called "paranormal powers" of our species.

But the assignation of them as "paranormal powers" serves mostly to relegate them into those social auspices that are very nervous when it comes to the "paranormal," and which social auspices are usually very concerned and jittery within anything smelling of power and its "potentials."

In any event, it can prove very useful to re-designate paranormal powers as smart systems.

Of itself, the concept of smart systems is usually nerve-wracking to this or that societal status quo, but at least we have the advantage of FINALLY perceiving what primary sentiency and secondary sensitivities are all about. Clearly, the existence of sentient and sensitivity systems within our species would, in the species master plan, not be designed to make us more stupid.

Much to the reverse, it can be said achievement of stupidity is much more the goal of social systems reductive of the sentient and sensitivity systems. By far and large, stupidity is most often achieved by social systems than by given individuals.

DEFILEMENT OF COMPREHENSION BY NOMENCLATURE

It is useful to examine a bit of nomenclature at this point. The concept of PARANORMAL POWERS is quite sociologically useful -- because it identifies two topics that can be justified as of sociological concern and condemnation and can easily be rejected.

However, societal concerns would be very hard put, even embarrassed, to condemn smart systems -- since there is rather broad awareness in all social systems that smart system are needed, perhaps even merely to survive.

Thus, sensitivity (or certain kinds of it anyway) are accepted, but probably because sensitivities are almost everywhere -- somewhat like the air we breathe. But hardly anywhere are increases in sensitivity taught or supported by mainstream social vectors.

Super-sentiency is not taught, either. There is no perceived need to do so -- because the topic of sentiency itself has disappeared.

S E N T I E N C Y

Most dictionaries define SENTIENT as: "responsive to or conscious of sense impressions, finely sensitive in perception or feeling." There usually is mention of SENTIENTLY as an adverb. These definitions, it could be submitted, are somewhat minimalizing ones -- considering the panoramic factors involved. The term SENTIENCY does not appear in most dictionaries.

There are no main entries for SENTIENCY in the following important psychical research and parapsychology sources:

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF OCCULTISM & PARAPSYCHOLOGY (1978).

HANDBOOK OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY, Benjamin B. Wolman, Ed. (1977).

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHICAL RESEARCH, Berger & Berger (1991).

A short definition of SENTIENCE is found, however, in the PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY compiled by R. J. Campbell (1981): "Mere sensation, apprehension, or cognition, without accompanying associations or affect."

The DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS compiled and produced by the American Psychiatric Association, also has no entry for SENTIENCY or SENTIENCE.

There is no mention at all of SENTIENCY in the otherwise wonderful and extensive ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY, edited by Paul Edwards, and published by Macmillian Publishing Co. (1967). It seems that most other authoritative encyclopedias follow suit.

Although "psychics" were referred to as "sensitives" before they became referred to as "psychics," there is no reference in the Psi research sources to SENSITIVITY per se -- except as an occasional reference to the "exteriorization of sensitivity" analogous to out-of-body experiencing, psychokinesis, telepathy, etc.

Now, it should be said that no Psi function could possibly exist if such functions were not first built upon, or were not extensions of, some form of sentience and sensitivity.

Thus, if we dare to consider that special formats of sentience and

and sensitivity are the horses that pull the cart of Psi and associated perceptions, then we are faced with the somewhat astonishing probability that the cart has been dissected and pulled apart in every possible way.

The horses, however, are thought so unimportant that no one has bothered to study them.

SENTIENCY AND MENTAL INFORMATION PROCESSING GRIDS

Early in this database was placed an essay entitled MENTAL INFORMATION PROCESSING GRIDS -- and within which INFORMATION POINTS were described.

If one is moved to design an information processing grid that might be somewhat functional with regard to the superpowers, the concept of one as a SENTIENT entity could figure as a centrally important information point within the schematic.

All the other phenomena discussed in this database could then be placed in some aspect around this central information point -- and between them all lines could be drawn interconnecting them this way and that.

Humans have a distinct tendency of viewing things through their own inventions. Thus, recognition of the nature of sentiency, and some of its parameters, probably has something in common with sonar, radar, microscopes and telescopes -- and maybe even with the Internet. Such hypothetical possibilities will be elaborated in a forthcoming essay.

(End)

NOTE: If anyone knows of any printed or published sources examining the nature of the sentient being and functions of sentiency, it would be nice to reference them in this database.

Thanks in advance.

TOWARDS ACTIVATING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (26Mar98)

PART 6: "REALITY" PROCESSING VS. RECOGNITION

It would be obvious that what people do or do not recognize as real has something to do with:

- Information contained in memory and functioning in mental information processing grids;
- Capacities for observation;
- World views, ranging from tiny to large;
- Blockages or freedoms regarding information acquisition and processing;
- Interest, ranging from none to a great deal;
- Nomenclature available;
- Socially-determined concepts and knowledge;
- Human nature fluctuations, internal and external;
- Tendencies to constructivity and destructivity;
- Types of fear and courage;
- And etc., etc., etc.

Even so, REALTY has an official definition: "the totality of all real things and events; something that is neither derivative nor dependent, but exists necessarily."

"Exists necessarily" turns out to be a kind of philosophical confabulation the meaning of which is that something exists because it does exist -- the "necessarily" meaning that no one can do anything about

what exists because it continues to do so regardless.

What exists simply because it does exist has always been problematical -- in that no one has ever been able to explain why anything exists. Most people are prepared to accept this, and to get on with whatever.

But certain types of thinkers are not, and some of them can even be antagonistic toward accepting what exists because it does exist. Certain of these kinds of thinkers can flagellate their synapses by attempting to organize reality so that explanations can be offered up as to why what exists because it does exist has the meaning it does by virtue of existing in the first place.

This kind of procedure conveniently obfuscates the basic problem of not knowing why anything exists.

This is a sort of generic philosophical process that usually, but not always, requires that certain existing things NOT be considered - - because doing so clutters up the few aspects of existence that are being considered. This is somewhat understandable -- because no one has ever been able to simultaneously cope with the whole of what exists, largely because no one so far has managed to discover the whole of it.

Besides, during their whole lives most people only manage to espy a few really existing things, never the whole shebang of existence. And from these few things they select only those that have promises of benefiting their own existence, and which itself exists because it does exist. This leaves the conundrum of people not being able to explain the why and wherefore of their own existing.

So this whole affair gets quite complicated -- even more so because, generally speaking, humans don't like complicated things, especially if they are too big.

So to resolve this, a rather dependable way emerged at some point back in history. If limits are placed on reality, then one might never really learn a lot. But the complications of the overly large and apparently endless realities are cut back to manageable size.

Thereafter these reduced complexities are quite likely to be referred to as reality. And if general agreement is obtained about these cut-back realities, then they can be utilized, as in a tall building, as steel-like infrastructure I-beam supports for the enormous social edifices that can be erected on them.

The educational processes within the social edifices then set about teaching what is real, so that upcoming citizens can fit properly into the social edifice.

This procedure has proven entirely workable -- and indeed it does work best if no citizen ever self-discovers any reality, but merely goes with the flow of the social infrastructure.

Thus, most people never need to self-discover a reality, and many can get through life quite well without doing so. But such are the social enclosures in this regard that if one accidentally trips across a reality,

one might not be able to recognize it.

After all, there are hardly any schools that teach what a reality should look like AS a reality. There are schools only to teach WHICH reality should be seen or not seen.

In any event, even if all of the above didn't exist because it does exist, reality recognition is an arduous affair. So it's not unusual for one to accept a reality simply because someone else says it is one. This saves one the bother and the struggle of having to spot realities. If the reality gets into print, then it is broadly accepted as real because the print exists because it does.

One of the not entirely unanticipatable outcomes of all this is that realities slip and slide around a lot, often resulting in a moody sense of insecurity as if one can't really figure out what's really going on or what's really happening.

The whole of the foregoing has been rather sardonically elaborated in an attempt to suggest (1) that trying to determine what reality consists of is the realm of spin doctors and usually a messy polemical affair; and (2) that such is not a profitable way to proceed if one wants to get anywhere -- at least in some profound sense.

In any event, if one can't RECOGNIZE realities even if one chances to trip across them, then the whole polemical edifice of trying to determine what they are, what they consist of, is more or less a safari leading to that thickly fog infested land called Nowhere.

IF seen in this light, then the problems attendant upon the nature of recognition ITSELF somewhat take priority over the problems of reality. And this would especially be the case regarding any proposed activation of the superpowers of the human biomind.

Indeed, if one can't recognize what is to be activated, or recognize what perhaps has already been unknowingly activated, then arrival at the misty fogs of Nowhereland draw closer and closer.

In the sense of the foregoing, then, it is somewhat amusing that the modern sciences, philosophies, or psychologies have paid no attention to the phenomena of RECOGNITION.

Since there is somewhat of a vacuum in this regard, there is nothing from them that might resemble a trickle-down effect into the observing-sensing processes of "the masses."

But like all cultural vacuums, this particular one is unnoticed because it is the nature of vacuums not to be noticed -- even though they, too, exist because they do.

In the sense of all of this, then, although the nature of recognition might at first seem far removed with

regard to any desire to activate any of the superpowers, even a brief discussion of the nature of recognition should take its authentic place within all the other factors pertinent to the superpowers.

Indeed, it is possible to hypothetically suggest that recognition might well be among the most CENTRAL CORE factors involved.

RECOGNITION

RECOGNITION is officially defined as "knowledge or feeling that an object has been met before."

However, why recognition is linked only to objects is somewhat of a mystery -- because any simple, raw experiencing of recognition extends into other factors.

So, for the inclusive purposes of this database, this definition can be extended to include not only "objects," but also subjective and qualitative experiencing.

Indeed, recognizing the qualities of objects and subjects goes hand-in-hand with the recognition of objects, and which often cannot be recognized in the absence of their qualities.

As but one example, if the qualitative distinctions between glass and diamonds are not recognized, then the meaning value of both would be somewhat the same.

However, in an ideal or altruistic sense, the official definition is logical. But difficulties arise when it is understood that what has been met before has also been responded to in some way, specifically in that some kind of meaning has been attached to what has been met.

In this sense, if what is recognized is taken to be meaningless, then it is usually consigned to the landfill of the meaningless. In this regard, the human species has a rich tradition of assigning meaninglessness to objects and realities that often turn out to be quite meaningful.

In any event, it is so far possible to recognize that recognition is already composed of not one but two factors, the second consisting of meaning. Indeed, if meaning of something is not recognized, then the something itself may not be recognized.

RECOGNIZE is said to be taken into English from the Latin RE + COGNOSCERE -- the Latin

combination meaning "AGAIN to know." The direct implication is that one cannot know again unless one has known in the first place.

But the use of KNOW in this sense is superlative, when what is actually meant is EXPOSED to, often without KNOWING and which requires making sense out of what one has been exposed to.

Here we have but a hint that recognition is most likely a tricky business -- so tricky that philosophers have elected not to become involved in it.

However, and moving bravely on, it can be said that meaning has to be attributed to things to be recognized -- because in large part the things do not have signs on them itemizing their many possible meanings -- and, in fact, have no signs at all.

In the sense of our species, then, it can be said that meaning-making is a reality phenomenology of our species that exists because it does exist -- while, at the same time, no one has yet understood the whys and wherefores of its existing. The only thing known somewhat for sure is that each specimen born of our species is equipped to be some kind of a meaning-maker.

With regard to the nature of MEANING, here we ARE on traditional philosophical territory.

ENCOUNTERING THE CERTAINTY/UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE

Even well before the modern period, philosophers had somewhat sorted out the fact that two basic kinds of meaning can be established: (1) meanings that increase certainty; and (2) meanings that decrease it.

Both of these meaning criteria can be extended to things, subject's qualities, and experiencing -- and lead to their recognition either which way.

In this sense, it can be postulated that reality, things, etc., are not first recognized for what they ARE, but whether they contribute to certainty or uncertainty.

This is all well and good, of course. But it can be observed that approaches to whatever increases certainty are well laid out and demarcated and achieve social support. However, whereas approaches to whatever increases uncertainty (such as the not yet known) don't achieve much in the way of social support.

RECOGNITION VIA THE BASIC TWO-FOLD MEANING DYNAMIC

The two-fold MEANING dynamic can be very clear here, at least hypothetically speaking.

Exposure to something that is suggestive of an increase in certainty will be responded to via that meaning.

Exposure to something suggestive of an increase in uncertainty will be responded to via that meaning.

As a third category of meaning response, if something is encountered which can not be recognized as fitting into either of the two above categories, it is usually considered to be of questionable, even potentially dangerous, merit -- and is usually shot on the spot.

It would be quite clear in this regard that these two generic kinds of responses are entirely relative to situations and circumstances. But in the larger species-wide picture sense, these two responses have a great deal to do with how realities are recognized and responded to.

In a certain sense at least, it must be assumed that information or data one is exposed to does not equate to recognizable knowledge UNLESS meaning can become attached.

Even modern philosophers have often said that the meaning-less is not knowledge. If this is carried to the social extremes it usually is, the implication is that the meaning-less cannot be recognized as knowledge.

This is rather straightforward so far as it goes. But an attendant implication is that one cannot recognize the meaning-less -- because there is nothing there to recognize. Thus, one can not encounter it AGAIN, or meet with it AGAIN.

This is not completely a matter of obscurant double-talk. It simply means that if one encounters something dubbed as meaning-less, the one will have trouble in recognizing it when one DOES encounter it AGAIN.

Indeed, this concept was one of the earliest officially stated reasons for the philosophical and scientific mainstream rejection of psychic stuff. Even if there was the mere chance that psychic stuff -- such as clairvoyance and telepathy -- really existed, it was meaningless since it had no real uses.

The illogic of this dismissive attitude is obvious, of course, and seems to have been based on a very low

order of imaginary capacities. Behind this, however, can be detected something that appears to have been more than a hint of a certainty that developed Psi would increase the uncertainty of established social orders. The superpowers have always been accompanied by this troubling aspect.

REAL

At this point, briefly touching on REAL can't really be completely avoided -- but only with the continuing proviso that nothing in this database is to be taken as an attempt to established any reality.

But in the sense of this essay, certain things might be recognized as constituting hypothetical approaches to the real.

The modern definition of REAL holds that it is "of or relating to fixed, permanent, or immovable things apparent in fact, and [as we have seen earlier] necessarily existent." This definition really should be extended to include phenomena -- largely because phenomena as well as things exist because they exist.

One of the more interesting aspects of REAL was that it was not introduced into English until the late 1400s (a rather late date, all things considered.)

In the late 1400s, however, the Oxford Dictionary of the English Languages offers says that the early meanings were "indistinct."

It was only in the later 1500s that REAL began to be used more or less as we try to do today.

The term was derived from the Late Christianized Latin RES (meaning thing), but was said to be akin to the very much earlier Sanskrit RAI (not meaning thing, but particular qualitative essence).

Regarding this, then, something like 5,000 years of human history seems to have gotten on without the term REAL as we define it today -- and one wonders how things were managed without this concept.

In any event, we today are irrevocably plugged into this term, because at the bottom line of everything it

is felt necessary to establish the reality of all things -- and very much depends on the success or failure of this idea.

Rather exhausting examination of REAL can ultimately reveal that, like recognition, there appears to be two major categories of THE REAL. For efficiency here, these can best be illustrated by a diagram rather than by verbal exposition.

The REAL contingent upon known facts	The REAL contingent upon experiencing
--	--

..

. Whereas both converge .

. on .

. RECOGNIZE .

..... REALIZE

..

TO MAKE REAL OR APPARENTLY REAL

In sense of the above, then, we could say that REAL and REALITY are contingent or relative only to some kind of unfoldment process having to do with recognition, the nature of which is imploded into some kind of culturally-avoided vacuum.

But even so, that our species is multi-tiered regarding recognition of anything and everything can, by now, seem apparent.

Based on this discussion, certainly only hypothetical, two trend-like phenomena can sometimes (but not always) be observed.

1. What is experienced as real by some is sufficient enough to them;
2. What is thought real because of known facts is considered by others to be sufficient for them.

Both of these major categories, however, have significant complications:

1. Real experiencing is often not contingent upon known facts;
2. Factual reality has to undergo change when new facts are brought to light, and so factual reality is itself not contingent upon known facts.

One is then justified in wondering what role "known facts" play regarding anything.

Well, for one thing, they represent the perceived margins between certainty and uncertainty -- and which is the most obvious reason why large segments of social strata place conviction not only IN them but with regard to their necessity.

And it is this that gives recognizable substance to the hearty resistance toward new real facts if they are of such a nature as to radically destabilize old real factual bases.

Thus, it can be seen, if only in vague contours, that the matter of RECOGNITION plays an important role within any approach to activating the superpowers.

However, each aspirant along these lines will have to mull this over within their own reality tents than house their own realities -- some new emphasis being on the dynamics of recognition, a matter regarding which few, if any, have hitherto paid much attention.

(End)

SMALLER PICTURE VS BIGGER PICTURE

Ingo Swann (06Oct98)

PART 1

PREPARING THE "MIND" TO INTEGRATE WITH SUPERPOWER FUNCTIONS

One of the questions most frequently asked has to do with How Can One LEARN to be "psychic," or learn to manifest some particular aspect of Psi-Superpower phenomena.

This is the famous "How To" question. On its surface, it seems a perfectly logical one. And so in answer to it, people expect to be guided to some kind of tutorial studies that will present a learning process in some kind of organized, step-by-step fashion.

Thus, a Market for such kinds of tutorial studies comes into existence, with the result that entrepreneurs and opportunists design study and instruction programs that encourage people to variously invest time, effort and substance.

Types of the tutorial programs vary, but they range from rather long-term studies involving philosophic

and metaphysical concepts to rather short-term efforts that might involve six easy steps.

The quality of the offerings ranges from quite high-minded sincerity down to and including some rather tawdry programs and not a few scumbaggy mishmashes.

As it is, then, beginning especially about the middle of the nineteenth century there has accumulated a large, multifaceted and continuous history regarding this kind of thing. However, that particular history is not recognized as existing by the mainstream, while the mainstream also does not recognize the real existence of the superfaculties involved.

In another sense, the history is also composed of variegated and eclectic factors. They range from proposed tutorial methodologies and approaches drawn from Western and Eastern mysticism, occultism, and spiritualism. Some are drawn from inspired and other-worldly sources, creativity and self-improvement studies, concepts established by esoteric and exoteric gurus, various cultic avenues, and so forth. Large portions of the history are quite complicated, while other portions consist of over-simplified pap.

Additionally, the whole is laced through and through by combinations of glamour, hope factors, charismatic sales pitches and high expectations, and it is not unusual to encounter pompous posturing and so forth. Thus, the history is quite dense and it is exceedingly difficult to work one's way through it and make any clear-cut evaluations.

But it is relatively safe to say that the number of such tutorial attempts that have COME along is equal to those that have GONE along -- and among the combined results of their coming and going is a somewhat obvious absence of achieved superpower activation.

This is almost the same as saying that a great number of efforts intended to produce positive results have only yielded something of an extended chain of empty ones.

The first and seemingly most logical interpretation of this is that the failure rate is high among various kinds of superpower tutorials -- because the fault is with the tutorials.

There can be no question that this is sometimes the case. But if one steps back from this accusative interpretation in an attempt to achieve a broader overview, it can begin to seem quite odd that ALL the tutorials seem mostly to demonstrate failure rates.

After all, why should all of them incorporate failure?

During the early 1960s, this writer was inspired to research the so-called "green thumb" phenomenon many demonstrate with regard to growing and nurturing plants. Although this phenomenon is usually

considered beneath serious interest, it is none the less a quite remarkable one.

As it was, this green-thumb effort extended into a larger study of the intuitive aspects of farmers, and into the wisdom-lore of farming as well. Within that lore can be found the ancient axiom having to do with perfectly good seeds falling into inadequate or unprepared soil -- after which nothing will happen regarding any growing.

In this sense, the fault is not with the seeds, but rather with what they fall into.

By analogy, this ancient axiom can be transliterated with regard to all kinds of superpower tutorials. The tutorials can be likened to the seeds. It is expected that the tutorials will fall into "something" wherein they will "grow" and produce their products.

If the sense of this is grokked, then one might study How To configurations. But if the ground the configurations fall into is inadequate or unprepared, then nothing (or at least not much) will happen.

On average, most assume that merely learning about something will somehow result in a product. And if this does not transpire, then most also assume that the fault is with the learning.

But in better fact, learning has to fall into and interact with whatever it DOES fall into. If the desired result is not achieved, then the chances are quite good that the learning has fallen into grounds inadequate or unprepared -- fallen into grounds that cannot really accommodate or nourish the seeds.

One of the common traits found within Western concepts of the mind, as far as study is concerned, is that it accepts anything that can be presented to it in some kind of rote-learning, easy, step-by-step way.

In one way, there can be no doubt that this methodology is a proven process regarding many things. But in another way, it is like the process of painting a picture by the numbers -- and which processes may, but probably won't, awaken far more profound and powerful creativity that are known to exist in all specimens of our species.

In any event, the "mind-ground" that How-To tutorials are expected to fall into is an aspect hidden behind many kinds of tutorials and several learning myths, and often hidden behind the cognitive comprehension of the student as well.

To be sure, this is NOT at all to cast blame or criticism on this or that individual's mind-ground. Rather, it is to establish that a situation exists regarding superpower activation which has been left unexamined and unappreciated with regard to its actual importance.

The fact of the matter, though, is that this kind of situation is NOT all that unfamiliar. Indeed, many fields requiring operative functioning also require extensive preparation of the mind -- and only after which will the operative functioning begin to manifest.

If all of the foregoing is considered as calmly as possible, the question will ultimately arise regarding what a prepared mind actually might consist of.

For this, there is no easy How-To answer conveniently at hand. But it is quite easy to figure out how to make mind UNPREPARED for a great number of things, or to make it unprepared for anything at all.

In this sense, all one needs to do is figure out how to confuse mind, or to shape it so that it functions only in minimal ways -- especially with regard to those two composite cultural items sometimes referred to as "social norms" and "average intelligence."

Here we encounter a principal clue that probably has great relevance to the concept of preparing the mind to interact with the superpower faculties.

In examining the clue, it is important to admit that the concepts regarding social norms and average intelligence are of undeniable importance regarding most societal structures -- since the two combined incorporate the workhorses upon which the stability such structures depend.

But it can be demonstrated (as some of the better sociologists have done) that social norms and average intelligence are themselves incorporated upon or based in "smaller pictures" or "smaller realities."

Of course, one has to deal with and within smaller pictures all of the time. They exist, and so there is no shame in doing so.

But, smaller pictures can be socially engineered, as they sometimes are, so as to exclude, even to forbid, contact with bigger pictures or bigger realities.

The principal clue referred to above revolves around the idea that IF the superpower faculties belong within some kind of bigger picture context, then smaller picture contexts are too limiting and might act as unrealized cognitive barriers to their functioning.

If such would be the case, then minds prepared only with regard to smaller picture contexts might need to add bigger picture contexts in whose soil the seeds regarding the superpower faculties might better take hold and flourish.

The whole of this might at first seem slightly off the wall. But there is exemplary precedent for it, and which can easily be marshaled in support.

One of the longer-term knowledge fall-outs of parapsychology is that ESP, telepathy, etc., fail to

robustly manifest in laboratory settings, but do manifest in real life situations.

Labs clearly constitute smaller-picture situations -- while real life situations almost always have some kind of larger-picture connotations.

The implication here is that while one might know a great deal about scientific methods in a laboratory, one might also not know much about real life phenomena. Therefore, examining real life phenomena might better prepare the mind to interact with them.

With regard to differences between smaller- and bigger-picture scenarios, there obviously would exist very many levels and strata between them. So, there are of course numerous complications that can arise in discussing them.

But as a general rule of thumb, in their first instance bigger-picture factors refer to whatever can be seen as universal to our species entire -- while most smaller-picture situations incorporate only what is local (non-universal) with regard to segmented parts within our species entire.

It has already been established in other essays that the superpowers of the human biomind are universal to our species. This understanding is based on direct and copious evidence that the superpower elements spontaneously manifest in all human civilizations, historic ages, and in all generations.

The superpower faculties therefore transcend all of the above, and in this sense they can do so only if they are universally inherent in our species itself.

IDEAS about the superpowers do form up in various cultures and societies, of course. But in the sense that the dynamic activities of the superpowers spontaneously manifest in ALL cultures and societies, well, this can only mean that the activities are downloading from the species-universal level.

If the above consideration holds water, then merely adapting one's mind-ground to local (and historically transient) socio-cultural ideas about them might not serve very well.

All one might end up with is some kind of understanding of the socio-cultural ideas, but perhaps very little by way of engineering activation based on any mix of the socio-cultural ideas. In any event, socio-cultural ideas about the superpowers come and go, and certainly do go if they don't bear fruit, so to speak.

If the foregoing is somewhat taken on board, one rather typical response might be to dissect and critique the socio-cultural ideas in order to discover what's wrong or amiss within them.

But the direction here is not to critique, but to suggest that on average smaller-picture understandings of the superpowers probably won't prepare the mind to integrate with phenomena essentially based in larger-picture perspectives.

The most probable solution here (or at least some full part of it) is to patiently identify and consider the bigger-picture perspectives themselves.

Otherwise, the mind prepared to interact only within smaller- picture realities will not become enabled to effect the catalysts and syntheses that are required to make dynamic transitions from smaller-to bigger-picture functioning.

SMALLER PICTURE VS BIGGER PICTURE

Ingo Swann (08Oct98)

PART 2

OUR AMAZING SPECIES AS A BIGGER PICTURE

PREAMBLE

As readers of this website will understand, the whole of its contents are based upon actual research and experience that have spanned at least forty years by now.

A greater part of this research involved endless experimenting and testing in laboratories, and which, at one point, yielded a tutorial-training program that demonstrated a good deal of positive results.

The reasons for achieving positive results need to be entered into and integrated within the line-up of the information contained in this website. In attempting to do so, however, one particular detrimental phenomenon must always be kept in mind.

As with everything that is wonderful, it is always detrimental to synopsise, shorten, and down-size whatever is involved into easy, how-to terms. The process of making things easy to understand has its valid place, of course. But this is appropriate only AFTER all that is involved has been made completely visible or brought to light.

The detrimental part of making things easy to understand is that via the reductionist process of doing so, any number of important factors and nuances usually have to be ejected from the down-sizing line-up. And this reductionist process is especially unrewarding in those cases where a bigger rather than a smaller amount of factors need constantly to be carried in mind.

In this sense, then, BEGINNING a study of something by depending on a down-sized, simplified version of it can easily end up locking the mental processes within the down-sized, simplified version. But this is approximately the same as becoming locked into the peripheries of a smaller picture of something.

In the past, this writer had the opportunity of personally knowing several "natural psychics" and also took the opportunity to study autobiographical out-pourings of others. In addition merely to satisfy my simple fascination with them, one goal was to discover what they had in common within their personality structures.

As I had encountered it during the 1960s, the general consensus in psychical research and later parapsychology was that they had not much in common -- since beyond certain similar egotistical manifestations, their personalities were extremely varied otherwise. Indeed, most parapsychologists had little interest in the personalities of such individuals -- somewhat because the parapsychologists were interested in Psi phenomena, not in people.

One excuse several times given to ME was that the psychics couldn't articulate themselves very well, and so it was impossible to understand what they were talking about.

Well, it is somewhat the duty of researchers to penetrate any surface problems of articulation, and attempt to perceive the person behind them.

The psychics had one important factor in common, and once it is pointed up it is not all that difficult to identify it.

They all demonstrated a wide or large overview of things -- each in their own particular way, of course, but none the less a factor rather consistently present within them as an identifiable group. (This factor will be fleshed out in other essays and chapters in this website. Here, it is only necessary to point it up within the contexts of smaller pictures versus bigger pictures.)

The implication was that their larger overview of things might somehow be associated with their Psi

functioning, and might also contribute to understanding something as to why they were variously alienated from many aspects of the world around them.

As it turned out, the alienation aspect made things easier rather than harder, for it was quickly possible to associate it with a number of entirely respectable sources having to do with social alienation.

One of these, perhaps the enduring best one, was Colin Wilson's very remarkable and enormously acclaimed book *THE OUTSIDER* (1956). In this book (and with articulation so elegant it has seldom been matched), Wilson sets forth the "anatomy" of *The Outsider*.

But he does so not only from the point of view that the outsider is representative of the conventional idea of a misfit, but he also sets forth what the outsider won't and can't fit into.

Transliterating Wilson's observations into the concept-lingo of these essays, the central problem encapsulating outsiders is that their overview of things is bigger than the smaller social pictures they otherwise would be expected to fit into.

Wilson postulated, with some degree of accuracy, that most social environments don't really contain much in the way of visionary elements. He describes this visionary lack as largely down-loading from average mainstream social reluctance to deal with factors that might upset conventional social balances. Wilson's "visionaries" won't and can't fit into the conventions, and thus achieve the status of "Outsider."

Wilson's book was one of the first to focus not only on the so-called psychological "maladjustments" of visionaries, but also to quite thoroughly examine the limiting psychological maladjusting processes of social groupings. It is clearly "suggested reading" for anyone truly interested in the superpower faculties.

Although Wilson didn't employ the concepts of smaller and bigger pictures, these two analogies are interchangeable with his visionary and non-visionary ones.

While the conceptual characteristics of visionaries and psychics might not be exactly the same, they do overlap, and both involve the same problems attendant upon smaller pictures versus bigger pictures.

Here, then, is uncovered the somewhat invisible background noise involving (1) what does and doesn't fit into what; and (2) distinctions between smaller and bigger pictures, and their fall-outs.

By now is uncovered a fatal flaw in the modern, Western concepts of Psi.

Many parapsychologists themselves have acknowledged that the modern evolution of the concepts of Psi and etc., compartmentalized them too narrowly away from the general category of life processes.

But as one might interpret, this is almost the same as saying that the compartmentalization resulted in smaller pictures -- perhaps really tight ones, and which became really up-tight as their overall failure ratio became more and more evident.

In any event, and with all the foregoing now having been stated, if one attempts to utilize a smaller-picture module to train and develop something that actually needs a bigger-picture module, it is possible to say that the handwriting regarding failure is already on the wall.

This can neatly be put another way by invoking the analogies of SYSTEMS, SYSTEMS WORKABILITY, and SYSTEMS FAILURE. (NOTE: A separate set of essays on the topic of systems is forthcoming.)

As a passing observation here, it is not unusual to find topics being dealt with in a certain context -- when, in a bigger reality they actually belong in another context.

For example, in the cultural West, and by broadly accepted definition and understanding, Psi factors have been dealt with as "mental abilities of gifted individuals." Attempts by designing training to trigger the Psi-mental abilities into functioning have not succeeded very much, if at all.

Since such efforts have almost a total failure rate, there is no harm suggesting that Psi factors are not mental abilities, but are systems functions regarding modules of awareness.

If this would be the case, then the situation has to do with identifying and activating the proper module of awareness.

Indeed, mental abilities cannot produce products that download from awarenesses which the same mental abilities don't conceptualize as existing.

This can be put another way. Mental abilities are, of course, wonderful. But that they and their products are based on modules of awareness is quite clear. After all, mental abilities can process only to the degree that various modules of awareness are actively on-going.

Other modules of awareness that have never been activated, or somehow have been stupefied and deadened, cannot contribute anything at all.

All of the foregoing has been discussed in order to help construct a bigger picture regarding the superpowers, and which picture has somewhat to be in place before training in superpower details can proceed toward a success potential. (This particular concept is henceforth to be restated in several ways so as to locate important different nuances that go along with it.)

Returning now to the topic of the natural psychics, it was pointed up that they tended to have wide or large overviews of things.

It was THIS that they had difficulty in articulating, especially if required to do so within the confines modernist psychical and parapsychological concepts and lingo. To my knowledge, no Psi researcher EVER ASKED a psychic to write out their worldviews.

One aspect that downloaded over time from most (but not all) of the psychics I talked with was that they felt that the superpower faculties existed within everyone, but that the faculties did not develop into activity in most.

This was not merely fashionable, democratizing chit-chat on their parts -- in that they could SENSE-FEEL as much in most people they encountered. Their convictions along these lines emerged from their bigger worldviews, not from mere intellectual conditioning.

In the sense that "EVERYONE" was expressed, this of course refers not the vast conglomerate of all people, but rather to Our Species out of which each of us downloads. Indeed, if everyone has the faculties, either deadened or active, then the faculties are inherent in our species.

And so it is within the greater context of our species that we will find the bigger-picture systemic contexts for the superpower faculties.

And thus, we FINALLY arrive in the proximity of the central topic of this essay -- and which is a centerpiece of some kind that reflects through all the contents of this website.

Our Species

As to the topic of this essay itself, although one can easily have an assumption that a great deal is understood about our species, the more basic fact is that what is NOT understood looms like a gigantic fog filled with unexplained mysteries.

For a number of reasons, the existence of the fog is often minimized, one reason being that people don't like to think in terms of fogs. Even so, complications descending out of the fog are real enough.

In order to help penetrate at least a short distance into the fog, one can discern three initial reasons for making the attempt to do so.

(1) A double question can be considered:

(a) whether enhanced understanding of the superpowers (and their functioning) can be found within the contexts of smaller pictures;

(b) whether the superpowers belong, so to speak, within the contexts of a bigger picture that is commodious enough to include ALL aspects of the human species entire.

(2) It can easily be established that neither the existence nor the phenomena of the superpowers are officially incorporated into conventional, modern conceptualizations of our species.

Indeed, without too much effort, it can be brought to light that various forces modulating the conventional concepts work not only to diminish FUNCTIONAL knowledge of the superpowers, but to disenfranchise them as meaningful species attributes.

(3) As already mentioned, modern conceptualizations in large part tend to focus on awful, sicko and unfortunate aspects of our species -- with the result that these are over-emphasized and end up negatively suffusing a larger cognitive understanding of what our species actually consists of otherwise.

By comparison, although the higher, more astonishing attributes of our species are sometimes referred to in some idealizing manner, active pursuit and enhancement of them is rare. One obvious reason for this might be that idealizing might not be completely and effectively based on its real processes and functions.

With the foregoing having been more or less preambled, it can be mentioned that most efforts to describe our species usually begin by rehashing what is conventionally known and/or accepted.

This approach is not without its merits. But in several ways it rather tends to plunge one into limited smaller-picture concepts.

Indeed, if one is up to identifying (or admitting) what is NOT understood (or even known) about our species is quite large compared to what is known, then what is known obviously must constitute some kind of smaller rather than larger possible picture.

Various dimensions of this can best be grasped by considering the following.

One of the unique factors of our species is that it possesses both intelligence and mental faculties sufficient enough to make attempts to explain not only itself, but to explain existence per se.

Many might miss the utterly remarkable nature of this unique factor, especially if their awareness is fixed into lower-order levels where it has little meaning.

But, to the extent that all Earthside species are so far understood, ours is the only one that possesses this quality, and possesses it on a species-wide level.

Furthermore, our species is the only one that has built enormous, even fabulous societal and cultural edifices in this regard.

This unique factor takes on even greater amazement by virtue of a secondary but none the less astonishing fact: that where and when our existing is not really understood, our species entire anyway proceeds to invent or imagine this or that kind of "understanding."

It is possible to consider that ALL invented or imagined understandings along these lines are smaller-picture ones, and this no matter their status otherwise. If this would be the case, then WHAT makes the understandings is a bigger picture than the understandings themselves.

By far and large, conventional pictures regarding the nature of our species usually first focus on the bio-bodies that are thought to comprise it.

There can be little doubt that human bio-bodies are an astonishing example of biological engineering, whether this be natural, evolutionary, artificial, or the achievement of some otherwise unknown something.

Our species also possesses one rather astonishing factor that is seldom identified, much less discussed, but which can easily bring into question all conventional explanations of our origin.

Our species is endowed with elements and faculties far, far beyond what are needed merely for survival Earthside, and even for mere survival of the species itself within Earthside environments.

This is explicitly to say that in its greater collective sense at least, our species is thus strategically over-endowed for the purposes of mere survival. And this aspect lifts our species out of the line-up of all other species which are precisely, directly and brusquely endowed for survival.

This single factor establishes that there is some kind of very great distance between our species and all other Earthside species, and this clearly opens up the question of the actual origin of our species.

Of course, many smaller picture answers to this question have been provided, have had their day and their smaller histories. But, as will be partially discussed in the next essay, all of them have been provided by negating the fact that there is an enormous distance between our species and all others.

For some possible clarity here, most efforts to comprehend our species focus on our similarities to other

species, not on how utterly different our species is from them.

In any event, as a result of being over-endowed merely for survival, our species possess a great number of faculties that it hardly uses. But the essentials of them are none the less replicated from generation to generation, and in each of which signature elements of the essentials spontaneously flare-up, and are experienced.

The real existence of these essentials can easily be determined not only by their spontaneous flaring up.

Not only do the extraordinary essentials spontaneously flare up, but many social subsets of our species recognizably put dampers on varieties of these faculties -- or at least many social workings refuse to endorse and support their functioning -- and which is the same as admitting the existence of what is being denied support and development.

One hypothetical way of conceptualizing the above is to speculate that our over-endowed species could activate 100 per cent of its powers. In fact, thought, many societal norms only encourage utilization of only about less than 10 per cent of them.

But this factoid only heightens what is perhaps one of the greater of all human mysteries.

Why would a species possess faculties that, on average, it doesn't use? In other words, why would the species basis for those faculties have become installed in the first place -- IF they were never meant to be activated and used in the same first place?

Here it must be mentioned that the panorama and peripheries of the above are made somewhat hard to discern and articulate -- because our same remarkable species possesses a number of rather influential small-picture-making attributes that can easily get in the way.

For example, consider the triple penchant for societal reductionism, uniformism, and conformity. Additionally, one might consider the social stabilizing mechanisms having to do with erecting LIMITS regarding proper and improper formats of consciousness, awareness, experiencing and thinking.

All such pseudo-formats of course refer to how human intelligence is to be managed within this or that smaller-picture framework.

As it is, though, the immediately foregoing somewhat serves as small introduction to what is obviously one of the chief and central elements of our species.

This central element has to do with the rather mysterious fact that our over-endowed species does exist on Earthside. But it is principally and unmistakably existing not simply as a biological organism, but

completely and unquestionably existing as a quite remarkable, even elegant intelligence-system.

Indeed, if this aspect is SUBTRACTED from the marvelous bio-bodies, then not only is mere survival of the latter brought into serious questioning, but one can well wonder what would be left over after the subtraction might somehow be effected.

There are, believe it or not, some indications of what might be left over -- in that certain societal systems make efforts to erode and suppress intelligence, thus enabling us at least some insight as to what could be left over.

There is, of course, some confusion as to whether body-system or intelligence-system is the prime factor of the human species.

The human body-system is undeniably astonishing. And it is true that its elements are more clear-cut than the human intelligence-system.

But, it is also quite obvious that both somehow fit within each other, and this factor obviously has some fundamental kind of importance.

However, the nature of the fitting cannot really be achieved via over-emphasis only on the physical body-systems. Even if the physical emphasis would be expanded to its largest degree, still the only thing that would result is one-half the picture -- and one-half a picture is smaller than the full picture to be sure.

Within this confusion, however, the evidence is quite good that human body-system subtracted from human intelligence-system leaves the former flopping about and usually in deplorable, disgusting and sad ways.

Thus, it is possible to assume, hypothetically anyway, that our species intelligence-system attributes constitute its prime principle.

This can be put another somewhat more personal way -- in that it is possible to suggest that WHATEVER specimens of our species might think, it is most likely that they CAN think that is our species prime principle.

But here we indeed run into the first of a series of major problem-situations -- in that our history demonstrates that it is difficult even to approximate what a biomind intelligence-system consists of.

Even to begin getting into this topic, it is necessary to distinguish between:

(1) the inherent existence of the human intelligence-system per se, and:

(2) whatever descends out of it as thought-products.

This distinction is to suggest that the human intelligence-system is a THINKING THING out of which, and because of which, thought-things are produced. In this sense, then, the intelligence-system is greater than what it produces, no matter how much the products are held in esteem.

One important factor that can be noted regarding the above is that many maps have been made of what the intelligence-system produces. But the actual nature and basic configurations of the intelligence-system itself has more or less remained unmapped.

Moving briskly along beyond the above quagmires combined, it is now meaningful to make a distinction about our species which has not been made in the past with any enduring clarity.

This distinction is a subtle one, and has to do with the differences between (1) what our species IS, and (2) what our species CONSISTS OF.

While (1) and (2) can easily be intellectually collapsed into each other and be taken as meaning much the same thing, there are in fact some important nuances between them.

For starters, in the past the concept of our species was assumed to consist of, and be defined by, all physical bodies that could interbreed with each other -- or at least had the potential if not the preference to do so.

This is to say that all human bodies WERE our species in its greater collective sense.

However, an important and concept-shifting nuance regarding this has entered into the overall picture, due to advances in the genetic sciences.

In a more strict sense, and in the first instance, our species is no longer really comprised merely of all physical human bodies, but of the genetic pool out of which each physical-body specimen emerges.

This might be put another way. Our species IS the genetic pool (the GENOME) of our species, of which each individual is a manifesting, down-loading intelligence-system encased, as it were, in its particular bio-format. The particular bio-format is referred to as a GENOTYPE within the GENOME (the entire gene pool).

Technically speaking, and specifically with regard to the genome, each manifesting biomind individual is a quite small part -- if compared to the greater genetic whole which incorporates billions of smaller parts.

As a somewhat grumpy aside here, it bruises the ego of many to consider themselves merely as a manifesting smaller part of the greater on-going genome. However, this psycho-factoid might explain something as to why many biomind specimen members of humanity seldom care to consider humanity as a whole.

Indeed, it can be noted, with some factual accuracy, that the concept of humanity, as traditionally mounted, has always been more idealizing and abstract than functionally meaningful.

One understandable reason for this is that the individual biomind specimens that descend out of the generic genome of our species are not exact duplicates of each other. Each is different in any number of outer surface aspects, and which range along a scale of lesser-to-greater differences.

The differences are more obvious than the species sameness aspects -- since the samenesses (and their extent) are sort of cloaked behind the differences.

Throughout recorded human history, some few astute observers have noticed that the samenesses are probably more important than the surface differences -- if only in that the samenesses are enduring and transcend the generations.

But in large part, the differences are what people deal with on a day-to-day basis, whether these are natural or artificially encoded in social behavior.

Because of this it is not too much to say that the matter of the differences has frequently been elevated (or inflated) to the sometimes giddy heights of philosophical, theological, scientific and sociological importance.

Indeed, in the past this author was told by three important scientists that the study of differences was the principal path toward accelerating progress in understanding the human framework -- and FURTHERMORE, that the study of the samenesses was merely a study in redundancies.

Differences clearly have importance and meaning. But this is no real reason for not undertaking, or for culturally suppressing, in-depth studies regarding the samenesses upon which the backbone of our species is clearly founded.

Here again, if one over-emphasizes the differences, one is dealing in one-half the human picture -- and one-half is a smaller picture than the whole shebang is.

As an aside, though, there does exist one-behind-the-scenes reason why the matter of human differences achieves over-emphasized importance.

Most social structures depend on differences with regard to a number of factors -- one of which is that differences contribute to social stratification, and to the ease the stratification can be maintained even if only artificially so. This may be one reason why our species sameness factors are marginalized, if not completely ignored altogether.

If one delves into the sameness factors of our species, one can easily begin to comprehend that the difference factors are, so to speak, the frosting on the cake while the sameness factors are the cake itself.

At the individual level, one can expect to encounter various kinds and designs of the frosting. But the deeper one goes into the sameness factors, one can begin to discover the central frameworks upon which the species is built, and which ALL specimens of our species directly share in.

A central clue here is that the sameness factors can and do differentiate into various kinds of differences. But by far and large they do so mostly because, as it were, of cultural-social nurture rather than because of all-encompassing nature. There is a saying I read somewhere now forgotten, but easily remembered: "Nature provides; men demarcate among what is provided."

Another clue is that if one begins to become somewhat knowledgeable about our species sameness factors, it is possible to begin comprehending that those factors trend toward the awesome, toward the amazing and the utterly remarkable.

As but one very significant example, all human specimens of our species are born with the language factor. This language factor is operative and ready to function from birth, and infants aggressively begin coping with at some point quite early during their first year.

To speak language is clearly taken for granted, and is usually assumed as representative of one of those "redundant" samenesses that are of little interest.

However, the inherent, or indwelling, language factor is present in all specimens of our species, and thus must be assumed as representative of one of our species prime backbones contributing to the vast distances between ourselves and all other Earthside species.

For additional clarity here, within all social contexts, as different as they might be, the language factor is universally considered as the ability to communicate.

This is obviously the case -- but with one important proviso. The ability to communicate is down-loaded FROM the language factor. It is not the factor itself, and this is now scientifically understood beyond any doubt.

There is quite an awesome story involved here. But little of it depends on what had been understood about languages before rather recent times.

The July 1993 issue of LIFE magazine featured a write-up regarding "The Amazing Minds of Infants." The magazine's cover announced in bold print that "BABIES are SMARTER than you THINK. They can ADD before they can COUNT. They can UNDERSTAND a hundred words before they can SPEAK. And, at three months, their powers of MEMORY are far greater than we ever imagined."

The article itself consisted of a brief overview of what had recently been learned about infants in the research fields of memory, mathematics, language, and physics.

The article is quite short, but liberally laced with thought-stopping statements. For example, in the physics category, Cornell University researcher Elizabeth Spelke "is finding that babies as young as four months have a rudimentary knowledge of the way the world works -- or should work."

Furthermore, "Researchers speculate that even before birth, babies learn how physical objects behave by moving their body parts, but Spelke believes the knowledge is innate."

The concept of "innate knowledge" pre-existing within infants is touched upon with regard to each of the four categories -- even though the modern idea of knowledge refers to having acquired it by experience and study AFTER birth, and then only by kinds of logical reasoning that start concretizing later in childhood.

Indeed, in the modern cultural West, the working definition of KNOWLEDGE is given as "the fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity or understanding through experience or association."

Thus, there is a nervous discrepancy between (1) the definition of knowledge acquired through experience or association, and (2) the concept of innate knowledge.

The discrepancy centers on the definition of INNATE, the first definition of which is "inherent: belonging to the essential nature of something."

A second definition is also usually provided -- "originating in or derived from the mind or the constitution of the intellect rather than from experience or association."

The subtle magnitude of this nervous discrepancy has two major parts, both of which can become visible only to those somewhat familiar with the serious denial, during the modern twentieth century, of innate KNOWLEDGE.

During this epoch, the possibility of innate human instincts was occasionally, although usually

grudgingly, admitted. But the concept of innate KNOWLEDGE was a topic too close to the forbidden topics of inspired, received, clairvoyant, telepathic, intuitive or extrasensory knowledge -- all of these tending to manifest in the absence of experience and association, and even in the absence of logic and reason.

Second, the concept of innate KNOWLEDGE arouses the tremendously complex problem of how and why KNOWLEDGE, of all things, should have been innately installed in the human species in the first place.

Returning to the LIFE magazine article, the squib regarding LANGUAGE was short, but quite a show-stopper.

First, it must be established here that the origin of human languages has always been a very great mystery. During the modern scientific period, it was often pictured that language originated from cavemen grunts and gesticulations -- followed by the concept that over longish periods of time these gradually evolved differently in different parts of the world into many different language formats.

However, according to the LIFE magazine article, something else is involved that can strategically alter the above picture if one takes time to consider it.

The "something else" is that psychologist Patricia Kuhl of the University of Washington in Seattle indicated that from birth to four months, babies are "universal linguists" capable of distinguishing each of the 150 sounds that make up all human speech. (NOTE: UNIVERSAL in this sense means present in everyone.)

During this period, and before they begin learning words, babies are busy sorting through the jumble of the 150 sounds in search of the ones that have meaning. By about six months, they have "begun the metamorphosis into specialists who recognize the speech sounds of their native tongue."

This process of "sorting through the humble of 150 sounds" sounds something like a language analyzer or decoder more than it sounds like a language learning process.

To get at the import of the above, one needs to consider the following with some attention.

That all human languages (Earthside) are made up of 150 sounds has been understood for some time. A fair share of these sounds are utilized to build up the speech sounds of a local language system.

The long-held conventional idea then has it that the babe learns (in-takes, acquires) the sounds by repetitive exposure and practice and begins to duplicate them. The babe is thus seen as learning from external local language factors -- and in this sense languages are local affairs.

Now, from a superficial viewpoint this explains why there are and have been so many different local languages. But it doesn't really explain why language is a universal principle within all specimens born of the human species.

Different local languages constitute smaller-picture aspects of great and awesome language penchant of our species. The information that all languages are made up of 150 sounds helps enlarge the picture. Thus, if the language formats are indeed different in different sectors, the sounds of which they are made none the less constitute a universal language factor that is nigh on identical throughout the species.

That all babies possess some sort of a system that is capable of distinguishing each of the 150 sounds literally means that babes are not principally learning language from external sources, but rather are merely distinguishing which arrangements of the sounds are being spoken external to them.

This is almost the same as saying that babes don't LEARN a language system, but merely recognize which language system is going on about them.

The language factor within the species entire could thus be described as a system of sound recognition that is recombinant regarding at least the 150 sounds all human speech consists of.

It now needs to be emphasized that while languages are different, each human specimen possesses in a same way one of these recombinant sound-recognition systems. Furthermore, in each specimen the system is automatically active at birth, perhaps even before (as some researchers are beginning to suggest.)

One neat way of putting this is that each language is but a software program installed into the built-in hard drive language system that is innate in each individual. The hard drive language system is the same in every one, or at least relatively so.

For the purposes of this series of essays, it could be said that all software programs are smaller-picture kinds of things -- whereas the hard drives that they get installed into constitute rather larger pictures.

Another grumpy observation: regarding this, it rather has to be admitted that all social systems tutor their inhabitants to think in terms of their different smaller software pictures -- and thus it is easy enough to be oblivious to the rather majestic nature of our hard drive capabilities.

Analogous to this, it does need to be understood that smaller pictures ARE smaller not because of what they contain, but what they DON'T contain.

The "universal language" factor of our species is some kind of a example lesson in point here -- in that it

is capable of containing and dealing with ALL human languages (including dialects, etc.) of which there have been many, many thousands. The languages are smaller-picture components of the larger-picture universal linguistic system.

In any event, for the purposes of these essays, it is apparent that our species, in its hard-drive sense, universally is made up of an intelligence system, and which in turn clearly functions in tandem with a universal language system.

However, if we conceptualize an intelligence system, it is possible to conclude that it would need at least two other universal, hard-drive systems in order to be more completely functional: a system of sensing mechanisms, and a system of meaning recognition.

These two additional systems could not possibly be composed only of software programs locally decided upon, but, in some kind of fact, would need to consist of hard-drive factors that incorporates both the species entire as well as all of its down-loading individual specimens.

The REAL universal existence of the (hard drive) meaning recognition thing has been deduced by virtue of studying language in babies.

As psychologist Patricia Kuhl pointed up in the LIFE magazine article, "long before infants actually begin to learn words, they can sort through a jumble of spoken sounds in search of the ones that have meaning."

How meaning recognition works in the pre-verbal level is not as completely understood as is the universal sound thing. This is to say that while all languages might be composed of 150 sounds, the same can't really be said about all meanings.

None the less, the implication is that each specimen of our species has some generic kind of hard-drive meaning-recognition system.

This system functions in tandem with the hard-drive intelligence system, the sensing mechanism systems, and the language system. All four of these supersystems (as it were) can be seen as universal to the species, AND to each individual born of it. And these are very astonishing samenesses, indeed.

The whole of this is quite awesome -- if one can grok it. But the grokking can sometimes be difficult in this regard -- because of smaller-picture interference patterns.

These not only lurk about just about everywhere in societal force-fed kinds of ways, but are sometimes mistaken as big pictures, even if unthinkably so.

If one is interested in learning and development, it is not unusual to suppose that whatever seems to be interfering should be deconstructed and gotten rid of.

Indeed, if the superpowers of the human biomind belong to the universal supersystems and not to some local, smaller-picture concept, then one might undergo the urge to reject, abolish or demolish the latter.

But there is a problem here. Rejecting some smaller-picture thing is itself a smaller-picture phenomenon. It might stretch some mental muscle to consider it, but it can easily be demonstrated that smaller-pictures can universally be identified by what they reject, don't include, omit, jump over, rationalize away, or simply by what is not known within them.

In other words, it is difficult to achieve bigger-picture awareness by following the pathways that lead to smaller-picture constructing.

And here we encounter a somewhat amusing, but none the less great oddity of our species.

Our species is awash in smaller pictures, and many piss and snarl because of it. And so many make rather invidious efforts to trash whatever this or that they consider a smaller picture.

The oddity here is that smaller-picture trashing can be akin to jousting with windmills -- IF one doesn't know much about the criteria for smaller-picture constructing. This is to ask WHY IS a smaller picture a smaller picture -- and how can a smaller picture be recognized as one.

After all, if one wants to escape from anything, one needs somewhat precisely to know what one is desiring to escape from.

SMALLER PICTURE vs BIGGER PICTURE

Ingo Swann (08Oct98)

PART 3:

ATTEMPTING TO IDENTIFY SOME DYNAMICS OF SMALLER-PICTURE FORMATS

If one is to conceptualize any kind of tutorials or training with regard to activating superpower faculties, one has to consider almost from the outset that "reality shifts" are going to be involved.

Two general assumptions in this regard are to be found, and both of them are usually left unexamined and thus not understood very well.

The first assumption revolves around the idea that if the student is presented with organized information regarding the superpowers, then the needed reality shifts will occur within the student.

The second assumption involves the idea that if the needed reality shifts do not occur, then the difficulty lies within the responsiveness of the student.

In observable fact, the two assumptions can be appropriate in most cases where (1) delivery of the organized information is the key step and issue of the training, and (2) IF the organization of the information first and only pertains to factors external to the student.

In other words, adjustments among the student's inner realities (and mental equipment) will somehow take place with regard to incorporating the organized information about the external factors—and needed reality shifts, if they are required, will more or less occur without much further ado.

The whole of this particular concept is centered on the idea that in-take of information alone will result in learning. As mentioned elsewhere in other essays, this type of teaching methodology has without doubt demonstrated its effectiveness. But, it might be added, only within the particular criteria as given above.

This is the dominant concept of teaching-learning in the modernist cultural West, and as such is composed of three aspects: (1) teacher; (2) delivery of organized information about outer factors; (3) student.

However, with regard to activating the superpower faculties, the principal basis of what is involved is, in the first place, NOT external to the student.

So, whereas the existing condition and extent of the student's inner realities can be minimalized in the Western concept, the status of the student's inner realities now takes on essential importance—and does so as a first order of business.

The principle goal of activating the superpower faculties is, so to speak, to ENERGIZE or AWAKEN faculties that already exist within the inner realities of the student, but remain latent or deadened, and thus are non-experiencable within the scope of the student's concretized awareness margins.

The faculties remain latent or deadened because the student's awareness peripheries and inner realities are somehow structured so as to exclude direct cognitive contact with them.

As long as this excluding structuring remains in place, no amount of organized information about the superpowers will serve to go very far.

It is clearly to be realized that there are strategic differences between the concept of inner awakening and the concept of rote learning via organized information regarding outer factors.

It is also to be realized that EACH individual possesses some kind of concretized inner reality structure—and by even superficial observation it can be realized that each individual's inner reality structure is different. And as everyone discovers sooner or later, everyone tends to cling to their concretized realities—and often do so come hell or high water.

One direct meaning here is that each individual WILL process all information through their existing mental information processing grids. Thus, information of any kind, whether external or internal, will be reconfigured to fit within those grids, and what doesn't fit will be excluded and disposed in a wide variety of ways.

Now, one might at first consider the foregoing as alien to all concepts of human learning. But in fact it represents a situation that has been familiar in Asia since antiquity. This is the guru-chela relationship, and which has been translated into Western languages as teacher-student.

But a more exact rendering is guru-awakener, chela-awakenee. The interactive dynamic between them is founded on the understanding that it is very difficult for the chela to self-awaken since the chela is encapsulated within the limits of his or her concretized realities.

Such concretized realities include various kinds of excluding mechanisms that inhibit activation of awareness of WHAT IS outside of the excluding mechanisms. As long as the excluding mechanisms remain in place, what is outside of them will remain non-experiencable and thus invisible.

In the Eastern context, the principle function of the awakener (the guru) is two-fold: to present information about WHAT IS, and to aid the awakenee to become cognizant of his or her particular inner excluding mechanisms and thus transcend

them.

In this sense, there is almost always a one-to-one, and somewhat time-consuming relationship between guru and chela. So how-to presentation of information meant to be in-taken "by the millions" is not really workable in this regard—although such information can serve as extensive background considerations.

One factor that is important in this regard is that in the classical sense the guru clearly recognizes the importance, meaning and value of the chela as an individual entirely capable of awakening to and attaining bigger and more extensive peripheries of awareness.

The express and well-advertised purpose of doing so is to enable the chela to in-take and participate in larger realities—with the important proviso that if the mental excluding factors are not identified and transcended then any "knowledge" of the larger realities will merely remain superficially intellectual.

There now downloads from the foregoing the question involving where and how the mental excluding factors are to be found and identified.

A careful study of Eastern literature in this regard establishes that the major source of the excluding factors is the mental adaptation to local social factors, and which social factors do not take much cognizance of bigger realities.

The essence of this can be transliterated to the concept of smaller pictures versus bigger pictures—in that if the individual is oriented majorly within smaller pictures, then in many a sense the mind oriented in the smaller pictures is not prepared to access into bigger ones.

Indeed, a smaller picture can be identified by what it excludes, and so it is of little wonder that individuals who adapt to them erect inner mental exclusion factors appropriate to whatever smaller picture is involved.

PICTURE

To now begin to get deeper into this, it is worthwhile establishing the definitions of PICTURE. Beyond identifying that a picture is an illustrations of something, most dictionaries give the following:

1. As a noun—"A portrayed description so vivid or graphic as to suggest a mental image or give an idea of something"
2. As a verb—"To form a mental image" or, as might be added, to form a mental concept

It is also worth noting that PICTURESQUE is defined as "evoking mental images."

In turn, EVOKE is defined as "to call forth or summon up; to re-create imaginatively."

Moving a bit beyond the established definitions, a picture is also a FRAME OF REFERENCE: "A set, format, formulation or system (as of facts or ideas) serving to orient or give particular meaning."

A frame of reference also has a FRAMEWORK, this defined as: "A basic structure (as of ideas); a skeletal, openwork, or structural frame."

AN EXAMPLE OF A BIGGER PICTURE UNIVERSAL

Any even minimally competent assessment of the superpowers throughout the world easily establishes that the faculties are found world-wide, species-wide, and as having a transcultural basis.

This transcultural basis implies that the superpowers are

existing in both a generic and a universal sense. And indeed, via comparative cultural studies, some researchers and writers have partially undertaken to examine and account for them in this light.

The concept of "universal" carries a connotation that seems rather consistently to be missed or ignored. "Universal" implies bigger, even the biggest picture. By implication, therefore, the functional basis of the superpowers would seem to belong within that bigger picture.

DESCENDING FROM BIGGER INTO SMALLER PICTURES

At first this might sound like some kind of gobbledygook—until it dawns that something that essentially and dynamically belongs within a bigger picture might not manifest very well, or at all, into smaller-picture contexts.

One perfectly logical reason for this might be that smaller picture activity doesn't actually NEED bigger picture phenomena. This reason has a good amount of evidence behind it.

And so (as will be elaborated throughout this series of essays) it can be shown that bigger picture phenomena are usually EDITED OUT of smaller picture contexts, so as to protect the supposed integrity of those smaller contexts and realities.

SMALLER AND BIGGER PICTURE FORMATS OF AWARENESS AND CONSCIOUSNESS

In any event, one can wonder, for example, how well the superpowers might activate or function in a mind, awareness, or consciousness that is centered or locked into smaller picture contexts.

This kind of thing has something to do with how one's mind has been prepared or set to function.

Out of this, of course, comes the idea of MINDSET—which refers to a mind or a group of them centered or locked into a "picture" which is different from what other minds are locked into.

It is to be noted that the concept of mindsets has positive AND downer connotations, somewhat depending on which mindset is inspecting other mindsets.

Now, it can be said that our species, in the face of its many truly astonishing wonders, is quite excellent at setting up and nourishing small, limited mindsets of various kinds.

It is true that these are somewhat recombinant with each other. But the sum of the recombining still ends up Small and Limited—with the result that it is difficult to fit Universals into them.

Elaborating slightly, from a purely sociological overview, the proliferation of smaller, limited, or local mindsets accounts for the cultural sectoring of our species.

The cultural sectoring accounts, in turn, for the various different and usually conflicting societal formats one tends to encounter if one ventures into something so near as the next county or the next street.

All specimens of our species live within some kind of societal format, while the format in turn has something to do with how the specimens' awareness, consciousness and mind-configurations end up being basically formulated.

How the mind thenceforth functions is probably quite consistent with the basic formulation (often referred to as mental programming.)

THE NATURE OF SMALLER PICTURE

SOCIETAL FORMATS

By far and large, from within itself any societal format seems a bigger picture.

But it can also be shown that societal formats are mostly centered in local realities rather than in universals. And thus the formats usually have more to do with local social set-ups and local environmental factors rather than with species-wide or other generic kinds of universals.

And indeed, not a few social structures are somewhat notorious for expunging generic universals if they don't fit into their particular societal configurations.

If one takes time to reflect on the above commentary, it would thus seem that our species possesses the ironic universal capability of formulating different local societal formats—but that the formats are selective reductions emanating from the universal capability.

This is to say, then, that the reductions are smaller local pictures formulated because of and within the universal capability of formulating them. Grok THAT!

Indeed, anthropological and archaeological studies clearly establish that our species has, during its known Earthside history, formulated hundreds of thousands of smaller picture societal formats.

Most of these have come and gone, as is the on-going case today. The only really permanent aspect of this is our species, and which has the capability of formulating, and eventually disposing of, smaller societal pictures.

Put another way, it might be said that everyone has the capability to manufacture, craft, or construct SMALLER pictures. The reasons for the smaller pictures be might numerous, and indeed sometimes necessary. None the less, smaller IS smaller.

Individual specimens of our species are then formatted (or brought up, as it were) to fit into the smaller local societal formats, not into the larger universals that are generic within our species entire.

RELATIONSHIPS OF SMALLER AND BIGGER PICTURES

If the above can tolerably be considered, at least for theoretical discussion, it would then follow that ALL societal formats, no matter how bigger picture they seem, are actually smaller pictures—including the state, extent and content of their knowledge systems, whatever those might consist of.

Indeed, it is easy enough to demonstrate that knowledge systems can be characterized equally by what they DO NOT CONTAIN as by what they do contain.

Having said thus far, it would then be obvious that smaller pictures might be fitted into a larger picture. Many people are prepared to accept this, especially if they are humanitarian types.

In this context, it's worth pointing up that some of the historical tutorial modalities referred to in Part 1 have consisted of transcultural and metaphysical efforts to mentally or intellectually orient students within bigger pictures that refer to universals.

And it is from within those "enlargement efforts" (so to speak) that increases in the frequency of at least spontaneous superpower phenomena are often reported.

The reasons for this might not be quite clear. But in some sense, it is possible to speculate that bigger picture does have something to do with bigger mind, and bigger mind in turn seems to have something to do with increases in superpower functioning.

In any event, bigger and smaller pictures exist. While we can think that smaller pictures might (somehow) be somewhat fitted into bigger ones, the reverse seems unlikely. It is true that big feet won't fit into small shoes without wrecking the feet and/or the shoes.

To over-emphasize a little, it does seem a universal that small might fit into big with space to spare, but not the reverse. Thus, it could become obvious that bigger pictures won't fit very well into smaller pictures.

There are, of course, many simple and complicated reasons for this—one being that smaller pictures are in the first place usually set up to exclude bigger picture elements. And indeed, the boundaries of many smaller pictures might vaporize if they would be required to integrate universal elements.

Beyond the implications of the above, it is easy enough to comprehend that at various social levels many have interests seriously vested in maintaining the contours of their local smaller pictures—if only to remain, as it were, big frogs in the ponds the smaller pictures represent.

If and where this might be the case, it is understandable that the introduction of universals into smaller picture situations could be seen as troublesome and undesirable.

For reasons that might be obvious, one certainly does not want to antagonize whatever are the pictures set up by any segmented portion of our species—and which anyway is a stressful waste of energy.

But the notion might be entertained, hypothetically, that our human history is the history of its societal and social SMALLER pictures within which all specimens of our species are some kind of disposable and replaceable players.

It is true, of course, that the players are usually arranged along lines ranging downward from the powerful to the powerless. But the "identities" of the powerful and powerless tend to change if the picture configurations that contain them

starts shifting about.

This may be one reason why the powerful of course don't like the picture configurations to change—while the powerless sometimes tend to view such shifts with interest and bemusement.

As an aside, this is an hypothetical situation that emerges in other contexts at various points in this Website. But here it is worth noting that power is usually considered bigger picture. However, whatever is passing for the power is only relative to the size or dimensions of the picture within which it is being "played."

ONE ASPECT OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF PICTURE-MAKING

The usual, even standard, way of dealing with pictures is to attempt to concretize those wanted, and to try to trash those not wanted—and usually by any means possible.

The concretizing and trashing seem laudable within the mindsets locked into the pictures involved. But by far and large, this somewhat reeks of pismire proclivities randomly adrift in the hostile mildew of useless lower order illusionisms. And indeed, as many ultimately discover, any conviction that smaller pictures will maintain for very long is clearly an illusion.

SUMMING UP SO FAR

In attempting to sum up so far, it seems quite clear that big and small pictures do exist, and that there are important distinctions to be made among them.

Roughly speaking, it can be considered that bigger pictures probably refer and relate to universals.

In many a possible sense the smaller pictures refer only to local factors that are not universal in nature, but with one exception. It seems a rather vivid universal factor redolently incorporated into our species to be able to erect smaller pictures—and this could explain why there have been and are so many of them.

Indeed, it is possible to guesstimate that EACH specimen of our species is actually some kind of an individual and individualizing smaller picture, and this in a number of ways. And indeed, the concept of THE individual has its exceedingly important connotations in this regard.

As already mentioned, the usual way of managing WITHIN smaller pictures is to concretize the one desired and to trash others—this at the individual, group and cultural levels, and even at the philosophic, sociological and scientific levels.

The assumption here seems to be that the concretizing will enlarge the one desired and diminish the others. Thus, one can observe, rather frequently, a lot of attempted concretizing and attempting trashing.

The whole of this might be referred to as the Wars of the Smaller Pictures, this whole in turn being a rather stinky, lower-order enterprise that can trickle down into pismire stink replete with scumocracy and slimeocracy phenomena.

To now link back to the contexts of superpower tutorials, the world-wide evidence is quite strong that the superpowers "belong" to some kind of faculties universal to our species.

This seems to place the superpowers within some kind of bigger universal picture. However, the contours and formulations of this have NOT been adequately mapped.

Among the evidence along these lines that can be located and analyzed, it would appear that those individuals who can access, so to speak, universal bigger pictures tend to experience some kind of automatic enhancement or elevation in superpower functioning.

One of the tentative observations regarding the whole of this is that smaller pictures might at first seem far distant and not relevant to the case for superpower activation. Yet, their mindset effects or by-products might easily function as exclusion factors and inhibitors, especially if they are active in some kind of mental sub-awareness levels.

Whether this is the whole case or not, elements of it have obvious relevance to the entire theoretical contexts of any possible activation of the superpowers.

If this is understood for what it might represent, then the spontaneous urge is to reject and escape from the smaller pictures whose limitations might be thought of, and can actually constitute, mental blockages to increases of superpower activation and functioning.

However, long experience has taught this writer that smaller pictures are everywhere, and that it is virtually impossible to ESCAPE from them. Indeed, as was earlier the case with little Moi, one might merely make efforts to jump from one smaller picture to another one, based on the illusion that the latter SEEMS bigger.

Well, who knows for sure. Any motion is better than none at all.

THE STRUCTURE OF SMALLER PICTURES

Some years of study and reflection regarding this Situation suggest that escape from smaller picture confines does not mean avoiding them. Rather, entrapment (so to speak) in smaller pictures is possible largely because one doesn't understand what a small picture consists of in a structural sense.

After all, if one wants to escape a "prison," one needs first to know that it IS a prison, and then to know its layout, its construction, and its ways and means—and possibly even to know HOW and WHY it can and does exist in the first place.

In any event, there are NO studies regarding the topic that might be entitled "Recognition of Smaller Picture Characteristics."

Some few of these structural characteristics (or anatomy) that can easily be recognized without too much intellectual stress will begin in the following essay.

But before jumping into the structural characteristics of smaller pictures, a particular factor now really needs to be pointed up, somewhat bluntly.

On average most people already have some kind of idea about the superpowers—and those ideas are almost certainly derived from within some kind of local, smaller picture concepts.

SMALLER PICTURE vs BIGGER PICTURE

Ingo Swann (14Oct98)

PART 4:

SOME STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SMALLER PICTURES

As alluded to in earlier essays, quite compelling evidence indicates that the superpowers "belong" within a bigger picture that incorporates the whole of our species. The evidence is historical, anthropological and archaeological in nature, although the field of archaeology tends to avoid and smooth over much in this regard.

Additionally, if the existence of genetic memory is entertained, then certain kinds of evidence that otherwise cannot be explained could possibly be acknowledged.

This bigger picture evidence somewhat flies in the face of modernist conventional ideas that the superpowers are merely representative of various social or mental artifacts, and as such have little authentic existence.

However, while it is true that different social formats assign different nomenclature to the various types of superpower faculties, the structural functioning of the superpowers is remarkably consistent on the world-wide species basis.

As but two examples, what we call intuition and future-seeing are found world-wide, even if they are dressed in different

local social metaphor, terminology and lore.

The unavoidable implication is thus quite clear: that the superpowers belong not within finite, smaller-picture social collectives which can be so different in many ways; rather, the superpower faculties belong within the bigger-picture supersystems that demonstrate FUNDAMENTAL or CORE samenesses throughout our species.

Here it is useful to reprise the most convenient definition of the superpowers as those human faculties that transcend the known "laws" of physicality including space and time, and matter and energy.

By far and large, the superpower faculties have to do with information-transfer—and as such they are found well within the bigger-picture aspects of our species intelligence, awareness, and meaning-recognition supersystems, and which are shared world-wide across time and the bio-physical generations.

As it is, though, the universal Human World (as its called) is a very big world quite overloaded with all kinds of natural, artificial and local social differences.

Because of this, the differences tend to assume often overwhelming importance—with the outcome that the universal human world is observed and studied within the confines of the differences that are NOT universal.

Anything that demonstrates the existence of confines can be assumed to constitute some kind of smaller picture—and this even if the picture looms large from within the confines.

As it is, the human world contains many confines (i.e., frames of reference.) Thus, the human world has a rather vivid abundance of smaller pictures. So, by the nature of all things, most specimens of our species are more or less forced to accustomize and operate within the local smaller pictures in which they dwell.

As mentioned earlier, many recognize this aspect of the

human world. If it thence seems important to do so, many try the tactic of escaping the confines of the smaller pictures.

But this often results merely in taking on the trappings of other smaller pictures that seem alluringly bigger, but in fact might not be. This tactic can have something in common with escaping a local set of ordinances and replacing it with another local set.

If one studies the nature of the superpower faculties, an important clue to their activation and development can emerge.

By their TRANSCENDING nature, the superpowers faculties don't care very much for confines and sets of ordinances. And so, when they spontaneously emerge, they stubbornly transcend those, too.

One of the important implications of this particular clue is that escape from smaller picture confines can actually be quite meaningless IF the transcending superpowers remain inactivated.

Thus, escape might be a perceived duty in some cases, but there are important distinctions to be made between mere escape and the processes of transcending.

As a general rule of thumb, however, one can neither escape nor transcend unless one comprehends the nature of whatever is being escaped or transcended.

In the case of smaller pictures, it is easy enough to escape their cultural or social CONTENT. But smaller pictures also have a STRUCTURAL aspect that almost always remains invisible.

One possible metaphor for this is that the CONTENT of a smaller picture consists of the decor and furnishings of a room. The decor and furnishings can be changed in fashionable or trendy ways.

However, the room is in its building, and the building can be

referred to as **STRUCTURAL**.

In any event, smaller pictures have to hang together upon and because of something. Otherwise, their content would soon dissipate into the non-structured ethers.

The question thus before us here has to do with how smaller pictures are structured in a fundamental sense, and what are some of the characteristics of the structuring.

As earlier mentioned, a smaller picture is most identifiable not by what it contains, but by what it **DOESN'T**.

In this sense, then, the smaller picture is **STRUCTURED** so as **NOT** to contain something or whatever.

This aspect of smaller pictures, however, is broadly understood—and is one of the reasons many opt to escape from them. The picture doesn't contain whatever one wants or is searching for (bigger knowledge, for example), and so one attempts to go elsewhere to try to find the whatever.

There are a number of anatomical structural elements regarding **HOW** and **WHY** smaller pictures become formulated.

Four of these particular structural elements (or dynamics) are discussed below, with others discussed elsewhere.

The two most familiar structural elements regarding smaller pictures have to do with various modalities of **REDUCTIONISM** and **CONFORMISM**.

Although these modalities, in different formats, are recognizable from antiquity onward, they also became glowing hallmarks of the twentieth century sciences, most of its major philosophies, and overall sociological adventures and experiments.

A full part of the world drama of the twentieth century centers on the arising of and escapes from modernist reductionism and conformism, and a rich literature was

produced in this regard.

Lurking just behind reductionism and conformism, however, are two additional smaller-picture-making factors that are seldom identified and examined.

These are (1) UNIFORMISM (so unidentified, indeed, that the term doesn't exist); and (2) DEPRIVATION OF KNOWLEDGE.

UNIFORMISM

The term UNIFORMISM is not found in any dictionary, and is also not considered as a thing-in-itself in any philosophical or sociological context.

However, the term UNIFORMIST does exist, albeit only in the OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY, wherein it is defined as "an advocate of or believer in a uniform system, especially in respect of religious doctrine or observance."

As an aside here, why the Oxford Dictionary singles out religious factors in this regard is a complete mystery—in that one can discover uniformists of all waters everywhere pounding away whether subtly or stridently.

In any event, in that ISM is defined as "a distinctive doctrine, cause or theory," then wherever ISTs are found their ISMs are not far behind. Indeed, it is questionable that an IST could exist in the absence of the ISM to advocate or believe in.

Since they have different contexts, it is worthwhile reprising the definitions established for UNIFORM to help provide for increase of clarity:

1. Having always the same form, manner, or degree; not varying or variable.
2. Of the same form with others; conforming to one rule or code; consonant.
3. Presenting an undiversified appearance of surface, color.
4. Consistent in conduct or opinion.

Two slight, but temporary, difficulties surface in seeking to utilize the term UNIFORM.

First, the term is most popularly aligned with styles of dress, costume, or body decor, and not only of the military or ceremonial kind.

Second, the term UNIFORMITARIANISM has been claimed on behalf of geology as "the geological doctrine that existing processes acting in the same manner as at present are sufficient to account for all geological changes." (In this sense, a UNIFORMITARIAN is "a believer in uniformitarianism; an advocate in uniformity.")

To help sort through the latter definition, it should be noted that uniformitarianism as a geological doctrine is more or less defunct today. But the doctrine seems to have had its origins in a kind of pre-modern period when, in defiance of evidence otherwise, it was assumed that nothing fell from the sky to Earth's surface. The doctrine also held that all significant geological changes were SLOW ones, and that the changes proceeded within this slowness within averaging uniformity.

The above slight discussion has relevance to the nature of philosophical and scientific UNIFORMISM—which, of course, would have to be somewhat intolerant of any change at all, whether slow or fast. SLOW, however, is a major construct within UNIFORMISM, since slowness is least likely to "threaten" any brand of the ism.

As it is, outside of the concept of "making the fast buck," it is difficult in the human world to find any other context that has vested interests in FAST change. Indeed, if things change quickly all of the time, then the changes tend to become redundantly meaningless—and boring.

If the foregoing comments are slowly considered, then it can become apparent that, on average, there exists within the multifaceted human world some kind of general predilection for slow uniformisms.

However, the desired uniformity (whatever it might consist of) can be achieved only by lopping of whatever can't be made uniform.

It thus would follow that if what is lopped off doesn't exactly go away, but persists in flopping about anyway, then active measures need to be designed so as to discredit it and its meanings.

In the overall contexts of the on-going human world, this means that the work of uniformists is never done—because it takes careful work to keep things uniform.

Lopping of what doesn't fit into this or that ostensible uniformity is, of course, one of the all-time greatest and most popular ways to commence small-picture construction.

For whatever the reasons, the energies of our species for such kinds of projects are considerable, and so our history is appropriately littered with monuments to this or that kind of uniformity.

In the hypothetical sense of the foregoing, then, reductionism, conformity, and deprivation of knowledge are vehicles via which uniformists seek to achieve their lopping off goals.

But here we reach something quite difficult to articulate and grok.

On the surface of the uniformism issues, one might at first think that the goals of uniformists are to achieve the greater glories of the particular uniformism in which they are indulging themselves.

If this would be the case, then there are often various kinds of pride and ennobling purposes involved.

However, this is certainly only one side of the coin regarding all kinds of uniformism. If any given uniformism is to succeed and prevail, the obverse side of the coin has to be become vigilantly aware of whatever might disrupt or threaten it.

It then follows that whatever any disruption might consist of (such as facts and phenomena inconvenient, for example), it is fated to undergo attempted extinguishment—even if knowledge is cast askew and suffers as a result.

Now, as already pointed up, the concept of uniformism is unfamiliar—and so its workings and mechanisms are left unidentified and unexamined. In partial explanation of this, anyone can look around and perceive much that is not uniform.

Another reason is that the concept of conformity gets so much limelight attention that the conformity itself is taken to constitute THE problem. However, conformity always exists in regard TO something, and the TO something is almost always some kind of uniformism.

In this sense, any given conformity consists of a smaller picture of some kind.

None the less, concepts that are unfamiliar always at first tend to be imprecise and thus to become surrounded by fogs of ambiguity until the functioning dynamics concealed in the ambiguities are more clearly identified. The concept of UNIFORM itself is a good example of this.

The first recorded usage of UNIFORM in English dates from 1623 when it was utilized as IN UNIFORM—this defined as "in one body or flock." IN UNIFORM seems to have been utilized in the context of "Our sheepe shall fear no Wolfe, or suddaine storme; But goe and come all safe in uniform."

The above is indicated as obsolete in the Oxford Dictionary—which is astonishing, largely because the activities of going and coming in one flock are redundantly present everywhere.

In any event, the above usage was obviously intended to refer to a major sociological premise-cum-model, in that the sheep members of the flock were to be herded in inform ways—while at the same time those ways included the

protection of the sheep from Wolves and suddaine stormes, presumably by eradicating the former and guarding against the latter.

This sociological model has indeed produced a large number of very impressive social structures and institutions (some not all that beneficent on behalf of the sheep). Thus, the concept-premise of IN UNIFORM really should be dredged up and considered in some depth and seriousness. Here, however, it's possible only to reconstruct a nut-shell examination, expanding piecemeal in other essays.

For starters, the metaphor of sheep always directly implies the existence of herders. So at first take, the nature and character of the herders assumes limelight importance, and a good deal of fuss and bother of various kinds has always gone on in this regard.

However, at the bottom line of this sociological model, the herders haven't much to herd if, in the first instance, there are not sheep to go and come in uniform.

Thus, if this sociological model is to be workable, the sheep FIRST have somehow to be provided or acquired so that not only will the herders have something to do, but also live up to their job of eradicating Wolves and guarding against suddaine stormes that might cast the sheep-flock asunder.

If the internal dynamics of this model are groked, it can easily be diagrammed envisioned as a self-contained social system with the sheep and herders inside the perimeters and all else outside of them.

Even so, inside the perimeters the sheep remain of central importance. Attendant upon, and intimately integrated into, this importance is the matter of how and wherefrom the sheep are not only to be provided or acquired, but how their on-going population is to be maintained AND guaranteed.

At first sight, THIS factor seems very complex, indeed. But it can speedily be illuminated by the sheep metaphor itself.

Sheep are universally considered as dumb animals, and hence the sheep metaphor serves not only as the universal symbol of dumbness, but its archetype, too.

In this regard, it is not too much to say that the sheep metaphor cuts like a meat cleaver through ALL of the implications of the second essay in this little series—in which it is posited that the chief characteristic of our species has to do with the fact that it is, by any measure, a superlative intelligence-system.

In any event, where sheep are required, ways and means have to be undertaken to guarantee their existence and on-going presence.

At first glance, how their existence and on-going presence is to be achieved might seem as if it needs some kind of monumental and intricate solution.

However, IF this intricacy was the case, then many of the ostensible herders might find themselves inadequate to the purpose and quickly beached on its complexities.

The major solution is far more simple and easy to effect, and is neatly enunciated in the concept having to do with the deprivation of knowledge already mentioned.

In this sense (and as almost anyone can self-discover), it is far more easy to effect various kinds of deprivation of knowledge than it is to erect any kind of it. Thus, the task of the herders is not all that taxing and arduous.

It now would follow that sheep, in order to be and remain as sheep, need only to be deprived of the specific kinds of knowledge that would shift their sheep status to something else—specifically with regard to the overall IN UNIFORM context upon which this kind of social edifice is mounted.

Indeed, it's not too much to say that sheep can be identified not by what knowledge they have, but by the knowledge they are deprived of.

If this would be the case, then it would follow that there can be various echelons of sheepness through and through this kind of social structure, including up and through the top of it. Even the topmost herders can stand more completely revealed by virtue of the knowledge they are deprived of.

The foregoing attempted nutshelling of course leaves much unaccounted for. But one of the more astonishing (if revolting) factors of this has to do with the apparent fact that deprivation of knowledge can be managed IN UNIFORM kinds of ways, and that the entire social structure can conform to the deprivation.

At this point, it is worth mentioning the nuance distinctions between (1) the absence of knowledge, and (2) the deprivation of knowledge.

On average, and in some aspects, these two contexts might amount to the same thing.

But ABSENT is defined as "not present or attending; missing."

DEPRIVE is defined as "to take something away from; to withhold something from."

Thus, deprivation of knowledge has to do with something that is knowledgeable, but which is none the less taken away or withheld FROM."

Obviously, a deprivation of knowledge cannot be effected unless there is already a good idea of what the knowledge consists of.

Equally obviously, then, deprivation of knowledge is effected and engineered mostly because it is UNDERSTOOD to have direct negative implications regarding the supposed integrity of this or that uniformism.

The broader social contexts of all of the foregoing are, of course, entirely complex and complicated—so much so that at best one can only attempt to wobble one's way through

them.

But with regard to all of the foregoing, it can at least be hypothetically established that the largely unexamined dynamics of uniformism, reductionism, conformity and deprivation of knowledge can be engineered so as to work in tandem with each other.

Of these four societal workhorses, the dynamics of conformity are best understood broadly, with reductionism as close runner-up in this sense.

But, as already established, the concept of IN UNIFORM (and hence, its UNIFORMISM fallouts) fell into obsolescence and has thus remained largely unidentified since, and certainly not examined.

It is easy enough to see why—in that the CONCEPT of uniformism is a keystone with regard to great parts of the so-called human condition. Such keystones usually have something to do with power, how it is to be maintained, and how it is managed and partitioned in sheep-cum-herder social structures.

In the line-up of these four great societal workhorses inter-functioning in tandem, REDUCTIONISM usually plays a role somewhat akin to greasing the machine or system in fail-safe kinds of ways.

However, before briefly going into this, it seems necessary to point up that reductionism has achieved a rather bad reputation with regard to the sciences, in that the sciences have been accused of being "too reductionistic."

This may or may not be the case within the vast panorama of the sciences. But it is far more likely that the sciences internally suffer, when they do, more directly from unscientific deprivations of knowledge than from their reductionistic research methodologies—even though the latter can result in the former.

In the broader perspectives of the human condition, the

formal definition of REDUCTIONISM is given as "a procedure or theory that reduces complex data or phenomena to simple terms."

At first sight, this definition seems sensible enough. But the definition is somewhat astonishing with regard to whether complex data or phenomena can or should be so simply reduced.

Indeed, much naturally existing data or phenomena ARE and REMAIN complex by their very nature. And so in this regard this particular ISM and its formal definition clearly trend toward the oxymoronic—an OXYMORON consisting of "a combination of contradictory or incongruous words (in this case REDUCTION + ISM).

However, the history of our species clearly demonstrates that the concept of reductionism has had enormous appeal, and this even long before the term was coined.

One possible reason that might account for this appeal is that the erecting of "simple terms" need not necessarily be preceded by any given complexities of data or phenomena. Indeed, such terms can easily be "arrived at" without anything of the kind.

REDUCTIONISM is one of those terms that definitely need to be examined within the contexts it is being employed.

The appeal of this term is more pronounced within societal contexts than any other ones.

Since most societal contexts contain an over-abundance of sheep-cum-herder social systems—and since these are largely dependent upon ubiquitous presence of sheep deprived of knowledge—it is somewhat logical to assume that the sheep at best can only deal with "simple terms."

Another way at stating this is that ANYTHING other than simple terms might react among the sheep as the Wolfe and suddaine stormes might—thus upsetting the desirable balance of deprivation of knowledge shared by the sheep.

After all, it is easy to grok that no proper herder wants a nervous flock (even a science-oriented one), and which nervousness anyway would make the herders' jobs more complicated and stressful.

The contexts of this essay stand in direct conflict with the contexts of the preceding essay having to do with our amazing species as a bigger picture.

The central premise of that essay is that our species, in a bigger picture way, consists of a superlative intelligence-system, and which downloads into each specimen of it.

In this sense, then, the central bigger-picture confusion more or less involves a stressful dichotomy that can be described as follows:

(1) a species-wide, superlative intelligence system—which is distorted and diminished by

(2) such superficialities as socially engineered deprivation of knowledge and various uniformisms (no matter how elegant THEIR macro and micro managed surfaces might appear).

The struggle of (1) above to exist and flourish in the face of (2) above is awesome indeed.

To move rapidly on into next part of this small series of hypothetical considerations, the inherent mandate of our species as superlative intelligence system now needs some elaboration with regard to the individual level—for believe it or not the contexts highlighted in this essay can be reflected down into the individual level.

All things do trickle down, you know.

KNOWLEDGE—STATUS—REALITY

VS

THE THRESHOLDS OF HUMAN EXPERIENCING

Ingo Swann (02Nov98)

Anyone having an interest in learning about the superpowers beyond a superficial level has to realize, at some point, and in some bigger-picture sense, that unusual kinds of knowledge packages are involved.

In this regard, it is possible to say that those packages are "unusual" because they either can't be fitted into, or have been refused admittance into, those knowledge packages that have achieved status within societal mainstream power structures.

At first sight, the above might simply be thought of as a fluctuating social issue which doesn't particularly have meaning to the thinking mechanisms of the individual.

But via teaching, experience, and educational methods, almost all individuals (1) adapt their thinking mechanisms to the knowledge packages that have achieved status, and (2) disadapt from those knowledge packages that have been refused admittance.

Thus arises the interesting situation regarding how individual thinking mechanisms can become compatible with the unusual knowledge packages required for cognitive superpower activating.

There are two major source difficulties in this regard.

FIRST, it is an established fact that after a certain young age all humans interpret all in-coming information and knowledge via THEIR versions of reality, and which versions have mostly been socially installed via various kinds of educational programming.

In this sense, the thinking mechanisms, or mind maps, of individuals more or less emulate the larger societal mind map of knowledge-reality, including the accepted and rejected knowledge patterns within that larger mind map.

Very powerful mental information processing grids then form up, and which, for the most part, function automatically in a number of subconscious levels—and thus out of sight of the individual's conscious intellectual faculties.

Thereafter, the individual might become intellectually disposed to consider unusual knowledge. But mere intellectual interest in something might not lock it into the largely subconscious grids, and which "do their own thing." (NOTE: Some of the dynamics of mental information processing grids can be found elsewhere in this Website in the essay of the same title.)

SECOND, it is understood by many that societal power structures remain secure as long as the knowledge-reality packages upon which the structures are founded remain more or less intact.

Thus, most social power structures not only evolve their particular knowledge-reality packages, but also evolve ways, methods, and means of maintaining them as intact as possible. (*NOTE: Some of those ways and means are discussed in the series of essays treating the topics of smaller and bigger pictures.*)

Early sociologists established that conformity of the individual to societal knowledge-reality packages is THE key element regarding the conflict between the individual and society. That this IS actually the case can't really be argued, and so further dissection of it would seem unnecessary.

But various hidden elements incorporated within the conformity need further elaboration—in that conformity is usually studied only as a behavioral problem requiring some kind of societal policing. In that sense, the individual conflict is with the societal policing.

However, and in a bigger-picture sense, behind the situation as described above, hovers the matter of human experiencing.

This aspect takes on luminosity in that it is logical to assume that if individuals did not experience this or that which brings them into conflict with society, then it is quite possible that no conflict would arise.

There are only two meanings in this regard:

1. Conformity to societal knowledge-reality packages requires that individuals EXPERIENCE nothing that brings the knowledge-reality packages into question.
2. The societal limiting of experiencing can only take place and be maintained by decreasing the awareness margins of individuals, since awareness margins have a great deal to do with experiencing.

The superpowers by definition involve matters regarding the state and conditions of awareness margins and experiencing not only within a given societal whole, but within each individual incorporated into it.

In this sense, then, we can begin to glimpse the awesome difficulties involved if individuals have become conditioned to the societal whole, and if the conditioning has achieved the state of subconscious automatic functioning in the individual's mental information processing grids.

If this is the case, then mere intellectual study of the superpowers may not be very productive—because the study alone probably will not shift awareness margins very much, with the result that experiencing will either not take place, or will not be perceived.

Indeed, during the last thirty years, many have complained to this writer that they have read everything about psychic powers, but did not become psychic, at least in any awesome, functioning way.

In any event, if awareness margins and enhanced experiencing thresholds take on more vivid meaning with regard to the superpowers, then it is very worthwhile making an attempt to examine societal crunching and trashing of them.

This requires an attempt to erect or outline a bigger picture of what is involved—in that smaller pictures will not loosen up bigger pictures, but bigger pictures can and often do loosen up smaller ones.

Such a bigger picture of course has historical perspectives, but in this essay we need only to confine our observations to the modernist epoch.

Within the many wonderful and terrible features of the Modern Age there has drifted a number of topics that have some kind of great importance, but whose particulars were denied admittance into the status parameters of

modernist knowledge-reality overviews.

Beginning in about 1845, those overviews attained great power and importance. The overviews thus served as the basis for mainstream concepts of knowledge and reality.

The concepts, in turn, served intellectually as background information packages that determined the differences between proper and improper modernist thinking.

It is difficult to describe or grok what those denied topics consist of because the many real glories and successes of the Modern Age were of such luminosity as to blot out the nature and essence of what was being denied admittance.

It is thus difficult as a starting point to generalize what the denied topics consisted of.

In the contexts of the essays in this Website, though, it is possible to say that the "psychic powers" of the biomind faculties were denied as having any status parameters. Since this WAS the modernist case, we could make an effort to extend the present discussions only in that regard.

But if the discussions are extended only in that regard, one will soon encounter a tendency to drift downward, so to speak, into a number of smaller pictures concretized only within local social realities—and which local realities segment and fracture our species as a whole into largely conflicting and antagonistic compartments.

For hypothetical discussion, therefore, one somehow has to achieve a broader, more inclusive picture of what is involved.

One way of attempting to grasp the dimensions of a more inclusive picture is simply to acknowledge an important factor regarding all social collectives.

All social collectives establish many kinds of parameters with regard to what their members are allowed to EXPERIENCE—while most of them also emphasize what is NOT to be experienced, at least in any open way.

One of the results of this is that whatever is considered as permissible experiencing receives some kind of STATUS parameters, while status parameters are denied regarding what is not supposed to be experienced.

Now, the only area of human activity that deals openly and specifically with preventing or containing EXPERIENCING is the area of TABOOS. By studying the history and contexts of taboos, it is easy enough to establish that something reasonably akin to the above paragraph IS the case.

If one examines taboo history, it is easily revealed that the role and function of taboo is to stifle, and thus socially contain, certain kinds of experiencing that otherwise might flourish.

One of the centralizing concepts of all of the essays in this Website hypothesizes that our species is an intelligence-system species, and that this downloads into each and all specimens.

In this sense, it would be quite clear that an intelligence-system NEEDS wide awareness and experiencing margins in order to function as an intelligence system.

If this would be the case, then any narrowing, stifling, or cutting back of experiencing would in some sense be detrimental to the more complete functioning of any intelligence-system.

The term TABOO has gradually fallen out of fashionable usage during the twentieth century—especially after certain early sociologists began indicating, rather amusingly, that the modern sciences and psychologies harbored and supported various taboos within their own professional systems.

But the definitions of TABOO are vibrantly interesting, and especially if they are integrated into the contexts of knowledge, status, and reality.

In nomenclature origin, the term TABOO comes into English at about 1777 from the Tongan language of Polynesia, Melanesia and New Zealand—and meant "set apart or charged with a dangerous or supernatural power and forbidden to profane use or contact."

In the sense that it is used in the above definition, "contact" must be taken as meaning experiencing—in that one cannot usually have "contact" with something that is non-experienced.

By 1832, TABOO had been given two further elaborations as:

1. "To give a sacred or privileged character to something, which restricts its use to certain persons, or debars it from ordinary use or treatment, with stress on the privilege and the exclusion; to forbid, prohibit TO the underprivileged, to particular persons, or for general use."
2. "To forbid or debar by personal or social influence the use, practice, or mention of, or contact or intercourse with; to put (a person, thing, name, or subject) under a social ban; to ostracize, to boycott."

(NOTE: Although the term TABOO has largely become inactive in contemporary usage, the concept of "politically incorrect" carries on as a rough approximation of it.)

The idea of forbidding certain kinds of qualities of EXPERIENCING is admittedly not stated in the above formal definitions of TABOO. But it is possible to argue a reason for this—that the term EXPERIENCING itself fell quite neatly into a general taboo category.

After all, the term EXPERIENCE is taken from the Latin EXPERIENTA which meant "to try to, to attempt to."

In English as late as the 1970's, the Webster's definitions are given as:

1. "The usually conscious perception or apprehension of reality or of an external, bodily, or psychic event."
2. "A direct participation in events."
3. "Something personally encountered, undergone, or lived through."
4. With regard to the above definitions, and in order to somewhat link into the concept of human intelligence-systems, one might as well add: "Something or anything sensed, and which results in awareness, perception, and apprehension of reality."

These definitions considered, the only possible FUNCTIONAL use of taboos is to exclude, stifle, forbid, and deny TO INDIVIDUAL HUMAN INTELLIGENCE-SYSTEMS specific kinds of experiencing access with regard to conscious awareness, perception "or apprehension of reality."

An added nuance to this would consist of NOT trying to, or NOT attempting to access those kinds of experiencing.

There are, of course, many methods socially employed to set up and enforce taboos, even if under other names. But one of the better overall ways to

manage the enforcement is simply to withhold and/or delete societal status to whatever is involved.

One possible reason this method is so effective is that even if our species is a superlative intelligence-system, by wide and direct observation it is possible to see that our species also takes the matter of status with some quite serious seriousness. This aspect seem inherent in our species, since it very easily downloads and becomes quite active throughout all cultures and societal setups (even very small ones).

Indeed, it is at least somewhat possible to hypothesize that AFTER the matters of food and shelter comes the matter of STATUS, and this even BEFORE the topics of sex and money, and most certainly BEFORE the topics of KNOWLEDGE and REALITY.

It is also possible to toy with the hypothetical idea that our species is more sensitive and perceptive of its STATUS issues than it is of its intelligence-system faculties.

The topic of taboos is, of course, a nervous one. Indeed, one gets nervous even by writing the above commentary. But one of the major points of the foregoing discussion is to point up that all societal systems are based upon some kind of knowledge and some kind, or version, of reality.

But if all societal systems also contain taboos, then the taboos are embedded within the knowledge and the versions of reality—the sum of which embedding works to cut back or forbid certain kinds of experiencing awareness.

In such a case, individuals inhabiting this or that societal system are then quite likely to construct mind maps that conform not only to the knowledge-reality basis, but to the taboos patterns embedded within it. Generally speaking, this would mean that all individual mind maps would contain a category or an area titled "taboos."

Individuals absorb taboos without altogether consciously realizing it, of course, and most are anyway taught in many overt and subtle ways that it IS proper to do so. And anything considered to be proper is thus endowed with some kind of status.

Thereafter, as long as whatever they do experience is in keeping with their societal system plus its taboos, all can more or less be expected to go

well—both at the individual level and for the societal setup itself.

If the central goal of taboo-constructing is to contain human experiencing only in accord with approved and condoned awareness margins, then it would follow that only those kinds of knowledge- reality packages likewise in accord can be permitted and given the status of knowledge and reality.

Considering that our species is capable of quite extraordinary sensing and awarenesses (and of experiencing appropriate to the awarenesses), the management of all this can become quite hellish.

But, to those who comprehend it, the taboo-making process has a series of in-built, fail-safe factors that work quite well to reduce the hellishness.

After all, TABOO means that whatever is designated as such is not to be discussed, communicated about, or even thought about AT ALL. Thus, even if an individual experiences something that is taboo, lips are supposed to remain sealed with regard to it.

When this fail-safe mechanism doesn't work all that well, then more active measures can be taken. But discussion of such measures would be more at home in the section of this Website that attempts to examine the nature and functions of pismires.

Denying status to whatever is considered taboo is also quite workable, at least with regard to those who seek some kind of status within any kind of statusized system. Such individuals, of course, would not wish to involve themselves with something that has the aura of being de-statusized to begin with.

Some writers who have dared to identify and examine taboos have considered that when a taboo within a societal system begins to be broken or unwound, then cracks begin to appear in the egg-shell of the societal system itself. In that this is probably the case, then taboo maintenance takes on great and serious importance.

In any event, to a very large degree societal systems are supported as much by their de-statusized taboos as by their statusized knowledge-reality packages.

There are thus important interacting links regarding knowledge, reality, and status VERSUS human experiencing thresholds.

And this rather automatically leads into considerations about what knowledge and reality do and do not consist of within any given societal system.

Whatever is involved, though, is important with regard to the superpowers of the human biomind, and to any possible activation of them at individual and group levels. To try to point up what is involved in this regards requires a somewhat roundabout approach.

First, during the modernist period the implications of psychical research and parapsychology have been vividly taboo within all of the modern mainstream professions—including, for example, those of science, philosophy, history, archaeology, sociology and psychology.

The taboo embargo has been vigorously extended to include the terminology of Psi research—and so such experiencing descriptors as psychic, telepathy, clairvoyance, etc. are forbidden within those mainstream professions.

This clearly means that none of the forbidden terms (much less their implications) make even a brief appearance in the thousands of mainstream professional papers and reports produced annually.

Indeed, most professionals will not dare to discuss what is involved even in a negative way, since doing so moves them dangerously close to the taboos themselves.

Technically speaking in the societal sense, the inclusive sum of all published papers (and books based on them) is taken as de facto knowledge which is given the status AS knowledge—and which knowledge thereafter serves as THE reality basis regarding, as it were, knowledgeable awareness parameters.

If it is useful, at least in a hypothetical sense, to conceptualize all forms of Psi as particular forms of species-wide experiencing, then the taboo embargo works to prevent and deprive knowledge regarding those particular forms of species-wide experiencing.

It is clearly the case that those particular forms of experiencing obviously involve particular forms of awareness and perceptions.

And so the more clear-cut issue behind the taboo involves societal attempts to cut-back and forbid knowledge regarding those particular forms of awareness, perceptions, and information sensors not only to psychics, but to workers within the mainstream professional fields.

The most obvious implication here is that each individual human specimen as an intelligence-system is to have certain of its inherent information sensors and perceptions demobilized and shut down.

And about the only efficient way to achieve this is by some kind of deliberate societal oversight activity geared to reduce awareness margins in some kind of wholesale way, and which is effective with regard to the societal commune entire. THIS kind of societal oversight clearly qualifies as a kind of mind control (of which there of course exist a number of types.)

The use of the word "deliberate" in the above paragraph might at first seem rather extreme and off the wall. But it is entirely justified IF the tripartite major definitions of TABOO are recalled:

1. Set apart as charged with dangerous power, and forbidden to profane [common, ordinary] use or contact
2. To restrict use to certain persons, or debar it from ordinary use or treatment, with stress on the privilege
3. To forbid, prohibit to the underprivileged

In the sense of the above three definitions, they CANNOT be deployed unless what is to be made taboo is certainly and clearly KNOWN TO EXIST (at least, and most probably, by the so-called "privileged.")

Indeed, it seems quite difficult to see how something that is not known to exist can be incorporated into a taboo—or into any kind of knowledge-reality packages, either.

This is to say, then, that the modernist mainstream taboo regarding Psi awareness margins came into existence because the awareness margins appropriate to Psi were known to exist—with knowledgeable CERTAINTY.

Otherwise, there would have been no need for the tripartite taboo in the first place. [*NOTE: If the above would be the case, them among WHOM, where, and when the knowledgeable certainty existed is of some interest. There may be some surprising answers in this regard.*]

The foregoing discussions about societal knowledge-reality packages placing forbidden limits on awareness margins, perceptions, and wider experiencing thresholds now needs to be contrasted, or compared, to the following having to do with possible activation of the superpower faculties.

This activation is, of course, taboo within the powerful mainstream sense of it—while the taboo is assisted by appropriate deprivations of knowledge-reality overall.

In the sense of all the foregoing discussions, then, the species-wide superpower faculties have no status among modernist knowledge-reality packages regarding what humans consist of.

The non-status exists because it is taboo determined—and this precisely in the face of knowledge-certainty that the superpower faculties DO exist.

And so this taboo-non-status element must be omitted, removed, or somehow gotten around, in order to provide a picture of the human that excludes the faculties.

The point of the foregoing is that it can easily be shown that the "knowledge" based picture of the human that excludes the faculties consists of three factors that need to be understood and acknowledged as existing that:

1. The picture HAS been convincingly erected during the modernist period.
2. The resulting picture enjoys enormous group- and mass-mind influence both at the objective knowledge and subjective (psychic?) awareness levels.
3. Any expansion of awareness margins that might include contact with the dimensions of the superpower faculties probably will also include contact with (1) and (2) above.

One of the most probable meanings here is that any activation of the superpower faculties would NOT in the first instance merely consist of attempts to widen awareness margins per se.

Indeed, the first instance would rather constitute a defiance of the knowledge-reality package status that works to prohibit activation of the needed awareness margins for possible common use among the "underprivileged," or the not-privileged.

To move briskly onward now, if one excludes any awareness of the elements presented in this essay so far, then the expectations associated with learning and activation of the superpower faculties seems rather straightforward and simple.

In general, the expectations involve three considerations:

1. Understanding the nature of the superpowers
2. Whether they will be activated at the individual level for common usage by teaching-learning processes
3. The degree they might become activated and utilized

This three-part expectation downloads from the teaching-learning concept that if the student (or individual) intellectually learns to understand something, then the student will become mentally enabled to interact with it in some functional way.

This expectation is well-founded with regard to many subjects and topics where intellectual learning is, in some major sense, all that is required.

For example, if one intellectually learns a great deal about biology, then one will become mentally enabled to function within biological knowledge contexts.

In this kind of case, it might be said that one's awareness margins regarding biological matters were expanded and increased by the intellectual learning. This in turn results in higher stages of conscious mental functioning with regard to the biological matters.

This type of learning is based in the idea that if one intellectually learns a great deal about a given area of interest, then one's abilities to FUNCTION with respect to it will automatically be enhanced and expanded. Depending on the individual involved, this is entirely possible—except in those cases where powerful societal taboos are encountered.

As discussed (and repeated) elsewhere in these essays concerning the superpowers, this type of intellectual learning has been tremendously successful in the cultural West—to the degree that many assume that it is applicable with regard to learning everything.

However, the best track record substantiating the effectiveness of this kind

of learning pertains almost exclusively to outer physical factors, i.e., to dealing with concrete THINGS.

This kind of learning begins to "fail" to the degree one attempts to apply it to inner awareness states and consciousness, and which are fluid-like and hence seldom thinglike in nature.

Before concluding, it is worth establishing that learning about external things via intellectual in-taking of information was entirely compatible with the philosophy (and sciences) of materialism.

Philosophical materialism is defined as "a theory that physical matter is the only reality and that all being and processes and phenomena can be explained as manifestations or results."

After about 1846, this philosophy achieved mainstream dominance in the cultural West, and as such was extended to include modernist mainstream formats of the sciences, the various psychologies, as well as mainstream academia, students' awareness margins, and the profession of text book compilers and publishers.

One of the factoids being pointed up here is that the approach to knowledge and reality via materialism didn't really NEED any other format of learning except the one that focused exclusively on intellectual in-take of information regarding material things.

All other possible kinds of learning could therefore be marginalized, declared obsolete, and ultimately vanish from conscious knowledge of them. If those sanitizing options didn't work too well, then the option of erecting taboos needed to be undertaken.

It is important to establish that the point of the above discussion is not to discredit the very valuable mode of learning via intellectual in-take—but simply to help establish that there are many aspects of knowledge and reality that, so to speak, do not respond to that in-take.

Thus, it is possible to hypothesize that:

1. Those aspects require additional or other learning formats.
2. Entry into those aspects might not benefit all that much from the intellectualizing teaching-learning formats characteristic of "realities" associated with mainstream materialism.

Various elements pointed up herein will be further elaborated in a subsequent essay entitled MIND MAPS vs THE SUPERPOWERS.

NOTE: For further information regarding [EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN EXPERIENCING](#), see the contributed paper of the same title by Rhea White [found elsewhere in this website](#).

SMALLER PICTURE vs BIGGER PICTURE

Ingo Swann (10Nov98)

PART 6:

THE INDIVIDUAL vs SMALLER AND BIGGER PICTURES

What is simply referred to as THE INDIVIDUAL is, in actuality, a very complex affair—so complex indeed that efforts to generalize too much are doomed to becoming bogged down with regard to whatever might be their purpose.

The above having been stated, it is incumbent on this writer to identify some kind of a basic starting point for the elaborations to follow.

On average, discussions about The Individual usually focus on differences—perhaps because the differences are most visible on the surface of the topic as it is usually first conceptualized.

The assumption that goes along with this is that the individual is an individual because of differences with regard to other individuals, and whom, of course, are different, too.

This has led many to assume that the differences among individuals appropriately DO constitute the central and most logical approach regarding whatever else might be involved.

Thus, the central concepts of The Individual and Individuality are closely related to the concept of Differences.

However, if one consults the established definitions of the term INDIVIDUAL, one will find no mention of differences among them. Rather, the central concept has to do with SEPARATE and the quality of being separate.

And indeed, the individual needs to be separate in the first instance of existing as an individual. And so it would transpire that only AFTER being separate would differences have much bearing on anything.

If this is reflected upon, we can illuminate a strange and contradictory factor that lurks somewhat invisibly just behind the common concepts of The Individual.

The factor is this: if individuals are majorly judged and demarcated by their differences, then they are all too often conceptualized as belonging within sets of differences that can indiscriminately and ambiguously comprise a great number of individuals.

When such is the case, the individual then loses the identity as a discrete individual or a separate entity.

One can think of many examples in which people are NOT conceptualized as separate, but are identified by the sets of differences into which they can be fitted—and this as other people see them or are taught to see them.

This leads into those situations where the individual is supported or condemned in much the same fashion as the sets of differences themselves are supported or condemned, or are tolerated or not tolerated.

Thus, depending on the circumstances involved, the individual can quite quickly suffer a loss of individuality by being ignominiously subsumed into a set of differences—within which the idea of The Individual becomes ambiguous, even unimportant and meaningless, and in which the idea of The Individual is NOT supported.

There are two important implications that descend out of this

kind of thing.

The first is that the concept of The Individual might be representative of some kind of idealism. But as regards practical life and matters, the idealism can quickly fall by the wayside in a rather tattered condition.

The second implication revolves around the concept that individual-as-separate constitutes the bigger picture of the individual, while any differences constitute smaller, or at least, secondary pictures.

This latter concept might seem rather murky at first. But it become more clear if one considers that:

1. Differences are ALWAYS perceived and mediated via some kind of local societal framework.
2. All societal frameworks are set up and managed via various types of uniformism, reductionism, conformism, and deprivations of this or that kind of knowledge.

In this sense, then, although individuals may live among the social frameworks and adapt to their uniformisms, etc., the differences belong to the frameworks, not to the individual per se.

In this sense, if The Individual is to be fitted into any kind of uniformism, etc., then the fact that The Individual is a separate life-force-carrying entity must become downgraded and of hardly any interest except in some vaporous philosophical idealizing, if even that.

But the worst here also needs to be pointed up. If The Individual is to be fitted into any given, smaller-picture social framework, then The Individual is susceptible to the viruses of the mind that uniformism, reductionism, conformism, and deprivations of knowledge can possibly bring into existence.

(NOTE: A larger background for this possibility can be found in the book daringly entitled VIRUS OF THE MIND (1996) by Richard Brodie, who was the original author of Microsoft

Word and personal technical assistant to Bill Gates.)

In any event, and because of the foregoing considerations, it is worthwhile digging deeper into the contexts of The Individual.

SAMENESS FACTORS OF INDIVIDUALS

While differences among individuals obviously have some kind of meaning to the concept of The Individual, each individual possesses certain sameness factors, and some of these are of extraordinary importance.

Over-emphasis on individual differences, and differences individuals have in common, has apparently served to almost completely occlude the fact that individuals also possess sameness factors.

First of all (and it IS a first of all) each embodied individual downloads from the generic intelligence-system attributes of our species. As such, no matter how different each individual ultimately is, each is first and foremost a replicated, downloaded intelligence-system incorporated as a separate and independent specimen of the species.

Incorporated into each independent intelligence-system are arrays of biomind sensors and awarenesses equipment, and a number of pre-installed hard-drive attributes—some of which were partially described in part 2 of this series of essays.

One of more obvious mainframe functions of the sensors, awarenesses, and hard-drive attributes is to permit the intelligence-system to experience phenomena and to grok meaning regarding them.

In this sense, by essential nature the individual is **FIRST** an experiencer of phenomena—**AFTER WHICH**, and to be sure, both positive and negative nurture can play significant roles with regard to ultimate differences.

It is important to point up here that the context elucidated in the above paragraph can become more easily visible if one considers the individual as a downloaded specimen of our species.

Achieving this visibility is made much more mushy and swampy if the individual is considered merely as a dweller within the labyrinthine complexities that clog the veins and arteries of local social frameworks.

It is also worth pointing up at this juncture that if an individual is basically an intelligence-system completely equipped to experience phenomena, then The Individual, in this sense, would frequently be viewed with abject alarm within sheep-cum-herder societal frameworks.

The reason is easy enough to deduce. Such societal frameworks much depend on this or that kind of uniformism, etc.

But in the case of all types of uniformisms, their parameters are to be maintained and safeguarded.

In this sense, individuals incorporated into the parameters can hardly be permitted to run around and willy-nilly experience phenomena that might put cracks into the uniformism—or, as well, disturb the desired balances of deprivations of knowledge.

Thus, arises the great specter regarding tolerance and intolerance of human experiencing, the specter having special importance regarding **THE INDIVIDUAL LEVEL**.

Having to deal with this specter, however, is usually circumvented by establishing stringently enforced uniformity with respect to certain levels of deprivation of knowledge—especially with regard to what The Human Individual actually consists of.

THEN, if individuals experience stuff outside the boundaries of the uniformism, it is likely they won't really want to tangle with the greater prevailing-wisdom (so-called) forces always

stringently on guard within the uniformistic parameters.

As discussed elsewhere in this Website, this particular aspect is entirely relevant to any consideration of the superpowers of the human biomind, and pointedly so with respect regards any significant activation of them.

THE PHILOSOPHIC IDEA OF INDIVIDUALISM

Moving onward now, it needs to be pointed up that most concepts regarding The Individual download from the centralizing philosophical concept of INDIVIDUALISM.

This is essentially a modernist concept, in that most pre-modern societies didn't incorporate it—and certainly not in the ways it has flourished in modernist times.

In tracking down the origins of the philosophic idea, it is surprising and interesting to learn that it somehow arose in the United States where it was early encountered by Alexis de Tocqueville, the French traveler, observer and writer.

In his 1835 book, *DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA*, de Tocqueville noted that "Individualism is a novel [American] expression, to which a novel idea has given birth."

De Tocqueville gives the working definitions as of 1835: "Individualism is a mature and calm feeling, which causes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellow creatures, and to draw apart with his family and friends."

From this was drawn the first formal definitions of INDIVIDUALISM: "Self-centered feeling or conduct as a principle; a mode of life in which the individual pursues his own life and ends or follows out his own ideas; egoism."

However, the concept of INDIVIDUALISM made very rapid progress, philosophically speaking. For about five years later (at about 1840) it was being defined in England as no less

than a "social theory which advocates the free and independent action of the individual, as opposed to communistic methods of organization and state interference."

By about 1877, the theory of INDIVIDUALISM had been embellished with, of all things, metaphysical contexts and had made a metamorphosis from theory into a doctrine: "The doctrine that the individual is a self-determined whole, and that any larger whole is merely an aggregate of individuals which, if they act on each other at all do so only externally."

The "metaphysical" context of the above doctrine might not at first be visible today. As of 1877, the "whole individual" was still being thought of as some kind of life force "principle" that animates the material physical aspects of what we today would think of as the physical genetic body.

This life-force was considered the central principle of VITALISM, while the life-force principle itself was considered as meta-physical in source and origin.

As it transpired, this metaphysical doctrine quickly ran afoul with those particular Western societal trends intent on doing away with any kind of METAphysical stuff so as to cause the uniformism of materialism to emerge supreme and universal.

The foregoing definitions were about the only somewhat clear-cut description of what individualism was thought to have referred to. Thereafter, with its possible meanings, implications, inferences, and interpretations, the term was dragged into one of those hyper-dichotomizing swamps that clutter various intellectualizing aspects of The Human Condition.

Another enhancement to the swamp occurred as the twentieth century geared up—in that the proponents of HOLISM felt obliged to criticize and attack the proponents of INDIVIDUALISM, and vice versa.

Thus, because of the democratic processes of equal time, equal consideration, neither of the two isms could be discussed without the other, at least at academic levels.

Shortly, the individualism-versus-holism conflict took shape as a major philosophical conundrum, the nature of which can be found described in THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY (1967) under the entry for "Holism and Individualism in History and Social Science."

With apologies, part of the introductory paragraphs are quoted below.

"In most recent philosophical discussion, the contrast between holism and individualism in history and the social sciences has been presented as a methodological issue.

"Stated generally, the question is whether we should treat large-scale social events and conditions as mere aggregates or configurations of the actions, attitudes, relations, and circumstances of the individual men and women who participated in, enjoyed, or suffered from them.

"Methodological individualists say we should. Methodological holists (or collectivists, as some prefer to be called) claim, rather, that social phenomena may be studied as their own autonomous, macroscopic level of analysis. Social 'wholes,' they say, not their human elements, are the true historical individuals.

"This issue obviously bears directly upon the way we are to conceive the relations between such social sciences as psychology and sociology, and between these and historical inquiry."

The entry for this dual topic now continues for several double-columnar pages. The interested reader is now referred to those pages—albeit with the warning that ANYTHING to do with The Individual per se has disappeared from considerations so momentous they don't really need to acknowledge the existence of individual specimens of our species.

We are thus left in a condition of wonderment about What The Individual IS.

Hot on the track of ANY answers here, most dictionaries define INDIVIDUAL in of the following ways:

1. A particular being or thing as distinguished from a class, species, or collection
2. A single human being as contrasted with a social group or institution
3. A single organism as distinguished from a group
4. Being an individual or existing as an indivisible whole
5. Existing as a distinct entity

If one wants to grasp what the individual IS, the above definitions are only of minimal help—because they establish hardly anything about what the individual IS, but only focus on the PLACE of individuals among other factors around.

However, it's worth noting that definition 3 above is particularly odious, if contrasted to the established definition of an ORGANISM:

"A complex structure of interdependent and subordinated elements whose relations and properties are largely determined by their function in the whole."

In this sense, the term "single" in the definition should be amended to read "separate."

Furthermore, in this particular context, it's worth entering here the definition for yet another ism, in this case ORGANICISM:

"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 [emphasis on SYSTEM added].

WHY the above should be considered a theory is somewhat mysterious—since the definition seems more or less to describe self-evident facts.

In any event, by tracking our way through the above definitions, we at least get into the proximity of the concept

that whatever else the individual might consist of, it is in the first place some kind of indivisible SYSTEM.

THE INDIVIDUAL AS AN INDIVISIBLE INTELLIGENCE-SYSTEM

At this point, it is well worth while wondering WHY in the first place the term INDIVIDUAL took on common understanding as referring to ONE or to SINGLE, or even to SEPARATE or to DIFFERENT.

The term INDIVIDUAL is taken from the Latin INDIVIDUUS—and which meant: "One in substance and essence; not separable; that cannot be separated."

One of the problems here is that while the definitions just above MAKE SENSE, all of them have been declared OBSOLETE in most modern dictionaries. Even so, the obsolete definitions remain perfectly good and useful ones.

Indeed, those definitions were being carried into English as late as about 1650 at which time INDIVIDUAL was still being taken to mean "existing as a separate indivisible entity."

At about the same time, however, the term was also began to be utilized in the context of "distinguished by attributes of his own," and eventually this concept trended toward wider usage over the earlier ones.

And thus The Individual became thought of as individual because of having particular different attributes—not because of being of one in substance and essence.

One of the on-going fallouts of this is that people sometimes think of themselves as an individual because of their attributes different from those of others.

In this way, the very important idea of "an indivisible one in substance and essence" tends to get lost in the miasma of everyone's different attributes.

The small nomenclature discussion above is extremely important to how the superpower faculties have been perceived in modern contexts.

Those contexts generally held that the superpowers emanated from a particular and uniquely special form of "giftedness" and/or set of attributes not shared by all individuals.

This meant that expressed forms of Psi, if they existed at all, would involve only a very small "gifted" percentage of the populations. And if this could be established as the case, then the small percentage was not a troublesome threat to any number of established societal uniformisms.

Any other troublesome threat would be further minimized almost to extinction if the "gifted" percentage could also be identified within the contexts of hallucination.

Thus, both the gifted small percentage and evidence for Psi could be reduced to a quite smaller picture—while attaching the label of "hallucination" would cause that smaller picture to be viewed with social disgust and horror.

Today, one might think that there were never any organized social measures undertaken that would result in the above scenario.

However, in 1889 the then quite socially powerful International Congress of Psychology meeting in Paris urged that a Census be established and conducted. This activity was ultimately titled the "International Census of Waking Hallucinations in the Sane."

In the mainstream societal sense, the Census was thereafter thought to have "furnished ample and trustworthy data" with regard to the fact that less than 7 per cent of the "sane" experienced hallucinations.

By lumping psychic phenomena into hallucinations, this was taken to mean that less than 7 per cent of the population would experience Psi perceptions, but which anyway were to

be interpreted as hallucinations. Hence, nothing to worry about, percentage-wise.

(The interested reader is referred to HALLUCINATIONS AND ILLUSIONS: A STUDY OF THE FALLACIES OF PERCEPTION by Edmund Parish, published by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897, and in which the Census and its findings are reviewed.)

In any event, some did not "buy" the anti-psychic hallucination concepts, and these opted to speculate that the psychic individual was psychic BECAUSE of special giftedness.

This pro-psychic "explanation" then became a dominant idea that floated within early psychical research and later parapsychological overviews. One of the results was that the modernist Western social systems have not fully recovered from its negative knowledge impacts.

Through the intervening decades until now, many ostensible psychics were also quite partial to this "explanation."

Of course, the "explanation" didn't actually explain very much. But it did tend to bestow on psychics a status of "specialness" among all other presumably non-special people, and which special status tended to puff up not a few "psychic" egos.

From the whole of this, there occasionally descends here and there the idea that the superpowers cannot be tutored or trained because they are naturally special only to the few who "naturally" possess the (unspecified) endowments—and as such the special but unspecified endowments cannot be artificially installed in others.

Alas, whether this is the case or not depends on what one possesses as basic concept configurations regarding what the superpowers ESSENTIALLY consist of—especially if such configurations are based on traditional smaller-picture misinformation.

Such concept formations might indeed limit how the superpower faculties are perceived not for what they are, but only in accord with the marginal limits of the concept configurations.

Alternative concept configurations are possible. For example, if the superpower faculties principally involve the matter of awareness margins, then our species has a long history of expanding them (as well as contracting them in accord with societal uniformisms.)

It is also quite well understood (in the performing and mechanical arts, for example) that perceptual boundaries can be expanded by tutoring and training designed to do so.

More fundamentally, however, if the notion is entertained that each specimen of our species is an individual intelligence-system, then that system has to possess arrays of sensors replete with awareness equipment that goes along with them.

The fact that the awareness equipment can be cropped back and downsized to conform to this or that set of smaller-picture social realities would not alter the species bigger picture in any enduring way.

What might occur, though, is an on-going conflict between downsizing and upsizing of awareness margins—this conflict sometimes being referred to as the on-going conflict between the individual and society.

Further consideration of the individual as an intelligence-system now requires two forthcoming series of essays.

The first involves **SYSTEMS** in general.

The second involves two essays regarding the topic of **MAPS OF THE MIND** with special reference to catalyst and synthesis qualities of prepared and unprepared mind situations.

If one has the patient desire to do so, the contexts of this present set of six essays can now be integrated with previous

essays already entered into this Website.

For example, it would be obvious that certain smaller-picture configurations can act as "noise" within bigger-picture ones, and so the essay regarding the signal-to-noise ratio can now take on wider awareness perspectives.

It would also be obvious that various mental information processing grids might be littered or clogged up with smaller-picture configurations.

The nature of smaller-picture versus bigger-picture phenomena can also be integrated into the contexts of the following essays (also on this website) entitled:

- "Non-conscious Participating in Social Consensus Realities"
- "Information Processing Viruses and Their Clones"

SMALLER PICTURE vs BIGGER PICTURE

Ingo Swann (10Nov98)

PART 5:

SOCIAL GROUPINGS vs THE INDIVIDUAL vs MARGINS OF AWARENESS vs DEPRIVATIONS OF KNOWLEDGE

The action of considering anything at length can become tedious and boring unless provision is made for two important factors that assist cognitive processes.

The first has to do with establishing why the consideration should be undertaken in the first place. The second has to do with establishing some kind of graphic format that encapsulates the whole of what is being considered.

As will become apparent to different readers, a consideration of smaller pictures vs bigger ones has to do not with the pictures themselves per se, but with expanding margins of awareness about them.

Although awareness is not usually considered a superpower function, it is easy enough to grok that it serves as the basis for all other superpower faculties. If taken this way, then awareness could actually be thought of as a meta-superpower something or other.

As to a graphic format that encapsulates the whole of the

central topic of this set of essays, it is easy enough to DO the following:

1. Draw a large circle on a piece of paper, and give it the label of OUR WONDERFUL SPECIES with all its amazing powers and attributes.
2. Inside the large circle, sketch a number of smaller circles numerous enough to fill up the larger one. Label these as social groupings. Outside of the larger circle, note that each of the social groupings can be characterized by elements of uniformism, reductionism, conformism, and deprivations of knowledge.
3. Now fill up each of the smaller circles with dots, and call these the individuals within the social groupings.

If one is inspired enough to do so, one can now make a list of social groupings world-wide, and make an effort to identify the elemental characteristics regarding their formats of uniformism, reductionism, conformism, and deprivations of knowledge.

However, while constructing this graphic representation, be pleased and contented to bear in mind that the point of doing so is not to wax critical of any of the social groupings. Waxing critical usually one results in becoming emotionally embroiled within the smaller-picture confines of the social groupings. If this embroiling happens to any great degree, one usually ends up participating in some kind of pismire activity.

The point is only to establish the graphic representation in order to provide one's cognitive powers with a short-form concept format regarding smaller pictures vs bigger ones.

THE INDIVIDUAL vs AWARENESS MARGINS

Here we now encounter a topic having considerable dimensions, but whose dimensions are seldom considered within most social contexts.

Indeed, most social contexts establish uniformistic configurations that specify what kinds of awarenesses are to be tolerated and not tolerated.

In fact, it can easily be shown that most social frameworks permit only those kinds of awareness that (1) cohere the framework parameters of the group, and then (2) fit the individual into the framework, and THEN only in keeping with the individual's place within the social whole.

In this sense, it would be clear that the awareness margins of the socially powerless (the sheep) needs to be cut back and limited in order to keep the powerless in, as it were, the condition of being powerless. Only by managing the social group this way can the powerful (the herders) identify and define themselves.

Something regarding the on-going reality of this can be uncovered by taking note of the absence of schools and special training activities the specific purpose of which would be to enhance and enlarge awareness margins in wholesale kinds of ways.

Everyone knows that awareness exists, of course, that it can become empowered and thus powerful, and that it is a hallmark trait of our species to the degree that it is one of its most fundamental essences.

Since this IS the case, it then goes almost without saying that control of margins of awareness is one of the major fulcrums of almost all social groupings.

One of the most direct implications in this regard is that inhabitants of any social grouping must be deprived of knowledge about AWARENESS itself, and especially with regard to THEIR individual awareness systems.

If this would be the case, then one could expect to find very little information about the nature of awareness, and this especially with regard to training and mechanisms that might enhance and expand it.

And indeed, if any care to make the effort, readers of this essay might themselves now undertake to discover what is known about awareness, whether it has been studied and researched, and if the results of such are available for downloading into individual cognizance. Well, good luck at this.

Awareness is most clearly and without any question one of the chief survival functions of our species, and thus of each of its downloaded specimens.

It can also be established that awareness is so much and so close an intimate adjunct of our species as an intelligence-system that it is almost impossible to separate the two factors.

But it is possible to hypothesize that awareness faculties innately exist in our species hard drive mechanisms - after which, like languages, it undergoes specific modulating and formatting according to what different socio-cultural sub-units establish for its tolerable margins.

After undergoing this kind of degrading and downsizing, the general topic of awareness becomes a very sensitive issue - to the degree that anyone hoping to become acceptable within the confines of their local social grouping explores the topic at their peril.

It is thus, regardless of their other stunning achievements, that the modern twentieth-century sciences, philosophies, and sociologies have managed to arrive at a lesser understanding of awareness than was the case in most pre-modern societies. It is not improbable that this was by socio-cultural design, rather than because of modernist ignorance.

Indeed, it is in this sense that the double dominant uniformisms of the modern age, scientific and philosophic materialism, were broadly seen as highly desirable.

After all, it is difficult to see how MATTER can have awareness. And if matter was considered as the basic be-all-end-all aspect of everything, then there was no need to enter into discussions and research regarding the nature of

awareness.

Thus, even if awareness is a fulcrum regarding human survival and the struggles of existing, it could be removed or at least marginalized as anything of substantial concern - with scientific dignity left neatly intact.

Likewise, there is no general entry for AWARENESS in the all-inclusive Encyclopedia of Philosophy (1967), while that Encyclopedia's index lists only five brief references to it. The Encyclopedia is well over 4,000 pages in length. So only five brief references to awareness is exceedingly brief, indeed.

This situation is a rather amusing one - in that it can be presumed that philosophers of all waters have awarenesses at least sufficient enough upon which to found their particular philosophical versions.

DEFINITIONS OF AWARENESS

The concept of HAVING AWARENESS is clearly a very old one - and as such has been represented by an enormous terminological assortment through the ages.

The English term AWARE is derived from A + WAER, and is found in Old English at about the year 1000 as AWAER, and which apparently meant "watchful." Earlier derivations of the term into Old English are apparently not known, and there does not appear to have been much

interest in tracking them down.

There are only two principal definitions of AWARE:

The first definition is: "Watchful, vigilant, cautious, alert, on one's guard." This definition is given as OBSOLETE - although WHY it should be considered obsolete is at first sight a complete mystery.

The second, non-obsolete, definition is: "Informed, cognizant,

conscious, sensible; to have experience; to know; to be aware of (that)."

The above two definitions, as given, are the beginning and end of the definitions and meanings of AWARE. If the ultra-importance of awareness is considered, this is ridiculously short treatment.

But even so, there are strategic nuances between the first and second definitions. These differences might escape notice if they are not pointed up.

In the first place, the first definition is ACTIVE, while the second one tends toward the PASSIVE, the receptive. Specifically put, "informed, cognizant, conscious" require an "of something" because there is no condition of "informed" unless it is of or about something.

In terms of the dynamics involved, the second definition portrays nothing like the first, which specifies being watchful and on guard.

The distinctions here become somewhat more clear in that, for example, social programmers of all waters would tend to view the first definition with some alarm - because if the social-sheep were to be watchful, alert, on guard, then it would be more difficult to inform them about what they should and should not be cognizant of.

In any event, the two definitions as given above represent the beginning and end of information about AWARENESS within our mighty Earthside civilizations.

So, the term is seldom really utilized with any seriousness, and in recent times had tended to be subsumed into the concept of CONSCIOUSNESS - and which is taken to represent a larger category and more general principle.

And here it is possible to uncover a peculiar factoid. It is possible to become conscious OF, for example, uniformism, reductionism, conformism, and deprivation of knowledge, and of smaller-picture social constructs as well.

But per se consciousness OF something and being watchful, alert and guarding against something consist of two dynamically different sets of responses.

In any event, it is well understood in the greater sociological sense that consciousness can better be manipulated and managed than can awareness - IF the obsolete definition of awareness is recovered as alert, watchful, vigilance, and being on one's guard.

Now arises the wonderment as to whether AWARENESS MARGINS refer to the first, obsolete definition of awareness, or to the second definition in which the concept of awareness is subsumed into that of consciousness.

Discussion along these lines must be undertaken in tandem with the concept that our species, and all of its downloading specimens, are intelligence-systems. One can then wonder what the intelligence-system would be like without the active definition of awareness.

Beyond the brief foregoing considerations, there is clearly much to be considered regarding awareness and awareness margins. But these discussions will benefit more if they incorporate additional bigger- picture phenomena of our species.

And so the theme of awareness margins will be unfolded more with regard to, for example, essays having to do with biomind SYSTEMS.

Meanwhile, it is now perhaps possible to grok something of the essence regarding the following: When grouped together, social groupings, the individual, awareness margins, and deprivations of knowledge do comprise something of a Mess of smaller-picture frameworks.

On average, though, many are not all that much aware of the existence of the mess, what it consists of, or its various impacts at the individual level.

One reason for this unawareness is that individuals are often locked into the frameworks of their local smaller pictures.

If the locking is strong enough (i.e., concretized solidly enough), individuals tend to project their local smaller pictures onto the world at large - and then to assume, often in an unexpressed sense, that the whole world can be explained and understood in the terms of their local smaller-picture frameworks.

The inverse of this is often the case. For example, individuals can encounter other kinds of smaller pictures, or at least some elements of them.

The tendency then is to interpret the other smaller-picture frameworks in ways that make them consistent with the ones the individual already has.

Another way of putting this is that individuals can modulate other realities to make them consistent with their own.

If certain factors at home in the other realities cannot be made to fit, then those factors are reinterpreted (altered) so that they can fit. If the fitting is not really possible, then the other factors are usually discredited or in some form done away with.

As will be discussed in the following essay, this kind of situation is of extraordinary importance in the case of any kind of tutorials or training regarding activation of the superpower faculties.

THE SUPERPOWER FACULTIES VS MAPS OF THE MIND

Ingo Swann (16Nov98)

The concept of maps of the mind has considerable importance regarding not only to the superpower faculties per se, but with regard to any efforts to activate them via any kind of teaching-learning efforts.

The basic reason for this importance is that when new information is in-taken by an individual, it is not only taken into a mind, but into a mind that is already structured or formatted in some kind of way.

In this sense, the new information will be processed in ways that accord with the formatting. In large part, the in-taken information will at first be processed with regard to whether it is compatible or incompatible with the formatting.

With what often amounts to diligent effort, maps can be made regarding the major elements that characterize the formatting.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

As discussed elsewhere in this Site, the general concept of teaching-learning involves in-take of information, guidance by tutors and teachers and, where appropriate, the undertaking of drills, tests, and practice sessions.

In certain areas of interest, this concept has yielded wonders

that shouldn't be denied. This concept also has an advantage in that the topics and subjects to be in-taken (learned) can be organized in step-by-step ways, and progressively linearized from "simple-easy" to "more complex-involved."

Additionally, this concept expects and predicts the eventual appearance of states of "proficiency" regarding what was in-taken.

This concept has achieved such overwhelming success that it has become, in the modernist cultural environments of the West, the dominant concept regarding teaching-learning.

Hence, when most think of teaching-learning, it is this concept that they are probably referring to, and it is this concept that is probably integrated into their mind-maps.

However, an examination of this concept as it has evolved over time shows that best results are achieved with regard to in-taking, in rote-learning ways, information about tangible, concrete things—or with regard to various activities that can be confirmed as existing by virtue of abundant evidence that they DO exist.

This concept does not have many high success turn-outs regarding human phenomena that can loosely be grouped under the general heading of intangible "mental processes."

As an example of some of the distinctions involved, individuals can learn to play chess because they can rote-learn the rules and general concepts of that game. After that, however, the game of chess further involves or incorporates the mental processing capacities of each individual player.

The rules of chess, and teaching-learning them, do not distinguish among individuals. But clearly the mental processing capacities do—and it is most certainly the latter that establishes the qualitative differences between average and achieved chess players.

Without going too deeply into it, it can be said that our species innately possesses at least two general categories of

teaching-learning mechanisms or systems.

One of these two categories, as already described, refers principally and specifically to teaching-learning regarding outer, concrete phenomena and activities related to those in some way.

However, it can easily be confirmed that our species also innately carries a vast panorama of phenomenological activity that is exclusively "mental" in nature, and which activity does not refer principally or at all to outer concrete phenomena.

With regard to the strategic differences between these two general teaching-learning perspectives, it is useful to consider that the first primarily involves in-take of information that establishes and broadens tangible and cognitive contact with outer concrete phenomena.

The second category, however, primarily involves our species systems of awareness—with the important proviso that those systems in their first instance might not be determined by any given relationship to outer concrete phenomena.

From this it would follow that teaching-learning regarding the first category is dependent on direct relationships to outer concrete phenomena—but that teaching-learning regarding the second category is not.

If this would be the case, then it would transpire that efforts to utilize the teach-learning patterns that so exquisitely benefit the first general category might be inefficient and non-productive regarding the second category, this to some larger degree at least.

As but one example here, information regarding outer concrete phenomena can be itemized and organized in perfectly logical ways—because the outer phenomena are tangible and visible.

If "mental processes" were likewise tangible and visible, then they could be charted and organized in some kind of similar way—and the rote learning so efficient with regard to outer

phenomena could likewise be honed to efficiency with regard to "mental processes."

But there is a central problem encountered in this regard. Outer phenomena more or less stay the same, and so they can be efficiently generalized and incorporated into step-by-step teaching-learning undertakings.

Regarding "mental processes," however, while these might be generalized to some degree, the generalizing comes quickly to an abrupt end in that the state and condition of each individual's "mental processes" is different—and, in certain respects, never stays quite the same on a moment-to-moment basis.

If we seize upon the concept of MAPS OF THE MIND, then it is useful to consider that the mind-maps of individuals are different in very many respects.

The meaning of this is quite clear. Any in-take of information, no matter what it consists of, must, at the individual, fall into an individual mind-map within which the individual's "mental processes" are organized in ways both special and peculiar to the individual.

At least two extraordinary difficulties can thus be encountered with regard to the second general category of teaching-learning:

1. In this category, there are no outer concrete phenomena that fundamentally stabilize the teaching-learning process.
2. In the absence of this stabilizing factor, what happens AFTER information is in-taken into the individual's "mental processes" can become something of a mystery, even to the individual involved.

The major point of having briefly outlined all of the above is that the situation regarding mind-maps in general, and INDIVIDUAL mind-maps in particular, has something to do with if-when-how any of the superpower faculties might actually become activated. And something quite like this is

the case no matter what kinds of information are in-taken.

This is to say that general concepts regarding the superpowers can be taught to groups of students. But unless the exquisitely important factor of their individual mind-maps is taken into active consideration by BOTH the teacher and the student, then it is NOT possible to predict profitable out-comes.

It now must be observed that the modernist West is deplorably deficient (1) of teaching-learning concepts regarding not only the second general category as described above, but (2) with regard to any teaching method in which the recipient individual MUST be considered as a principal factor—even as THE principal factor.

For clarity here, in the modern West the information to be learned is almost always considered THE principal factor, with the teacher as the second factor, and the individuality of the student sometimes having no status at all.

Indeed, the modern version of education is actually based upon the concept of mass education for the millions—with the real, but politically concealed expectation that only some of the millions will benefit enough in order to be suitably fitted into the societal structure.

Within the contexts of mass or even group education, then, it cannot really be said that the either the individual learner, or individual mind-maps, have any significant place of importance, and certainly not as THE principal factor.

There seems to be only one kind of teaching-learning method that places the individual in THE principal position. This is the ancient Guru-Chela set-up as found in the East, in some parts of pre-colonial Africa, and elsewhere.

This set-up has sometimes been adapted to group activity, but its essential essence and success factors are based on a one-to-one relationship between a guru and a given chela.

In this instance, the guru is not exactly a teacher, as so commonly mistranslated into Western terms, nor is the chela

actually a student.

Within the classical Eastern concept, the guru is thought of not only as a possessor of experience and knowledge, but of wisdom and expanded states of awareness-mental functioning.

There is an important proviso with regard to the above—that the guru also possesses activated or "awakened" faculties which the chela also possesses but in a non-active or unawakened condition.

The chief function of the guru is not merely to deliver information to the chela, but in the first instance the guru must "psych out" the existing mind-map of the chela—so as to perceive which of the chela's faculties need awakening, and so as to portion out information that will directly stimulate the awakening.

Thus, there is a distinction here between the in-take and accumulation of knowledge on the one hand, and stimulating awakenings on the other.

It is understood that unless the information in-take is designed by the guru precisely in the light of the chela's mind-map, then the chela might appreciate the information intellectually, but the awakenings of the latent faculties might not occur.

The chief function of the chela is not merely to be and remain a passive in-taker of information, but to "psych into" the mind-map of the guru.

This is NOT a teacher-follower relationship. Rather, the expectation is that at some point the chela and the guru mental processes, mind-maps and awakened faculties will become equivalent, and that in the end the chela will surpass the attainments of the guru.

In the cultural East, this kind of situation is sometimes referred to as the on-going, unfolding path of awakening, attainment, and enlightenment. In the pure sense of it, the situation is bastardized by transliterating it into the Western

concept of teacher-student.

Although the guru might simultaneously have several or many chelas, the guru cannot exclusively tutor them in a collective fashion, but must work on a one-to-one basis with the mind-maps of each.

Something akin to this guru-chela relationship is found in the West, but usually only with regard to the arts, especially the performing arts, where a highly achieved individual (Master) will accept to tutor up-coming talent on a one-on-one basis.

MAPS OF THE MIND

Based on all of the foregoing, it can hypothetically be said that anyone wanting to activate any superpower faculties has not only to consider information to be in-taken in this regard, but what the information is in-taken into.

Here is the all-time greatest omission of knowledge with regard to understanding the nature of the superpowers, and with regard to the mind-maps of individuals.

In a certain sense, it is probable that almost everyone can think of information as seeds. But few ever consider the condition or state of what the seeds must fall into.

In what follows, we can hypothetically think of information as seeds which fall into a rather large assortment and variety of mind-maps of given individuals.

Any approach to what is henceforth involved absolutely requires some sort of orientation concerning the nature of mind-maps.

The concept of maps of the mind is a rather recent one in modernist terms. One of the reasons for this is that modernist mainstream mind-sets unilaterally favored the philosophy and science of materialism—which held that everything,

including the mind, had a physical basis.

Accordingly, since the brain was a tangible, concrete affair, efforts were directed to mapping the brain—NOT the mind—since it was assumed that mapping the brain would provide ALL answers as to what mind consisted of.

As mapping of the brain proceed up through the 1950s and 1960s, some few leading brain researchers began speculating that the mind was not going to be found in the brain. THIS development, or slight glitch, within brain research was soon smoothed over so as to keep brain mapping uniform with expectation that the brain and mind were the same thing.

None the less, some few got the idea of trying to map the mind, an entirely complex and horrible undertaking to be sure.

In 1981 and 1983 respectively, two important books came out, and the remainder essay is principally a review of them. The topic of mind-maps will also be elaborated in other essays forthcoming.

The contents of those two books, when combined are capable of reorienting not only everyone's mind maps, but a rather large variety of awareness margins and perceptions.

Thus, both books are important for at least two reasons.

The first is that the individual can grok, probably for the first time ever, the bigger picture regarding maps of the mind—this, of course, only for it is worth to each individual.

The second reason is that everyone's particular mind-map is quite likely an alive, and quite dynamic thing-in-itself, and continues "working" even when one is asleep or unconscious. As such it actually likes to in-take information that pertains to itself, such in-take being something like a thrilling experience.

However that may be, the two books are important because IF an organized training school for the superpowers was ever

undertaken, both of the books would be required in the superpowers course 101.

The first book mentioned above is **MAPS OF THE MIND: CHARTS AND CONCEPTS OF THE MIND AND ITS LABYRINTHS** (1981) by Charles Hampden-Turner.

The blurb on the book's back cover reads: "In a ground breaking work of scholarship, Charles Hampden-Turner presents the first comprehensive attempt to collect, describe, and draw in map form the most important concepts of the human mind put forth by the world's greatest writers, painters, philosophers, and psychologists."

The second mentioned book is **FRAMES OF MIND: THE THEORY OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES** (1983) by Howard Gardner, in which the author theorizes that the mind contains a series of different kinds of intelligences. We will consider this book first, and then move on to Hampden-Turner's impressive work.

In Part 1 of **FRAMES OF MIND**, Gardner establishes an overview regarding "The Idea of Multiple Intelligences." In Part 2, he enumerates six of them as:

1. Linguistic Intelligence
2. Musical Intelligence
3. Logical-Mathematical Intelligence
4. Spatial Intelligence
5. Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence
6. The Personal Intelligences

Here, it should immediately be mentioned that language capacities are now considered to be universal to our species, and as such consists of a species-wide hard drive component that downloads into each human specimen.

By reflecting upon the other intelligences listed above, there is good and real reason to consider that they are also hard-drive, species-universal as well, and as such also download into each individual specimen.

In the sense above, then, the mind is not A MIND, but some kind of co-partnership among several systemic and interactive intelligences. This concept is entirely compatible with the concept that our species is an intelligence-system, which downloads into individual intelligence-systems, composed of the interactive intelligences.

Gardner's book goes on to discuss "The Socialization of Human Intelligences through Symbols" (chapter 12); and as Chapters 13 and 14 respectively, "The Education of Intelligences" and "The Application of Intelligences."

Although Gardner titles his book as FRAMES OF MIND, he has produced what amounts to a given map of the mind and which map contains a number of intelligences. All societal taboos considered, he can't be blamed too much for omitting another kind of intelligence that is likewise universal to our species—the superpower intelligences.

Although FRAMES OF MIND presented the idea of multiple intelligence as theory, it is worth noting that the theory has drifted into becoming factually accepted, as least in principle.

The reader is now referred to a special publication by no less than SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN magazine, entitled EXPLORING INTELLIGENCE, and which appeared in November, 1998.

This contains a number of science-based articles, among which is found one entitled "Multiplicity of Intelligences" by none other than Howard Gardner. (Here, it is worth noting that any article appearing under SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN auspices more or less announces science mainstream approval and the acquisition of scientific status.)

In this recent article, though, Gardner writes that "Rather than having just [a single] intelligence defined by IQ, humans are better thought of as having eight, maybe nine, kinds of intelligence." (page 19.)

The first five intelligences remain the same as given in his 1983 book, but the sixth one, Personal Intelligences, has been

broken into two parts as:

INTRAPERSONAL INTELLIGENCE—"Accurately determining moods, feelings and other mental states in oneself."

INTERPERSONAL INTELLIGENCE—"Accurately determining moods, feelings and other mental states in others, and using the information as a [feedback] guide for behavior."

Gardner has now added to his list of intelligences:

NATURALIST INTELLIGENCE—"Recognizing and categorizing natural objects."

A "possible" **EXISTENTIAL INTELLIGENCE**—"Capturing and pondering fundamental questions of existence."

Gardner indicates that the above Intelligence is "possible," because "More evidence, however, is needed to determine whether this is an intelligence." (Gasp?) Indeed, whether it is an intelligence or not, pondering fundamental questions of existence is species-wide, and the general concept transcends all smaller-picture cultural consortiums.

One of the cognitive benefits downloading from Gardner's article is that his "Criteria for an intelligence" are itemized into eight categories. These criteria do not so much define what an Intelligence IS, but are more directed to how they can be identified as such.

On behalf of reviewing this article in this essay, it is fair and dignified to list these criteria more or less as given by Gardner.

CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING AN INTELLIGENCE

1. Potential isolation by brain damage. For example, linguistic abilities can be compromised or spared by strokes.
2. The existence of prodigies, savants and other

exceptional [experiencing] individuals. Such individuals permit the intelligence to be observed in relative isolation. [NOTE: In the sense of this particular criteria, achieved natural psychics whose active faculties can be confirmed by objective means could be considered as some kind of prodigy, savant or exceptional experiencing individuals, and which permit the intelligence involved to be observed in relative isolation.]

3. An identifiable core operation or set of operations. Musical intelligence, for instance, consists of a person's [innate] sensitivity to melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre and musical structure.
4. A distinctive developmental history within an individual, along with a definable nature of expert performance.
5. An evolutionary history and evolutionary plausibility. One can examine forms of spatial intelligence in mammals or musical intelligence in birds.
6. Support from tests in experimental psychology. Researchers [mainstream] have devised tasks that specifically indicate which skills are related to one another and which are discrete. [NOTE: But with the minimal exception of intuition, such mainstream researchers have not developed, and still don't condone the development of, such tests with regard to, for example, telepathy and clairvoyance.]
7. Support from psychometric findings. Batteries of tests reveal which tasks reflect the same underlying factor and which do not.
8. Susceptibility to encoding in a symbol system. Codes such as language, arithmetic, maps, and logical expression, among others, capture important components of respective intelligences. [COMMENT: One wishes Carl G. Jung were alive today to read this one!]

One particular statement from Gardner is highlighted within the text of the article, but which can be amended a little as posited in the hard brackets:

"All human [specimens] possess all these intelligences: indeed, they can collectively be considered as a [hard drive]

definition of Homo sapiens, cognitively speaking."

Now to move on to briefly considerations regarding Hampden-Turner's book, **MAPS OF THE MIND: CHARTS AND CONCEPTS OF THE MIND AND ITS LABYRINTHS**.

For starters, in that Hampden-Turner has utilized the term **LABYRINTH** in his sub-title, it is worthwhile reprising the definitions of that term—which most dictionaries give as:

1. A place constructed of or full of intricate passageways and blind alleys
2. Something extremely complex or torturous in structure, arrangement, or character

The above definitions are well and good. But the **DICTIONARY OF SYMBOLS** (1962) compiled and published by J. E. Cirlot defines **LABYRINTH** term as:

"An architectonic structure, apparently aimless, and of a pattern so complex that, once inside, it is impossible or very difficult to escape."

Cirlot goes on to indicate that the labyrinth, as a symbol, is very ancient, but that the true labyrinth, in the ancient sense, has a "center." The center might symbolize the virtual essence of the life principle—while the intricate passageways and blind alleys around the center symbolize what can happen by drifting too far away from the centralizing life principle.

By stretching this symbolic metaphor a little, one might transliterate it into the concept of getting lost in the blind alleys of smaller pictures—as might be represented by some of the more narrow aspects of parapsychology and naive psychical literature, and also, of course, as representative of any ism, whether philosophic, scientific or otherwise.

As it is, and to move sprightly along, in its more mundane conceptualization, a labyrinth can properly be considered as anything extremely complex or torturous in structure, arrangement, or character—and hence the symbol

LABYRINTH has almost universally been applied as a basic descriptor of the human mind.

Hampden-Turner's MAPS OF THE MIND includes many pictorial representations of mind maps, and is otherwise delightful reading for anyone interested not only in the topic of mind in general, but in one's own mind-map. Interested specimens of our species are, of course, directed to the book itself—in that only an all-to-brief picture of this entirely important book can be outlined in this essay.

In the book's Introduction, Hampden-Turner states:

"What is the mind? is a question that has intrigued people from the earliest times—indeed, for as long as man has considered the possibility of mind at all. It is the first truly philosophical question which comes with the dawning of self-consciousness.

"Yet it stumbles on a vexing question: How can that which knows, know itself? Each representation of the know which lacks the knower is necessarily incomplete."

Hampden-Turner then goes on to indicate that MAPS OF THE MIND breaks with tradition in a number of ways. Although he does not say so, the "tradition" he refers to approximately consists of the following idea.

Philosophers, scientists, and psychologists have long held that the mind is a given thing-in-itself in almost the same sense as a leg or the brain are things in themselves.

For this reason, it was considered that the mind and brain are the same thing, and that when the brain is finally completely mapped, then the mind will also be completely mapped.

It was thus theorized that some kind of unitary brain-mind principle would eventually be uncovered. In Hampden-Turner's words, this theoretical unitary brain-mind principle is expressed as "some unitary reality behind multiple appearances" of the mind.

This multiple appearances," of course, partially refers to individual minds—and which by simple counting are found to be so multiple as to be uninteresting (and confusing) regarding extensive scientific or philosophic inquiry.

The central purpose of MAPS OF THE MIND is to help illustrate that ALL of its maps are not different per se, but exemplary of the mind's wholeness—and which wholeness from time immemorial has utilized metaphors, symbols and stories "to create mental pictures and configurations."

In Hampden-Turners concept of it, this "wholeness" does not imply a unitary reality behind the multiple formats produced by the mind. Rather, the "wholeness" is a metaphor serving as a protest against one of the multiple formats taking precedence over all others of them.

Thus, cultures are divided from each other by giving one map of the mind precedence over all others produced from the same whole mind of the species.

Hampden-Turner thus indicates that his "entire book is a plea for the revision of social science, religion and philosophy to stress connectedness" with regard to the whole (species) mind, rather than stressing cultural or societal emphasis on one of its (smaller-picture) formats or metaphors.

His "plea," as he puts it, thus gives emphasis to mind "connectedness, coherence, relationship, organicism and wholeness, as against the fragmenting, reductive and compartmentalizing forces of prevailing orthodoxies."

He goes on to indicate that "My belief is that industrial [modernist] cultures are dangerously overdifferentiated and underintegrated. [They] compulsively exaggerate our differences while ignoring what we have in common." Yes!!!

However, and as an aside, this present author constructing this essay can easily enumerate at least twenty "fragmenting, reductive and compartmentalizing" isms and mindsets through which Hampden-Turner's plea would fall like water poured into a sieve.

MAPS

Hampden-Turner goes on to explain that "We 'map' with words as well as images, but because words come in bits and pieces many people have assumed that the world is in bits and pieces, too, with bits corresponding to words."

He then suggests that one way to correct this verbal bias is to supplement words with visual maps. "If the human mind is to be conceived as a whole as well as parts, we need not just words to convey parts, but patterns, pictures and schemata to convey the whole."

The text of MAPS OF THE MIND presents sixty mind-maps, which are verbally AND visually treated. The sixty mind-maps are grouped under nine different "levels" as follows:

- LEVEL 1: Maps historical and religious
- LEVEL 2: Psychoanalytic and existential maps
- LEVEL 3: The physiology of brain functioning
- LEVEL 4: The creative mind
- LEVEL 5: Psychosocial development
- LEVEL 6: Communication, language and symbolism
- LEVEL 7: Cybernetics and psychobiology
- LEVEL 8: The paradigmatic mind
- LEVEL 9: The structure of myth

Except for a minuscule mention (in Map 55) of intuition in association with the right hemisphere, there is no mention of any of the superpowers, such as telepathy, clairvoyance, remote-viewing, future-seeing,, and so forth.

However, some of these are implicitly incorporated within terms less taboo, such as "bifurcation," "consciousness," "divergent thinking," etc.

The index includes a reference to "energy," but only indicates "See psychic energy."

"Psychic energy," however, does not appear as an item in the index, and so it is difficult to "see" it. But one will run across it in one or another of the sixty mind maps portrayed.

The index has a listing for "Energy, instinctual" and one is directed to page 40, which discusses Map 9 entitled "The Limited Energy Model of Sigmund Freud." Discussion of this map begins with the observation that "Freud's contribution to our understanding of mind began with the puzzle that we 'know' more than that of which we are consciously aware." Yes! Indeed!

A reading through this remarkable book will enable one to approximately discover which, if any, of the sixty mind-maps might be nearest to resembling one's own.

If nothing else, discovering this will make one's own mind map feel somewhat more legitimized. After all, if by the interests of others many people feel better if they and their minds are reflected back at them in ways that give them a little status. Finding something in a book that resembles one's own mind-map does give a little status.

The best source for discovering the nature of one's own mind- map is, of course, one's own mind map. It is thus very interesting for one to attempt to diagram one's own.

That map, after all, is the map into which in-taken information and learning must fall.

It is now to be observed that whatever else they might consist of, mind-maps actually have to be something like self-contained systems. These systems not only are and contain mind configurations, but also contain one's own mental information processing grids.

The mind-map in Hampden-Turner's book that best emphasizes SYSTEMS is Map 47, entitled "The Hierarchy of Living Nature," and which is exemplified via "The passionate pessimism of Arthur Koestler."

In explanation of the term HOLARCHY, Koestler's mind-

map model emphasizes that the mind has "permeable, reorganizable divisions with countless feedback loops and flexible strategies." Koestler suggested the word **HOLARCHY** for this concept, taken from the Greek **HOLOS**, meaning whole, and **ON**, meaning entity.

Koestler's term **HOLARCHY** therefore can be defined as referring to "a hierarchically organized, self-regulating, open system of holons."

Map 47 is thus described as "not solely applicable to biology, [in that] it could as easily represent social organization, anatomy, linguistics, technology or the branching of knowledge.

"For the holarchy is best regarded as a conceptual tool, not as an end in itself, but as a key capable of opening some of nature's combination locks which stubbornly resist other methods."

However, holarchies can best be groked by first in-taking a more expansive consideration of **SYSTEMS**.

END NOTE: If the sixty mind-maps in Hampden-Turner's book, and the nine intelligences of Howard Gardner, are all superimposed, one would begin to obtain to a quite bigger picture of mind and of our species intelligence-system.

Attempting to do this verbally and visually would constitute a rather awesome task. But in attentively studying the materials, mind finds itself reflecting back at itself—and it is not unlikely that various rearrangements in structure and content might automatically take place in the light of bigger-picture making.

Awareness and the Superpowers

VS

A Conspiracy (?) to Suppress Knowledge of Awareness

Ingo Swann (20Oct99)

The central purpose of this essay is to BEGIN to bring to light an extremely subtle and hidden situation that continuously surrounds the essential nature of the superpowers in an on-going and prevailing cocoon of disinformation.

This situation is so strange, and so seemingly unlikely, that at first take the following considerations might seem outrageously off the wall.

And so I hasten to refer to an ancillary situation that is entirely credible because it is generally understood to exist, and is broadly confirmed by relevant and available documentation.

It is a well-known fact that research and discovery regarding the nature of the superpowers is neither encouraged nor supported within the workings of the more powerful societal mainstreams.

As a result, organized forms of psychical and parapsychological research have been left dangling at the fountains of funding and needed academic interaction. They have been continuously distressed with regard to any authenticity of their accumulated work over the last 120 years of the so-called Modern Age.

The exclusion and condemnation of Psi, etc., by the powerful societal mainstreams is so obvious that it really should be considered as deliberately purposeful in its general intent.

Obviously, the societal mainstreams do not want constructive increases in parapsychological knowledge, perhaps especially with regard to telepathy. If developed into high states of functioning, telepathy would be considered as invasive of minds. And most societal power structures depend on power-making secrets being KEPT secret.

There are other considerations about the reasons, some of which have been partially considered in the essay herein entitled "Remote Viewing and Its Skeptics."

The foregoing having now been said, it can be pointed up that societal worries about possible Psi superpower enhancing have a history that stretches back anterior in time

before the last 120 years of the Modern Age.

In this anti-Psi history, throughout which cognitive development of Psi knowledge has not been wanted, it stands to reason that ANY knowledge regarding factors that might contribute to its development must themselves be culturally suppressed or permanently suspended in ambiguous confusions.

There are many subtle, long-term knowledge vacuums that have been perpetuated to that end.

The term AWARENESS is used all the time, and so it is difficult to think that information regarding its dynamic and extensive nature is encapsulated in a knowledge vacuum.

As that may be, however, it is clear that kinds of awarenesses and the kinds of superpowers are not only ancillary but are fundamentally interactive with each other.

Thus, if effective knowledge about the superpowers is to be suppressed, or at least distorted in some counter-productive sense, then effective knowledge regarding awarenesses must also be treated likewise.

To help drive home this point, the term IMPEDE is defined as "to interfere with the progress of, to block, to hinder."

In this sense, we can think not only in terms of impeded and unimpeded knowledge regarding the superpowers, but also in terms of impeded and unimpeded awarenesses.

Societal Suppression of Knowledge About Awareness Faculties

There are two central reasons for entering into the strange topics of this essay.

First, it can be thought that the superpowers and the spectrums of awareness are so basically and closely interrelated that it is virtually impossible to consider them apart from each other.

Second, it is true that the word "awareness" is used all the time. But if one makes a determined effort to discover the existence of any in-depth research and accumulated knowledge regarding it, one might become aware of rather extensive information and knowledge vacuums in this regard.

Awareness faculties and abilities are exceedingly strategic to the superlative functioning,

and even to the basic survival, of our species entire, and, of course, to each of its individuals.

Indeed, without what is called AWARENESS we would be little more than darkened, blind, stimulus-response critters that only react to stimuli but are unable to discriminate anything.

Because of this strategic importance, knowledge vacuums regarding the dynamics of awareness really should not exist as such.

Therefore, the existence of the knowledge vacuums regarding awareness faculties must be seen as representing an invisible, but profound situation of some kind - one in which a lack of awareness-knowledge seems to be important and with purpose.

It is broadly understood that scientific and philosophic minds, as it were, should take active interest in all matters that are of extreme and significant importance.

But science and philosophy are not independent of the societal environments in which they occur, so much so that without the positive support of those environments neither science nor philosophy can exist very well.

When one speaks of "societal environments," one is of course, and in the first frame of reference, speaking of societal power structures, within which power and the maintenance of it always represents the first order of business.

Speaking in metaphor, then, power structures do not like the emergence of information and knowledge that might weaken or threaten their assumed authenticity and realities, and within which societal power forces are vested.

Thus, determination of what knowledge is to consist of, or not consist of, is almost always a societal concern before it can be handed down into scientific and philosophic minds.

And indeed, ever since Francis Bacon (1561-1626) pronounced his famous axiom that "Knowledge itself is power," thereby connecting the two, it can be understood, with some certainty, that various power structures soon began keeping an eagle eye on emerging knowledge that might either support or disrupt them.

In other words, societal power structures first, THEN science and philosophy - provided those two workhorses of knowledge confine their efforts within societal power guidelines.

Indeed, knowledge is power, or at least can help make and sustain power to those who have it. Therefore, non-knowledge or lack of it gives depowerment to those, the powerless, in whom certain kinds of power-making knowledge are caused to be absent

by intent and design.

It is certainly clear enough that awareness is very closely related to power and to power status. What is not so clear, though, is that certain kinds of awareness are more power-pertinent than other kinds.

To somewhat grok the nature of what is involved along such lines, one has only to consider what, at the individual level, various INCREASES of functional awareness might portend in societal systems and their stratified power structures.

Any competent examination of such power structures quickly reveals that their continuing existence does depend on maintaining this or that extent of non-operative awareness factors of the masses.

There are many ways to achieve this, of course, and on many different levels. But one really efficient way is simply to suppress and remove the entire topic of awareness from constructive study - so that, simply put, knowledge of pro-active awareness cannot dribble down into the depowered intelligences of the masses.

In any event, while much of the information in this Website can be considered within hypothetical contexts, the direct relationship between awareness and the superpowers is so obvious that it is cast in factual cement.

If, however, one wishes to locate information packages relevant to this factual cement, one will ultimately discover three factoids:

1. A great deal of information is available regarding the existence of the superpowers; but
2. Information regarding awareness is so scant as to be almost non-existent; and
3. In the conventional societal approaches to the superpowers, and via parapsychology itself, there is no linking of awareness to the superpowers - even though clairvoyance and telepathy, for example, can be thought of as different specializing kinds of awareness.

But beyond the parameters of parapsychology, there is a larger and identifiable reason for this.

At the societal levels, beyond a few rather brief and obviously truncated dictionary definitions for AWARE and AWARENESS, there are no in-depth studies regarding their essence, nature, workings, and multitudinous phenomena in science proper, in philosophy, in sociology, and even in anthropology.

Thus, the information vacuum regarding the nature of awareness goes beyond its implications to parapsychology. Indeed, the vacuum is universally present in all

modernist approaches to knowledge, and especially with regard to endeavors that have anything at all to do with power and empowerment.

Awareness and the Superpowers of the Human Biomind

There can be little doubt that in their first or primary instance, the various kinds of superpowers consist of various kinds of naturally indwelling "units" that can exist in at least three identifiable states: (1) active; (2) inactive; or (3) blocked, impeded, or desensitized.

Thus, if one examines to examine the phenomena and functions regarding the superpowers, but does not examine the awareness spectrums that intimately go along with them, the end product can manifest as very little regarding superpower activations.

The whole of this results in two simple equations:

(a) The lack of awareness activation equates to no superpower recognition or activations.

(b) Organized awareness knowledge and expansions equate to increases of superpower recognition and activations.

In the light of the above, if a school or center for superpower development were ever established, its Basic Course 101 would focus on the nature of awareness, and include methods for enhancing and expanding not only its spectrums, but its entire panorama.

As it is, then, there are precise reasons for introducing this subject of awareness into these essays regarding the superpowers of the human biomind:

1. The superpowers involve those biomind awareness-faculties that can transcend the known limits and physical factors of space, time, matter, and energy;
2. It is entirely difficult to comprehend how the biomind faculties can achieve the transcending IF THEY DO NOT INCORPORATE ESSENTIAL AND SPECIFIC AWARENESSES consisting of a number of kinds and varieties;
3. If one subtracts awareness from the superpowers, one will NOT have the superpowers;
4. If one discusses and studies the superpowers as anything other than specific kinds of awareness modules, the superpowers will not become volitionally active;
5. Those who possess some "natural" kind of superpower functioning obviously also have a "natural" activation of the appropriate awareness modules.

Impeded vs Unimpeded Awareness Modules

One of the central functions of this present essay is to hypothetically consider the possible, but very subtle, existence of three factors. Their existence is of enormous importance to the superpowers of the human biomind.

The three factors are:

(1) The hypothetical existence of something that, for lack of more precise terms, might be called unimpeded or noiseless awareness.

(2) If it can be supposed that unimpeded awareness can or could exist, then it can be shown that the present compilations of modern knowledge are constructed in ways that navigate around it. The result would be that knowledge of it is not only consistently avoided but obliterated.

(3) In that ways and means must be contrived to avoid knowledge as well as to discover it, then the use and meaning of the term CONSPIRACY cannot be disallowed - although the exact sources of such conspiracy not be entirely groked via conventional suppositions.

(NOTE: With reference to concepts of impedance regarding (1) above, one might refer to the essays herein entitled "Remote Viewing and the Signal-to- Noise Ratio," "Mental Information Processing Grids and Meaning Transducers," and "Information Processing Viruses and Their Clones.")

Our Species As An Awareness Life Form VS Our Species As a Stimulus-Response Mechanism

Here we might pause to wonder again what our species, and its downloaded individuals, would be like if it DID NOT possess various kinds of awareness spectrums each of which may be quite extensive.

Indeed, without its vast arrays of awareness factors, any palpitating biomind would be not much more than a palpitating blob. In fact, one could delete the mind part from consideration, ending up with the bio part being little more than a non-aware stimulus-response affair, if even that.

Along those lines of thought, efforts to establish that the human is only a stimulus-

response affair are thickly woven into modernist knowledge packages via which attempts are made to codify what is knowledge about ourselves and what is not.

Attempts to erect a picture of humans as being only stimulus-response affairs are grouped together under the general heading of "behaviorism," or the "behavioristic" sciences and philosophies.

Definitions of BEHAVIORISM differ slightly, but are nevertheless consistent in concept.

WEBSTER'S (1967) indicates that BEHAVIORISM is "a doctrine holding that the data of psychology consist of the observable evidence of orgasmic activity to the exclusion of introspective data or references to consciousness and mind. [I.e., to the exclusion of awareness faculties.]

As the ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY (1967) further indicates:

". . . behaviorism, as a philosophical theory, is as old as reductive materialism [and is defined as an attempt] to interpret all mental states in terms of matter in motion."

Additionally, the fifth edition (1981) of the PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY (R. J. Campbell, Ed.) indicates that:

"Behaviorism claims that 'consciousness' is neither a definable nor a usable concept, that it is merely another word for the 'soul' of more ancient times. . . Classical behaviorism asserted that all behavior is to be understood in terms of stimulus-response formula; the organism [i.e., the human being] is thus essentially passive and can only react to stimulation."

(NOTE: In the context of the above, do be pleased to remember the use of the words "essentially PASSIVE and can only react to stimulations.")

In their collective sense, the three definitions above can be simplified in the following way.

It would be obvious that awareness and consciousness have something to do with each other. If we substitute AWARENESS for the term CONSCIOUSNESS, we can conclude that awareness is also "not a usable concept within the behaviorism model."

It is at least partially legitimate to make this slight replacement, since consciousness is given as one of the synonyms for awareness, as we will see shortly ahead.

Beyond behaviorism, an overall, and larger, picture of human history clearly establishes that smaller and bigger parameters of awareness frequently have played exceedingly important survival roles, and continue to do so.

This is highly suggestive of the perfectly logical premise that however the human "organism" might be explained or conceived otherwise, it would seem necessary to incorporate the elements of awareness rather than abolish or trash them.

This is to say, those elements would necessarily need to be incorporated - if we are to assume a picture of ourselves as something beyond the stimulus-response states of toilet training and eating dirt because the stimulus of hunger requires a response.

As a somewhat delicious aside here, it does seem that specific human specimens suffer from deletions and subtractions of awarenesses - and which subtractions might be inherent in not a few behaviorists.

Be that as it may, the desirability of enhanced parameters of awareness is not denied by other specimens - for example those obtaining to street smarts, etc., and those intent on climbing corporate ladders.

Expanded awareness does come in handy. One cannot climb a corporate ladder solely as a stimulus-response mechanism.

The Relationship of Awareness Modules to Human Intelligence

The existence of awareness is assumed to be one of the major criteria for designating our species as sometimes manifesting rather impressive attributes of generic intelligence - the functioning of which is rather dependent on some quanta of awareness however minimal or minuscule.

It is almost impossible to attempt to consider intelligence without also considering the NECESSARY attributes of awareness upon which any form of it can be mounted.

Even the stimulus-response routines of toilet training require a modicum of intelligence so as to enable continuous awareness-recognition of certain facilities established for such purposes.

Considered this way, it is clear that awareness and intelligence go hand-in-hand. It is entirely possible that one doesn't exist without the other.

It is even ethically and rationally possible to suggest that awareness and intelligence are two sides of the same coin.

In this sense, then, while enormous amounts of cultural, philosophic, and scientific research during the Enlightened modern period have been specifically devoted to TRYING to examine the nature of intelligence, hardly any investigative attention has been directed to the needed concomitants of awareness (this, of course, being another knowledge vacuum regarding awareness.)

The Societal Avoidance of Awareness Issues

To reiterate, there is an old saying that something can occasionally be recognized by its voluminous or thunderous absence. The topic of awareness clearly falls into the category of subtle absenteeism.

As but a few examples of the prolific absenteeism, no reference to AWARENESS is found in any scientific compendiums or authoritative scientific resources.

The topic of AWARENESS is likewise absent from psychological compendiums and resources, while the term itself hardly ever appears in their indexes.

With regard to philosophic theories and studies, the extremely inclusive ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY (1967) does not have an entry for awareness. However, the term is mentioned five times in the cumulative index of the Encyclopedia's eight volumes.

But since the eight volumes taken altogether amount to some 4,000 double columned pages, five mentions of awareness in the index can only be taken either as evidence of extreme marginalizing or as a gaping hole in overall philosophical mind-bending.

As another, perhaps somewhat smelly aside, one possible reason for the absenteeism of AWARENESS in overall philosophical perspectives is that philosophers, somewhat akin to behaviorists, might not necessarily need excessive quantities of it.

Returning briefly to the topic of parapsychology and etc., while much can be said about the many and quite varied topics that have surfaced in such research, the hidden thread that obviously binds them all into one unwinding spool are the different forms of awareness, and their various states and conditions.

And so, here to it can be pointed up that although the various categories of Psi obviously consist of a variety of awareness parameters and little else, no entry for AWARENESS is found in any organized compendium of psychic or parapsychological terms and nomenclature.

What all of this adds up to is that the more intimate concepts of AWARE and of AWARENESS are so generally taboo that they are not even mentioned as being taboo.

This, it seems, would more or less equate to a taboo taboo, the whole of which is ultra-taboo.

Thus, the history of awareness phenomena is almost completely and consistently marked not only by efforts to deconstruct the topic itself, but also to condemn, distort, and torture-punish it, and likewise to deconstruct and erase any organized approach to study of it.

Discussion of Existing Definitions of Awareness

In order to move ahead, two factors might be carried in mind in review of what has already been discussed.

1. There is almost nothing with regard to historical studies of awareness to which one might gladly refer in order to increase in-take of information packages regarding empowerment of it.
2. Thus, one is more or less in the position of attempting to locate relevant information packages via tugging at one's own boot straps.

In the sense of the above, tugging at one's boot straps can begin by identifying something or anything about awareness that is obvious.

One obvious element that has tremendous importance to each specimen of our species is that awareness does exist in many different formats. Without those formats, discernment of different things would soon resemble something like a murky soup.

If this tremendous and obvious importance is accepted as self-evident and unarguable, then it would seem that the nature and functions of awareness would long ago have been pointed up as one of our species chief and necessary characteristics.

This, in turn, would mean that awareness would have been submitted to in-depth, systematic study over time - and that studies specific to the nature of awareness would ultimately be housed in a hefty resource library resembling those that accumulate around all other important topics.

Well, all we have is the word AWARENESS and its exceedingly brief definitions. These are interesting enough in themselves.

However, one important factor that will not be immediately visible (but will be pointed up ahead) is that definitions of the term have, through time, undergone a curious shift of emphasis.

Most contemporary dictionaries that include mention of a word's etymology indicate that our present term AWARE is derived from the Old German-English GEWAR - the definitions of which are given as "wary" and "watchful."

The Oxford dictionary of the English language indicates that the term GEWAR was made up of GE + WAR, and is normally translated as "to be-become wary" or "to be-become watchful or alert."

However, GE had several nuances, one of which was taken to mean "to have," but another which was used to indicate "to be with."

Thus, GEWAR most likely meant "with wary," "to be with wariness," or, perhaps, "to be within wariness-cum-watchful-cum-alert."

These early definitions imply some kind of active-awareness state.

After these etymological tidbits, it is then indicated in most dictionaries that the two definitions "wary" and "watchful" are ARCHAIC - meaning that they are obsolete, and which advisory further indicates that they should not be used with regard to awareness unless one wishes to be seen as a retro something or other.

Why "to be wary" and "watchful" in relationship to any definition of awareness should be consigned to the nomenclature trash bins of history is something upon which one can meditate.

Indeed, those two definitions are entirely reflective of a vast spectrum of awareness attributes ranging from street smarts up through and including all organizational functioning where they are required in the contexts of economic, military, diplomatic, and corporate survival.

In any event, the modern definitions of AWARE substituted for the so-called "archaic" ones are:

1. "Having or showing realization, perception or knowledge;"
2. "Implying vigilance in observing or alertness in drawing inferences from what one sees or hears or learns."

Additionally, modernist dictionary conventions have established certain synonyms for AWARE:

COGNIZANT - implies having special or certain knowledge as from firsthand sources.

CONSCIOUS - implies having an awareness of the present existence of something; it may suggest a dominating realization or even preoccupation.

SENSIBLE - implies direct or intuitive perceiving, especially of intangibles or of emotional states or qualities.

ALIVE - adds to SENSIBLE the implication of acute sensitiveness to something.

AWAKE - implies that one has become alive to something and is on the alert.

While the above definitions suffice for a superficial comprehension of what is involved, they do not result in deeper understanding.

In the first place, the terms given as synonyms are not exactly, or are only loosely, the synonyms they are indicated to be.

SYNONYM is defined as "one of two or more words or expressions of the same language that have the same or nearly the same essential meaning in some or all senses."

If they are examined closely, the chief distinction between AWARE and the given synonyms becomes quite clear if one considers that awareness has to precede the downloading processes of cognizance, consciousness, sensible, alive and awake.

This is to say that the synonyms are products of awareness. If awareness did not pre-exist as a prime factor, then the secondary or downloading manifestations would not take place.

For clarity, one cannot have cognizance of consciousness of something unless awareness of the constituents that will comprise the cognizance has first taken place.

And indeed, the definition for COGNITION reflects this arrangement: "The act or process of knowing including both awareness and judgment."

Here is an an all-to-frequent example of utilizing the definitions of secondary manifestations to define the prime factor involved - and which permits the hidden probability of mistaking the secondary manifestations as the prime factor itself.

The above discussion is not just splitting semantic hairs - but has direct reference to the problems of causes and effects. The foregoing synonyms are describing EFFECTS that download from the causative state of AWARE, and which effects themselves can be

mistaken as original causes.

Furthermore, if one examines the second modernist definition of AWARE, then it is possible to conclude that "showing realization, perception, or knowledge" are, themselves, downloaded secondary products of awareness.

Another somewhat more precise and therefore more elegant way of putting all of the above, is that there must exist an awareness prime principle - and from which are downloaded all of the secondary products given in the above definitions.

But if this is considered, at least for hypothetical progress, then we are essentially left WITHOUT a specific definition for AWARE - unless we again consider the so-called "archaic" definitions of "wary" and "watchful."

If we elect to consider the archaic definitions, one can begin to wonder:

(a) Why or how they achieved their archaic status; and

(b) Why the secondary definitions have been officially and culturally substituted for the prime meaning of "watchful" and "wary."

And it is in pursuit of glimmerings of understanding for (a) and (b) above that we can begin to encounter one of the invisible factors that apparently besets our species - and which invisible factor, if groked to its fuller implications, is, simply put, shocking.

The Societal Conversion of Awareness Definitions From an Active to a Passive Mode

One way of getting into this is to attempt to perceive what the secondary definitions have in common.

Altogether, there are eight terms that represent the secondary, downloading manifestations of AWARE. These are: realization of, perception of, knowledge of, cognizance of, conscious of, sensible to, alive to, awake to.

Please note that "of" and "to" have now been added to those terms, since all eight of the terms are dependent upon being in some kind of relationship with something.

In other words, although an undifferentiated state of awareness might exist, awareness is usually in relationship TO or OF something.

One of the qualities the eight terms have in common is that their contours can be thought of as passive awareness formats, and which can be managed by factors that are external to the experiencer.

In other words, one can be taught, told, guided, educated, with regard to what is to be perceived, realized, etc. - and also with regard to what is NOT to be realized as well.

In contrast, "to be wary" and "to be watchful" seem more to be pro-active in a species generic kind of way. However, the subtle implication involved here might not be all that visible unless it is somewhat understood that large numbers of people who are wary and watchful might not be easy to socially condition this way or that.

If one can consider the existence of an ideal state of to be wary, or to be watchful, then it is explicit and implicit that that state would have to be composed of unimpeded awarenesses spectrums.

Indeed, it is difficult to think of active awarenesses themselves somehow deciding NOT to be aware of this and that. And so "learning" not to be aware of something can only be a societal artifact, deliberately installed by social conditioning that depends not on active awareness but upon passive formats of it.

If one considers the above with patience, and as calmly as possible, then it is possible to perceive that the eight terms are, in the first instance, NOT nuances of AWARE. Rather, they are properties of MIND or of mentation - as which, as most realize, can be conditioned this way or that by societal forces.

In other words, they are mind properties that can easily be responsive, in behaviorist terms, to organized formats of social and/or societal mind-management - this an easily recognized cousin to mind-control.

If there are difficulties groking the above, they quickly clear up when the definitions of the archaic term WATCHFUL and it's synonyms are integrated into the overall picture.

WATCHFUL - "vigilant, wide-awake, alert, being on the look-out especially for danger or opportunity."

VIGILANT - according to most dictionaries, "suggests keen, unremitting, wary watchfulness."

ALERT - "stresses readiness or promptness in apprehending and meeting danger or emergency or in seizing opportunity."

WIDE-AWAKE - "applies to watchfulness for opportunities more often than dangers and suggests awareness of accurate meaning or of relevant developments and situations."

With regard to the above terms, it doesn't take much imagination to grok that they represent awareness states or conditions that directly relate to power-making factors.

In THIS sense, then, it would be understandable that knowledge-managers in the service of societal power structures might easily view "being alert and keen, watchful and having unremitting vigilance" as the gravest of all their possible difficulties.

With regard to the watchful, vigilant definition of awareness, it is possible to connect that definition directly and unambiguously to various kinds of the superpower faculties.

That definition has to do with being alert, but with special emphasis on being alert regarding danger or opportunity, and perhaps other stuff as well, such as stupidity, etc.

Any competent survey of reported occurrences of spontaneous (natural) ESP, telepathy, precognition, clairvoyance, foreseeing and intuition easily establishes that a very large percentage of them have to do with alerts to danger. The remainder usually have to do with opportunity whether sensed, for instance, via telepathy, clairvoyance, and intuition. The danger and/or opportunity may be present or forthcoming.

Thus, it is apparently necessary to establish that some kind of unexamined situation exists that directly links the watchful-vigilant-alert definition of AWARE to what might be taken as two of the major functions of the superpower faculties having to do with danger and opportunity.

Theoretically establishing the certainty of the existence of those links is easy enough to do, since much of the available data regarding spontaneous functions of the superpowers are unambiguous in this regard.

In that the above statement reflects what abundantly IS the case, it is surprising that the nomenclature link between aware-watchful and the superpowers has not ever been clearly identified - and so, of course, no considerations along that phenomenological line have ever come into existence.

From the foregoing discussions, it can be seen that TWO definitional sets exist for AWARE and AWARENESS - i.e., the active set, and the passive set. For increase of clarity, those two sets should be compared side-by-side.

AWARE - AWARENESS

·
·

.....

FIRST SET	SECOND SET
(archaic, active)	(modern, passive)

Watchful	Realization
Alert	Perception
Vigilant	Knowledgeable
Keen	Cognizant
Alive to	Conscious of
Awake to	Sensible to
	Alive regarding
	Awake regarding

Taken together, there can be no doubt that the elements implicit the two sets do constitute a bigger picture of whatever is functionally involved regarding the overall qualities of aware and awareness.

But there are important and informative distinctions to be made between the two sets.

In the first instance, the archaic set is entirely suggestive of some inner kind of an ACTIVE state per se.

The second set is suggestive of PASSIVE relationship to outer situations, information, social conditioning, educational parameters, and so forth.

At first take, one might think that too much is being read into the above distinctions. But there are two vital clues available.

The replacement set is suggestive of relationships to conditions that can be formatted and educationally managed in this or that way - with the added proviso that one's mind elements can be equally conditioned:

1. To realize or perceive certain kinds of information - and which would equate to a condition of limited awareness; and
2. To NOT realize or perceive other kinds of information - and which would equate to a conditioned state of non-awareness or un-awareness.

A substantive question can now be asked: WHY were correct, vital, direct, and active definitions of AWARE declared archaic at some point, and thence replaced by definitions that are indirect and passive? And whose vitality can be managed by conditioning this way or that?

To help consider the appalling nature of this situation, it is useful to postulate that unimpeded states of awareness do exist. In their first instance, they are not dependent upon conditional situations which can be modulated by motivational societal factors.

If we postulate the existence of the unimpeded states, they could be unimpeded only if they were NOT amenable to being modulated by conditioning motivational factors.

Additionally, in order for the awareness states to become impeded, they would FIRST have to exist in some kind of unimpeded state.

With regard to the superpowers, the existence of unimpeded awareness faculties would have to naturally pre-exist them as such - after which they could undergo having impedence installed by various societal conditioning formats.

As mentioned earlier, the term IMPEDE, of course, means "to interfere with the progress of; to block; to hinder; to obstruct."

As it is, one cannot impede something that doesn't pre-exist in an unimpeded state.

So it becomes at least hypothetically possible to think that if one's superpower faculties are non-functional or inactive, the reason could be that their ancillary awareness spectrums have been impeded - and for any number of possible reasons.

Nuances of some of those possible reasons will be discussed in two subsequent essays.

One of these is entitled as "Awareness and Perception vs Status of Individual Realities."

Another essay, entitled "Passive Awareness Formats vs Active Awareness Formats," will discuss the prevailing problems of attempting to activate the superpowers by utilizing passive awareness formats.

(End)

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 Absence 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 Tzu 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 transference."

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

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: 00

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

Gifted spectrum: 00

!!!!!!!!!!!!!!XXXXX***!!!!!!!!!!!!!!*****!!XXXXX

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 Awareness

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 led 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 their 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 intake 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.

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 oversimplification 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 awarenesses 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 awarenenses 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 scientific 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 Awnresses

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 awarenresses:

- (a) Do awarenresses belong to the minus-life inorganic?
- (b) Do awarenresses belong to the plus-life organic?
- (c) Do awarenresses 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 as 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

PART ONE

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 proceeding 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 psychological 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 criteria 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 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 since 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 enhanced 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 criteria 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-discovery 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



[Ingo Database](#) | [Real Story](#) | [Contributed Papers](#) | [Contributed RV
Papers](#) |
[Superpowers/ET Intel](#) | [RV Honor Roll](#) | [Superpowers Art](#)
[Miscellaneous](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Species Guild](#) | [Welcome](#) | [Home](#)

~~CONTRIBUTED PAPERS AND REAL STORY ARE NOT YET INDEXED~~

Copyright © 2003, Ingo Swann. All rights reserved.

Site by [Tom](#)

SUPERPOWER PROCESSES AND LAYERS OF MEANING

Ingo Swann (21Apr02)

Inside the clandestine workings of large intelligence agencies (such as the CIA, MI6, former KGB, etc.), it is said that some operatives and analysts score very big success rates because they are good at “teasing seven layers of meaning out of any given situation.”

At the opposite end of the spectrum, those who cannot do this teasing may end up plodding and grunting along, perhaps only within the layer that best fits into the limited contexts of their reality boxes.

Reality boxes do exist that perceive only what is immediately obvious, especially those that rely only on the fixed and limited ranges of the physical five senses.

THE TEASING

Because the teasing among layers of meaning leads to increases of efficiency, it is well worth trying to consider what it consists of.

At some beginning level, the teasing will have to include deducing what is not obvious, and then deducing what the implications are of what is not obvious.

From there, processes usually referred to as insight and intuition can arise, and perhaps other more subtle kinds of processes that have never been identified.

In conventional terms, deducing is not usually thought of as a superpower. While the physically obvious can of course stimulate deducing, it is largely not a product of the physical five senses but of that aspect of ourselves we refer to as mind.

More specifically, deducing seems to be the product of that aspect of mind referred to as ratiocination, and which, in English, is defined as

“a reasoned train of thought resulting in the processes of exact thinking.”

But it is important to know that the term is taken from the Latin **RATIOCINATUS** meaning “to reckon.”

Definitions for **RECKON** are given as a somewhat imprecise mixture of: “to count, to estimate, to compute, to calculate, to consider, to regard (i.e., to watch), to judge.”

Reckoning can take place with regard to “determining from a fixed basis.” Or it can take place without a fixed basis - in which event no one can explain how it works.

In that case, definitions of what might be going are handed over to the jurisdiction of the term **KEN** which in English is defined as: “the range of vision [not eyeball vision]” and “the range of perception, understanding, or knowledge.”

However, one principle source of **KEN** is the Old Norse language, in which it is defined, in English, as a mix of: “to perceive, to know, to recognize,” with emphasis on “to recognize.”

In contrast to the English definitions, though, a more in-depth study of Old Norse establishes that **KENNING** was used to refer to: “the power or faculty of attaining to direct knowledge or cognition without rational thought or inference.”

This, of course, is our present definition of **INTUITION**, an activity-process that usually cannot be accounted for via rational thought or inference.

And, indeed, intelligence analysts who are good at teasing among seven layers of meaning often have a hard time selling their observations and conclusions to their establishments **BECAUSE** of the difficulty of relating them to rational thought or inference.

Along these lines, it is worth mentioning that although insight is valued if it turns out well, **INSIGHT** is defined as: “the power or act of seeing, or penetrating, into a situation” via “the act of apprehending the inner nature of things or of seeing intuitively.” In other words, by **kenning**.

SUPERPOWERS NOT RECOGNIZED AS SUCH

One of the purposes of this essay is to bring to light the concept that

deducing, insight, and intuition ARE superpowers, although they are not generally recognized as such.

The reason is that those modalities can transcend not only the obvious, but also the limits of rational thought or inference. They can also transcend the limits of the five physical senses, and of physicality per se.

So, there is a modicum or humorous irony involved in discovering that top-dog intelligence analysts and operatives must be employing aspects of those modalities within the great intelligence establishments that otherwise commonly consider them only as giggle-factors.

One could as well add that various kinds of telepathy might factor in alongside deducing, insight, and intuition.

For it might be that top-dog analysts have modicums of that biggest giggle factor modality, too – of course perhaps without their own recognition of it, and certainly never admitting it.

One reason for mentioning this does have to do with teasing seven layers of meaning out of situations.

Well, the kinds of “situations” being referred to always involve not only people but their thoughts, motives, and goals as well. Is this not the case?

HUMAN SECRECY vs HUMAN SUPERPOWERS

If one studies the fascinating arts and crafts of intelligence organizations, it can be seen, in the bigger world picture, things were easier in the past when the five physical senses alone served spies and subsequent analysis of their information quite well.

In that more simple time, the discovery of motives was generally left to the diplomatic services, one of whose jobs was to try to apprehend motives via interchanges at the diplomatic level.

When this actually worked, things went along quite well. But when it didn't, largely because many real motives could not be penetrated, or were not believed if they were chanced upon, some very sorry outcomes soon followed.

Eventually, the situation got more complicated. Secrecy has always been seen as valuable in the historical sense, but with the advent of modern technological surveillance and detection it became more

difficult not only to protect secrecy, but also to detect it.

As we of the present generations have witnessed, this difficulty soon evolved into establishing enormously extensive, and even a morass of ways and means of protecting secrecy not only from technological penetrations, but from diplomatic exchanges, and from spies, analysts, and possible moles as well.

The breadth and depth of all this soon achieved astonishing proportions, so much so that it became increasingly difficult to detect motives, whose motives to detect, or to even to detect if there were any of them at all at loose somewhere in the world.

Any success in secretizing motives, and any failure to detect them (not even a clue), will probably result in some kind of "infamy," one situation of which we already have lived through.

And THAT comprises several of the layers of meaning that can be teased out of that SITUATION.

We now know that what equates to super-secrecy can prevail and have its complex way among even super-complex conventional modalities of intelligence gathering and analysis.

One reason for this (already discussed in other essays in this website) is not the excellence of anyone involved, but rather that on both sides of any secrecy fence there is extreme reluctance with respect to developing the superpowers of deducing, insight, intuition, and especially of telepathy. Secrecy, and its maintenance, depends on preventing these superpowers from coming into substantial active existence.

Simply put, the threat to secrecy of the enhancement of those giggle-factor kinds of developments means that secrecy manipulating might have a more difficult time of carrying on. It is quite clear that teasing at least seven layers of meaning out of any situation involves recognizing that layers of meaning undoubtedly exist not only with regard to a given situation, but also to all things.

In the case of this present essay, it can be said:

- (1) Secrecy exists, obviously and covertly so;
- (2) Human superpowers also exist;
- (3) The conventions of secrecy do not want the superpowers to be developed into useful advantages;

- (4) Therefore, conventional situations following the supposed advantages of secrecy make clever and successful efforts to distort appreciation of superpower evidence;
- (5) This distorting disables and alienates constructive research and development of superpowers;
- (6) A superpower vacuum thus comes into existence within the species that possesses raw superpowers; and so the superpowers cannot develop any muscle.
- (7) Therefore, super-secrecy can proceed - and claim victims among any number of conventional situations that otherwise might oppose it in conventional terms;
- (8) The principle reason for this is that our species possesses the superpower of cleverness. When mobilized to even a near-perfect degree, it can outwit just about everything, certainly including conventional situations.

Well, above are EIGHT layers of meaning that can be teased out of THAT situation.

SECRECY AND SCUMBAGGERY

Meanwhile, back at the ranch of more mundane human affairs, there is a rather large human tendency to think that what is obvious is really what it seems to be or is accepted as. Thus, it is possible to think that the obvious does exist, and to establish a fair modicum of trust in it.

But behind whatever is accepted, there always exist factors that are not obvious, and human history is littered with plenty of stressful examples of this.

Put more simply, it can turn out that the obvious might not be what you ultimately get – because what you end up getting was not obvious to begin with.

Take scumbaggery, for example. Proficient scumbags would not get very far if it was obvious that they were scumbags. And, as many have gloomily experienced, it takes something like the fabled superpower called the sixth sense to get a defensive edge on scumbags who are not obviously such, and to do so BEFORE they

walk away with, for example, billions of dollars harvested from one's money, investments, and trust. The term SCUMBAG came into English use not too long ago, probably about 1971. But it was preceded by older terms having approximately the same meaning, to wit: "A vulgar term of abuse, but also denoting a despicable person deserving to be despised."

Along with its earlier companion terms, scumbag is slang, of course. And as such, neither the terms nor their meanings can be officially recognized.

Thus, their meanings can neither enter into philosophical, scientific, or sociological discourse, and so there is no official examination of the phenomena of scumbaggery.

The meanings of the term do not even enter into the versatile conspiracy literature, and astrology has yet to produce studies regarding the astrology of scumbags.

Be all that as it may, scumbags benefit not only from secrecy, but also from the lack of developed superpowers via which they might be detected earlier rather than later.

Here, then, is yet another vacuum regarding the superpowers, and it is largely because of it that many scumbags can rise to important and powerful positions in conventional societies that do not permit the superpowers to grow and flex any muscle.

Scumbaggery is not only a collective of despicable motives. It is also a SITUATION out of which several layers of meaning can be teased. For example, one possible meaning involves the accepted context that SCUMBAG is a "vulgar" term. So its meanings cannot be incorporated into conventional non-vulgar contexts, EVEN IF its effects and results ultimately prove to be super-vulgar in the extreme – and, in the process of becoming so, simply trash non-vulgar contexts.

Another possible meaning of scumbaggery is that various types of scumbags are always of potential use to power mongers who may need fall-guys when this or that power mongering wobbles a little. That certainly accounts for instances where scumbags, already partially identified as such, remain in good standing in certain power-mongering circles. There are some rather excellent historical and present examples of this.

Another possible meaning has to do with the avoidance by scumbags of situations in which modicums of deduction, insight, and intuition might be present – and which might result in scumbag discovery.

Yet another possible meaning is that if ostensible superpowers hesitated to deal with scumbaggery simply on the grounds that it is vulgar, then this would result in great joy and satisfaction to all sorts and types of scumbags.

Ultimately, various degrees of scumbag efficiency can be reckoned by the number of victims claimed. Indeed, any activity in any walk of life that intends to create victims is a format of scumbaggery, in that the more victims that result the more serious and abysmal the formats have been.

The principal reason here for entering so frankly into the contexts of scumbaggery versus the superpowers is that a sort of elitist myth exists about developing the superpowers: to wit, that they can be, or should be, developed only by dealing with the positive AND by avoiding the vulgar.

Well, if scumbaggery did not exist at all, or even too much, then the NEED for activation of the superpowers would not be all that important, would it?

In any event, the positive version of developing the superpowers will not, in the end, evoke lean, mean, superpower fighting machines - even on behalf of the positive version itself.

Indeed, there are several layers of meaning that can be teased out of THAT situation – and which, as a superpower exercise, the reader can attempt to achieve if interested.

(To be continued as REMOTE VIEWING AND LAYERS OF MEANING)

NOTE: Some may be interested in viewing a dramatized version in which various meanings are urgently teased out of an important situation. If so, then the recent movie entitled THIRTEEN DAYS, a dramatized recounting of the Cuban missile crisis, is recommended.

The first meaning of that crisis was, at the time, the almost immediate advent of nuclear hostilities on American soil and elsewhere, and it is interesting to watch the detection of other meanings that gradually inched away from that horrifying potential.



[Ingo Database](#) | [Real Story](#) | [Contributed Papers](#) | [Contributed RV Papers](#) |
[Superpowers/ET Intel](#) | [RV Honor Roll](#) | [Superpowers Art](#)
[Miscellaneous](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Species Guild](#) | [Welcome](#) | [Home](#)



Copyright © 2003, Ingo Swann. All rights reserved.

Site by [Tom](#)



REMOTE VIEWING PROCESSES AND LAYERS OF MEANING

Ingo Swann (08Jun02)

A previous essay having to do with superpower processes and layers of meaning discussed concept that all situations and all things have several layers of meaning.

These layers range from the obvious through several kinds of meanings that become increasingly so subtle that they may not at all impinge on the processes of recognition.

The several situations that encompass remote viewing cannot escape from the difficulties this implies, in that information achieved via remote viewing is clearly one of the things that can have multiple layers of meaning.

To get this present discussion started, it needs to be pointed up that what is being referred to does NOT fall into the area of semantic difficulty.

The principal definition of SEMANTICS is given as: “The historical and psychological study and classification of changes in significance of words or forms viewed as factors in linguistic development.”

Rather, what is being referred to in this essay is that things and situations have multiple meanings that differ in significance, purpose, or connotation, or in import and implication.

Recognition of such meanings has to be achieved by deducing or inference, or via insight or intuition, etc.

For example, if a fifty-ton rock is tumbling down the hill toward you, the meaning rapidly to be deduced or inferred is that you rapidly better get out of its way – this being a rather obvious meaning.

The one complexity that enters into this discussion is that aspiring

and ostensible remote viewers are expected to detect meanings independently of the five physical senses, these senses being considered, in conventional terms, the only real source of deducing and inferring, and which are arrived at via reason and logic based upon a fixed set of postulates.

The contexts of this essay escape the foregoing, and largely dreary, debate simply by accepting that remote viewing is possible - and it is therewith that we can turn attention to the problems of multiple layers of meanings within the contexts of remote viewing processes.

As it is, remote viewers are expected to view things, situations, and meanings without depending on the limited ranges of the five physical senses. This constitutes an activity thought impossible in modernist conventional terms, but accepted as possible in most pre-modern cultures.

THE HELLA HAMID BREAKTHROUGH IN REMOTE VIEWING

To jump into this as quickly as possible, a woman named Hella Hammid proved to be a rather efficient natural remote viewer within the early part of the remote viewing project at Stanford Research Institute in the 1970s.

Hella was an extremely cultured person, a great photographer, and usually a joy to be with.

One day in keeping with a long line of experiments she was participating in, she was given a certain target to remote view. She ultimately sketched a large, hot, steaming teapot with a lid on it, and placed on some kind of crisscrossing tripod support.

However, the designated distant target was a small nuclear reactor. In standard parapsychological terms, this was a clear miss, and it could be concluded that no remote viewing had taken place, even though she had been very successful in earlier experiments.

Someone (guess who) thought to ask Hella if she had ever seen a nuclear reactor. Except for pictures of nuclear reactor out-buildings, it was thus determined that she had not, nor had she ever studied drawings, photos, or blueprints of nuclear reactor interiors.

So, as an enjoyable outing, we all visited the small nuclear reactor,

examined it closely, and then collected schematic examples of other kinds of reactors – which are relatively the same except for size and dimensions. And, when on line, they all produce heat and steam, as well as radiation which must somehow be contained.

At a later date, another nuclear reactor target was sandwiched into her random target pool, and when that target came up she promptly said “Oh, that’s another of those nuclear reactors.”

Now, the reader needs to pay close attention to the following - because this first experiment with Hella proved to be one of the most important benchmarks that ultimately led to training routines being discovered for increasing remote viewing efficiency.

IDENTIFYING ABSENT MEANING-MEMORY STORAGE

As already mentioned, when Hella did not get the first target correctly, in the standard contexts of parapsychology,, she missed the target, except for some few descriptive similarities in the case of the teapot.

In those parapsychology contexts, such matters as clairvoyance and remote viewing are considered as matters of perception, and so Hella had not perceived the target.

However, when her “failed” experiment is considered not in the contexts of perception, but in the contexts of the signal-to-noise ratio, her “failed” experiment can be analyzed differently.

FIRST, in response to the target, she sketched a hot steaming teapot with a lid on it, and on top of some kind of tripod.

SECOND, since she did not get the target, her response could be considered as some kind of noise, because her response generated an image that was not an image of a nuclear reactor.

THIRD, some of the descriptors in her drawing, i.e., hot, steaming, contained in a pot, are also analogous descriptors of a nuclear reactor if it is on line. A nuclear reactor is hot in several ways, produces steam, and its rods are surrounded by some kind of containment unit. Furthermore, such containment units are seriously supported on foundations of metal struts fixed into cement, etc.

FOURTH, the only thing out of place in Hella's response is that the target had been incorrectly identified as a teapot.

FIFTH, when asked if she had ever seen a nuclear reactor or knew anything about them, she replied in the negative.

SIXTH, she and others were then exposed to study and orientation regarding facets of nuclear reactors.

SEVENTH, when in the future she was given a nuclear reactor as a remote-viewing target, she quickly identified it correctly.

EIGHTH, when, in discussing both RV sessions, Hella was asked if she knew why she drew the teapot, she replied something like: "I guess it was the next best thing in my experience, for I had no experience of nuclear reactors."

Put another way, her meaning-memory banks contained no experience of nuclear reactors, but very good experience of hot, steaming teapots.

The mix of the eight aspects outlined above now needs to be considered.

In studies of how perception works, it has long been held that mental images are formed first, and only then do estimations of their meaning take place.

But, and very briefly, in signal-to-noise theory when applied to the human nervous systems:

- (1) Signals first come in;
- (2) The signals are then, in pre-conscious processing, translated into information-meaning categories, usually by some kind of comparing with meanings already stored in memory banks;
- (3) If memory-meanings comparable to the signals are found, then mental images can be manufactured and rise into consciousness;
- (4) However, if no comparable or comparative memory-meanings are available, then the pre-conscious systems segue over to the next best memory-meanings

– and mental perceptions and images are then constructed in the light of those.

(5) When this happens, the resulting mental-image impressions can be at some distance from the real import of the original signals, but can carry bits of information contained in the original signals.

Hella's first reactor RV experiment was an exact replica of the five steps outlined above.

RV signals had come in, but her memory banks had no comparable meaning-memory storage, and so her pre-conscious meaning detecting processes segued over to the next best memory comparison – which happened to consist of a hot, steaming teapot.

Another way of putting this is that the second best pre-conscious analysis of meaning OVERLAID the import of the original signals – and it was this revelation that ultimately engendered the descriptive phrase of ANALYTICAL OVERLAY within the SRI RV research program.

Within the contexts of that research, neither meaning nor mental images come first.

Rather, signals come first, then meanings of them, and then mental images based on the meanings.

Within the scope of the human nervous systems, signals in-put via any of the sensory detectors are electronic in nature.

The electronic signals are then decoded, via pre-conscious processes, into meaning categories and specifics, and it is the results of this decoding that, in turn, trigger on mental perception of them.

Save to say that signals ARE somehow translated (transduced) into pre-conscious meaning, and then into mental awareness and perception, no one yet exactly knows how any of this takes place.

For clarity, three steps are involved here:

- (1) Signal in-put;
- (2) Meaning comparison within the contexts of

meanings already stored in memory;
(3) Mental perceptions (feelings, images) built upon the meanings.

In any event, within the contexts of RV research at SRI, it turned out that meaning (of things and situations) was the fulcrum of functioning BETWEEN signal in-put and mental images of them.

This is to say that remote viewing does not begin with mental perceptions, whether in the form of feelings or images that are propelled into the state of conscious awareness of them.

Rather, these are the end products of the two preceding steps, both of which are contained in functions that are pre-conscious beneath conscious awareness of them.

TWO GENERAL TYPES OF MEANINGS

As to types of meaning, these may be numerous. But there certainly are at least two general types, i.e., meanings that can be deduced about things and situations in general, and meanings that in particular arise from meaning-memory storage at the individual level.

In explanation of this, it is generally thought, in philosophy anyway, that all things are redolent with intrinsic possible meanings. But at the individual level, any deducing of meanings is principally confined to the contexts of meaning that have accumulated and achieved storage in the individual's memory banks. Therefore, meanings outside the range of the individual's meaning-memory banks might have little chance of being recognized at all, or might be interpreted only within the contexts of analogous meanings that HAVE achieved memory storage.

MEMORY RESEARCH DIFFICULTIES

Efforts to research and dissect what memory consists of have proven to be extremely difficult.

An excellent consideration of those difficulties is described in a fascinating book published by George Johnson in 1992 entitled **IN THE PALACES OF MEMORY**, with the subtitle **HOW WE BUILD THE WORLDS INSIDE OUR HEADS**.

The book sums up the excruciating, but often humorous, difficulties in researching memory, and the very little real understanding that has downloaded from such research.

But the three major parts of the book, “Mucking Around in the Wetware,” “A Brain in a Box,” and “The Memory Machine,” are splendidly readable and should be studied very carefully by anyone interested in remote viewing.

Indeed, if aspiring remote viewers were to read and study only one book, *IN THE PALACES OF MEMORY* would be it.

The reason is that although it reviews memory research per se, what is discussed in it goes on in the heads of every aspiring remote viewer. And what goes on in the heads of each remote viewer is directly and fully significant with respect to all attempts at remote viewing.

The book is an excellent clear read, easy to understand, and is absolutely hilarious here and there.

THE INNATE EXISTENCE OF MEANING-MEMORY STORAGE IN OUR SPECIES

Each specimen of our species, each individual, possesses innate and very basic hard drive functions via which “the worlds inside our heads” are built, and are thence characterized by whatever achieves some kind of imprint in the wetware of memory storage.

At some point, usually early in life, the imprinted contents in the wetware begin altogether to function as a memory machine – and can actually do so even if dimensions of the contents are, well, quite sparse, narrow, or thin.

But even so, quite strong reality boxes are formatted within the resulting memory machines, and these are specific to whatever meaning-information has achieved memory storage.

THE MULTITUDES OF HUMAN CELLULAR RECEPTORS THAT IN-TAKE “INFORMATION”

Now, with regard to the processes of remote viewing, some issues that are additionally important need to be pointed up.

The first of these issues is that viewers do not view a remote “target” via their five physical senses.

Remote viewing provides information about things and situations distant in space and time from local surroundings, and if such information proves to have some degree of correctness, it is clearly legitimate to wonder what senses and sensing systems have made the distant information accessible.

Prior to the onset (in the latter three decades of the twentieth century) of discoveries of thousands of cellular information receptors extant throughout the biological networks of human nervous systems, there was hardly anything that shed any light on how interactions with distant information could be possible.

The topic of such receptors has already been discussed at some length in other essays in this website. And so there is no need repeat details here – except to mention that such receptors exist because they are a full part of the human genome – and thus download into all individuals of the species.

Once the combined dimensions of human information receptors are appropriately grasped and understood, it can be seen that the human receptor range is quite astonishing.

As but one example, sensing receptors in the pineal gland, if it is good health, are continuously busy sensing the sun and its changing conditions. This particular sensing is usually taking place beneath conscious awareness of it. But apart from that, it is safe to point up that the sun is at some great distance from Earth, and so it can be thought that pineal gland receptors are remote viewing the sun.

In addition to pineal gland receptors (which also function at the X-ray level), many other receptors of a similar nature have been identified with respect to distant sensing.

And so not only are various kinds of “remote viewing” possible, but they are already taking place throughout human nervous systems, albeit at levels usually beneath conscious awareness of them.

And so arises the second issue mentioned above. This has to do with what does and what does not get into conscious awareness. This, in turn, has to do with how parameters of conscious awareness are conditioned to function.

CONSCIOUS AWARENESS CAN BE FORMATTED

IN ACCORD WITH EXPERIENCE AND SOCIAL CONDITIONING

It is quite evident that the concept of conscious awareness looms exceedingly large in our appreciation of ourselves.

However, it has been scientifically understood since the 1950s that conscious awareness is but something like one part to a million parts that are never incorporated into it – even though the million parts are in constant activity beneath conscious awareness of them.

Furthermore, it has been understood (probably from the Year One of our species) that the small conscious awareness parts of our otherwise incredibly complex and magnificent systems, are entirely susceptible not only to all kinds of environmental conditioning, but also to social conditioning practices erected by humans themselves.

It is commonly thought that social conditioning results from social force, or by selectively educating in certain areas but not others. And it is in those contexts that people sometimes object to this or that kind of social conditioning, and thereby seek to overthrow or escape from them.

A good example of this consists of the “need-to-know” principle, i.e., who needs to know what, and who doesn’t need to know it, and then preventing the latter from ever knowing it.

But a deeper study of social conditioning easily shows that social control of meanings is at its strategic heart – for socially conditioned individuals can act on meanings they understand, but cannot too much act on whatever meanings evade them.

Indeed, no one, including aspiring remote viewers, can act on meanings that evade them. In this sense, it is not too much to say that the meaning-less is invisible.

It thus emerges that control of meanings is the most active principle not only within the contexts of social conditioning but also within the contexts of whatever the individual does and does not achieve conscious awareness of.

The reader might think that this brief discussion about social conditioning is a needless detour with respect to remote viewing issues.

But an in-depth study of social conditioning practices ultimately

reveals that all individuals of our species not only have scads of information receptors, but also have inherent systems for meaning detecting and deducing.

If this were NOT the case, then there would be no need for social conditioning practices whose central objective is to modulate and contain the innate existence of the meaning detection and deduction systems that are inherent in our species.

In 1983, the very world-wise John Kenneth Galbraith published a book entitled THE ANATOMY OF POWER, in which he indicated two things.

First, that social conditioning is set up on behalf of achieving and maintaining social power, and second, that the significance of social conditioning is seriously underestimated.

What Galbraith did not point up, however, is that social conditioning is effective only to the degree that it is successful with respect to modulating and controlling the meaning detection systems that are inherent not only within specific societal groupings, but within our species itself.

Indeed, we know that our species possesses sensing systems that access millions of bits of information, but we also attribute intelligence to the species.

Well, one cannot exactly go directly from inherent sensing systems to inherent intelligence in the absence of inherent meaning detecting systems AND inherent memory-meaning storage systems that accumulate and retrieve meaning bits.

It thus transpires that whatever meanings are imprinted into AND not imprinted into meaning storage systems of individuals has a great deal to do with what does or does not emerge into their conscious awareness.

A PROBLEM CENTRAL TO REMOTE VIEWING SUCCESS

What all this boils down to in the case of remote viewing is that absent meaning-memory storage can have serious repercussions. This was demonstrated in the case of the Hella Hammid RV experiment where she got a steaming teapot.

Well, it is fortunate that her RV experiment was only an experiment – for imagine what would have happened if the effort had been an operational one, and intelligence analysts were interested in what was actually at the target location.

In such a case, the analysts would have been told that the remote viewer says there is a big teapot at the location they were interested in.

As it turned out, Hella's experiment was by no means a failed one, because it brought to light a central problem relevant to the larger scope of all remote viewing processes.

For when it was determined that she had no intimate meaning-knowledge of what nuclear reactors actually looked like, it could also be determined that her meaning-detecting systems segued over to the next best thing her systems held meaning of.

With Hella's help at SRI, a number of previous "failed" experiments of her's and of others were reevaluated. It was discovered generally that the "failures" lay in the contexts of absent or misplaced meaning relevant to what was being remote viewed.

In other words, the remote viewer was NOT missing remote viewing, but his or her meaning-memory systems had pockets of absent meanings.

CORRECTING THE ABSENT MEANING PROBLEM

As one last reference here to Hella Hammid, she took a deep interest in this problem, and one of the results was that she became very expert in detecting absent meaning problems in target responses of other remote viewing test subjects.

But as she, herself, first observed, she could not see her own absent meaning contexts because they were, after all, missing in herself.

Well, there are many remote viewing examples of this. And indeed, in the larger picture of all things, it is difficult for individuals to see what is missing in themselves – because whatever it is, IS missing.

Even so, there was yet another significant development with regard to Hella.

After a while in continuing RV experiments, she began to sense elements of targets she was missing.

This enabled her to say one of two things: “I’m missing something about this target,” or “I don’t know what the target is” – and, most importantly, to express this BEFORE her systems segued over to the next best analytical overlay.

There is only one way to explain this change in her pre-conscious processing systems.

Because she had become consciously aware of and interested in this problem, it had taken on meaning within her.

As a result, it is possible to think that new connections had sprouted within and among her synapses and neurons, and a new circuit had formatted thereby. This new circuit thence created jabs of recognition regarding the absence of meaning-memory.

There is only one way to account for this – that the pre-conscious meaning circuits are SELF-CORRECTING when new and meaningful information is added into them – which they absolutely have to be in order to function at all.

Otherwise, there would never be any additive memory growth regarding what can emerge into conscious awareness of them.

It was this particular self-correcting aspect that made an RV training program feasible.

So, this breakthrough of understanding placed the developmental RV project at SRI on very solid grounds with respect to, believe it or not, conventional terms acceptable to the project’s very serious oversight committees. This needs a bit of explaining.

It had long been understood that a tiny portion of the brain is always PHYSICALLY changing at its cellular levels with respect to what is newly experienced or to new meanings that are recognized as such. The physical changes involve the sprouting of new connections being made among and between neurons and synapses, and elsewhere in the nervous system, that end up as a new circuit that will produce a jab of meaning recognition if and when the experience or meanings are encountered again.

Something along these lines indeed turned out to be the case with Hella after she had consumed a fair amount of written and especially of visual information relevant to nuclear reactors.

From all of this, and specifically from the remote-viewing point of view anyway, it was slowly understood that meaning-memory already incorporated into individual reality boxes, although important enough on average, was not as important as was absent meaning-memory.

But here was a situation that had long been understood in educational systems everywhere: I.e., absent meaning-memory can be filled in by exposing individuals to meaning-information packages that were absent before.

And if the exposure is sufficient enough and seen as meaningful enough, then the synapses and neurons of the brain and nervous systems will do the rest - and the resulting new circuits will be incorporated into the meaning-detecting systems already innately existing in everyone beneath conscious awareness of them.

TEASING OUT SEVERAL LAYERS OF MEANING

Now, the whole of what has been discussed so far in this essay might seem somewhat distant to the project of teasing seven layers of meaning out of any given situation or thing.

But don't count on any permanence of that distance too much, for as will be discussed in a forthcoming essay, meaning-memories are RECOMBINANT.

Therefore, meaning-memories can produce new combinations among themselves, and do so all on their own – and which recombinant process is one format of the superpower we presently refer to as intuition.

This aspect of our species is wondrous, indeed.

(To be continued as REMOTE VIEWING AND WHERE LAYERS OF MEANING TAKE PLACE)

[Ingo Database](#) | [Real Story](#) | [Contributed Papers](#) | [Contributed RV Papers](#) |
[Superpowers/ET Intel](#) | [RV Honor Roll](#) | [Superpowers Art](#)
[Miscellaneous](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Species Guild](#) | [Welcome](#) | [Home](#)

Copyright © 2003, Ingo Swann. All rights reserved.

Site by [Tom](#)