

---

# REMOTE VIEWING: General Discourses On The Superpowers Of The Human Biomind

Ingo Swann  
04Feb96

\* \* \*

## INTUITION

### Part One

#### A Request

Through the years I've studied and collected an extensive archive of intuition experiences. But I would like to add more of them via the Internet, as it is world-wide and cross-cultural. A great deal remains to be learned about intuition. So if anyone who chances to read this document can contribute a personal anecdote, it would be exciting to receive them. The contribution can be posted publicly or privately emailed, anonymously or under an aka. Many thanks in advance.

\*

As already mentioned in several essays I've provided regarding remote viewing (distant-seeing), a large spectrum exists of the superpowers of the human biomind. Remote viewing is but one of these.

Experience has shown that each of the superpowers is better understood if organized information is available about them all. I thus propose to provide rudimentary essays in which a number of superpowers are discussed within the contexts of what I've discovered during the many decades I've studied them.

Quality understanding about the superpowers has been at an all-time low during the modern epoch. It is fair to say that pre-modern cultures had a better grasp on them.

The existence of the superpowers was at least generally accepted within the pre-modern cultures -- -

whereas during the modern period their existence was generally denied under the rubrics of "the irrational" and "non-scientific."

The fuller spectrum of the superpowers was lost sight of under these modern rubrics. And, in fact, the concept that the superpowers do range along an INTERCONNECTED SPECTRUM vanished altogether.

The existence of this spectrum, and its curious and exciting nature, needs to be reestablished.

\*

Those phenomena we collectively identify as "intuition" play an essential and fundamental role within the spectrum of all the other superpowers of biomind.

The first notable factor of this role is the broad-base extent of experiencing intuitive episodes among almost all specimens of our species.

Intuition is the only part of the full spectrum which, population-wide, is experienced wholesale and species-wide. Compared to this enormous extent, most other of the superpowers are experienced only rarely.

## **Humanity's Debt to Intuition**

Our species owes an absolutely enormous debt to intuition, the basic biomind superpower.

It is almost impossible to conceive what our species would be like without it. All, or certainly most creative advances have their origin in some kind of intuition. As can be easily shown, "intuitive advances" have been present within our species from time immemorial.

But beyond that, individuals use it to regulate and guide their lives when it is active in them. The evidence for this is also exceedingly strong. So not only is intuition linked to creativity but also to individual survival.

\*

Since intuition is of such immeasurable importance, it is surprising how little is actually known about it. We use the word a lot, of course. But beyond that very little in the way of organized knowledge exists.

For reasons difficult to understand, intuition has been of very little interest within parapsychology, of practically no interest in science and psychology, and of no interest in psychiatry.

On the other hand, an extensive literature about intuition does exist. But it is a disorganized literature, and often quite shallow.

Thus, there exists within our species a superpower we know exists and which is important --- but of which we know almost nothing save that it does exist.

\*

This present discourse, and the two to follow, are offered in an attempt to point up factors which might permit the attentive individual to construct a more profitable mental information grid regarding intuition.

Intuition cannot really be understood unless the existence of the human biomind "sensorium" is established. But unless reasonably correct background issues and definitions are first established, the cognitive approach to the sensorium will be out of kilter.

This first essay, then, deals with problems, issues and definitions. The second will discuss the sensorium. After this, in the third essay, the anecdotes and other evidence about intuition will make better sense.

## Opening The Discourse

A great deal has been published regarding intuition. I have tried to keep up with the materials --- since intuition is one of those so-called "paranormal" topics which have interested me through the years.

Although some readers might disagree, my survey of the literature shows that during the last sixty years not very much has been added to our pool of intuition-knowledge.

My four-decades-long survey includes older sources, subsequent psychical and parapsychological studies, the few psychology efforts, and documents that deal with intuition's role in creativity, as well as meditation techniques relative to intuitive development.

My sources also include the many self-help books of the most recent modern period which propose to help people enhance their intuition. I have no wish to contest those self-help efforts, and each reader of them would have to answer whether they were helpful or not.

But in general, it seems that the sum of all of the literature is very little. Much has been written, but little has been learned. Why this is so of course has its place within these three discourses.

## Points of Entry

If we say that intuition is a situation, then getting into it requires a point of entry. I have selected three of many possibilities along these lines.

By way of discussion, though, when people seek to enter into a situation, such as intuition represents, most people will automatically try to utilize what they believe they know about it.

Another way of putting this is that they will attempt to utilize their EXISTING mental information grids in order to get into the situation.

This is all to the good IF one's existing frames of reference are permissive of intuitive functioning. However, if, for example, the frames are out of kilter regarding correct information, then one's intuitive faculties probably won't function very well.

This is the same as saying that you can make something work only if you understand it and its component parts. After all, there is a difference between correct and incorrect information.

\*

It is accepted that ALL specimens of the human species PROCESS INFORMATION. Doing just so is one of the major hallmarks of our species.

It should be added, though, that humans don't just process information, but that various specimens of them process it for better or worse in terms of what is understood or not, and also in terms of the evidential outcomes of the processing.

It thus would follow that if faulty information points are installed in one's mental information processing grids, then the ultimate output of the grids would also be faulty in some way.

I'm well aware, of course, that most people don't like the idea that their grids might have faulty information points. Indeed, this issue can become quite volcanic and/or somewhat soap-opera- like.

But in any event, absorbing or acquiring information points is a cumulative process --- and it is safe to say that all people have acquired a fair share of faulty ones.

Faulty information points account for thinking grid failures, and as such tend NOT to be permissive of excellent functioning regarding the faculties inherent in the biomind.

In this sense, then, intuition faculties are naturally indwelling within our species and within each specimen of it. If individuals have problems with their intuitive faculties, then most likely the fault is with their malfunctioning mental information grids which are not permissive of intuitive functioning.

All valid entry-points into the intuition situation, then, must consist of a discrimination between correct and incorrect information.

\*

The FIRST ENTRY POINT we will consider is why intuition should be considered a superpower of the

human biomind.

We can easily distinguish between the powers and superpowers of the biomind because the superpowers can be seen to transcend matter, space, time and energy. Our species possesses many powers that don't, or apparently don't, transcend the laws which govern the physical aspects of life on Earth. The powers indeed work **WITHIN** the known laws of the material situation on Earth.

But the first and foremost signal feature of intuition is the time and space transcendence thing. Regarding time transcendence, intuition is very notable regarding "premonitions" of things to come (in the future.)

Regarding space transcendence (which is a bit more tricky to discuss), people intuit what's happening at another place in the past, present and future.

Many books of anecdotes regarding intuition exist. In particulars the anecdotes may differ, sometimes radically and strangely so. But they all have one thing in common. The time-space transcendence thing.

\*

Indeed, everyone **EXPECTS** intuition to transcend time and space --- and in fact no one would call anything intuition if it did not. And this expectation is the same today as it was in prehistory and all that has transpired in between.

\*

Here, then, is the first and foremost face value factor of intuition --- time and space transcendence --- and it is the factor against which hardly anyone will argue.

\*

The problem here, though, is not that intuition transcends time and space but that the modern sciences held that time and space **COULD NOT BE TRANSCENDED**.

This is a very important point, and so a small discussion is in order.

In most, or even all, premodern societies the fact that intuition existed was never in question, either in theory or in practice. Noted skeptics of intuition did exist, of course. But their objections were centered on the often proven failure of intuition --- focused on the failure, not on the existence of it.

With the onset of the modern technological period, however, at about 1845, what is now called "classical" physics began enumerating the laws of the physical universe. The "laws" became laws because back then none of the steady states of matter, energy, space and time they represented could be seen as "disobeying" the laws.

\*

Thereafter, and by a series of unfortunate situations, it began to be thought that NOTHING could disobey the laws of matter, energy, space and time. And this "nothing" came to include, by assumption, the faculties of the human biomind --- even though it was well-known that the human mind thinks in terms of past, present and future.

With this assumption began a complicated and confusing quagmire regarding intuition that exists until this day.

But there is a bottom line within this quagmire that has to do with mental information processing grids at the individual level.

If the concept that time and space --cannot be transcended-- is locked in one's mental grids as an information point, then this concept will be inimical to one's intuitive faculties. This will be the case whether the information point is subconscious or conscious.

\*

To help make this clear, just imagine processing an intuitive time-space transcending signal through an information grid which has even one point in it that holds that time and space cannot be transcended.

I have talked with any number of people who want to enhance their intuition --- but who also wish to remain intellectually and politically correct with regard to the modern science attitude that time and space cannot be transcended.

If I've made my point here, then it would be clear that high-stage intuition can take place only via information grids that are properly and positively constructed regarding the time-space transcending faculties of the human biomind. Any information point which denies this will cause the intuitive faculties to crash, or at least malfunction.

\*

The SECOND POINT OF ENTRY I've selected has to do with the utter inadequacy of modern definitions of the word "intuition."

Most people don't at all realize that very many definitions of intuition have been offered up, but that none of them appear to be really serviceable except in quite shallow ways.

My trusty dictionary gives the following definitions:

- (1) immediate apprehension or cognition;
- (2) knowledge or conviction gained by intuition;

(3) the power or faculty of attaining to direct knowledge or cognition without rational thought and inference;

(4) quick and ready insight.

By these definitions, or a mix of them, one assumes one now knows what intuition is --- right? These four definitions actually appear to be defining an inexplicable form of magic --- the something-out-of-nothing thing.

Here it needs to be pointed out that all of the types of intuition ALWAYS deal with some kind of information and information outputs. And since this is so, intuition obviously is the result of some kind of information processing.

You can look up these or additional definitions if you want. Even more complex and lengthy ones exist, and you might wish to bemuse yourself with them, too.

But I doubt you'll discover one which gives, for example, "the faculties or power of mind and cognition to transcend time, space, and matter and energy as well."

\*

The situation (and the problem) here is that if one reads through, say, a thousand or more anecdotes and examples of verified intuition, one will eventually see that there are MANY DIFFERENT KINDS OF IT.

If different kinds of intuition exist, then it's worthwhile wondering why all of them should be called by one word --- intuition. After all, it would be important to discriminate among what is going on during an intuitive episode.

As to locating scholarly literature that attempts to distinguish between the different types of intuition, well, it is difficult to locate any. Most discourses on intuition argue philosophical beliefs about what it is. However, "The Encyclopedia of Philosophy" (Paul Edwards, Ed., 1967) makes an effort to identify seven types of intuition. These are worth quoting and considering --- although I warn that your thinking synapses might get a little dizzy doing so:

Begin quote:

1. Intuition as unjustified true belief not preceded by inference, in this (the commonest) sense "an intuition" means "a hunch." The existence of hunches is uncontroversial and not of philosophical interest. [Remember I'm quoting the Encyclopedia!]

2. Intuition as immediate knowledge of the truth of a proposition, where "immediate" means "not preceded by inference." This is a philosophically important sense, since philosophers have found it puzzling that one can have knowledge, and thus justified belief, without having made oneself aware

through the process of inference of any knowledge of a concept.

3. Intuition as immediate knowledge of a concept. "Immediate knowledge" here means, roughly, "knowledge which does not entail ability to define the concept."

4. Intuition as a nonpropositional knowledge of an entity - knowledge that may be a necessary condition, for, but is not identical with, intuitive knowledge of the truth of propositions about the entity.

The sense of "intuition" is exemplified by:

5. Sense perceptions, considered as products of a cognitive faculty distinct from the faculty of forming judgements concerning the entity sensed;

6. Intuitions of universals, or (as in Kant) of such insensible particulars as time and space - intuitions that are necessary conditions of our intuitive knowledge of a priori truths.

7. Mystical or inexpressible intuitions that, unlike sense perceptions and intuitions of universals, do not make possible knowledge of the truth of propositions about the entities intuited - such intuitions as Bergson's inexpressible intuition of duration, Ficht's intuition of the Transcendental Ego, and the mystic's intuition of God.

End quote!

If, having read these seven kinds of intuition, anyone can now tell me what intuition is, I'd be glad to be so advised. Meanwhile, welcome to the quagmire I mentioned earlier.

\*

Well, if you're wondering what the hell you've just read, don't worry too much. The above has been amusingly offered merely to show that certain philosophers have been aware that different types of intuition exist --- but which philosophers probably haven't sifted through the monumental anecdotal evidence of intuitions.

The "disinterest" of philosophy in hunches, though, is interesting, since it can be shown that most philosophies themselves derive from someone's hunches.

Hunches are among the most widely-shared aspects of our species intuitive faculties and therefore would seem important. And, as well, from some hunches some of humankind's greatest monuments and successes have emerged.

\*

You will note, though, that the time-space thing made it into the line-up, although merely as "insensible particulars." Since time and space are usually entirely sensible, it is puzzling why they are



philosophically considered "insensible."

If you care to read again through the seven types, I suggest you activate your sense of humor -- - if it hasn't already kicked in. In any event, the Encyclopedia seems to be talking about states of consciousness rather than about intuition --- this a point worth noting and remembering.

## Intuitus

Meanwhile, back at the ranch of our nomenclature problem regarding intuition and its definitions, we now must undertake scrutiny of the actual origins of our term "intuition."

Dictionaries state that the term is etymologically taken from the Latin "intuitus" --- the meaning of which is given as "to look at, contemplate" as taken from the Latin "in" + "tueri" ("to look inward as in to introspect.")

Well, we can introspect our imagination, fancies, desires, lusts, illusions --- none of which are intuitions, factually speaking.

However, after the etymological bit, the modern meaning of "immediate apprehension or cognition" is applied backward through time to the ancient Roman period --- and thus we are led to believe that the Romans utilized the term in the same way we do today.

Well, although it took me about five years to discover it, nothing, NOTHING of the kind is the case. As shown immediately below, the differences are extreme between the ancient meaning of "intuitus" and the modern meaning of "intuition".

**INTUITION** (the modern meaning): immediate apprehension or cognition; the faculty of attaining direct knowledge or cognition without rational thought or inference.

**INTUITUS** (the ancient meaning): to look at and contemplate felt relationships.

For references, if you wish to consult them, the ancient meaning of "intuitus" is given in the Oxford English Dictionary, in the 1892 version of The Encyclopedia Britannica, and is discussed at length in my own book *Your Nostradamus Factor* (Simon & Schuster, 1993).

Now, I can't know, of course, how many who read this will immediately discern the absolute differences between the two definitions. So I'll assume that none can in order to present all of the differences.

For starters, the ancient meaning of INTUITUS has introduced the concept of "felt relationships." "Relationship" is a term which has very wide applications. Today, though, we tend majorly to use it in referring to family, friends, and meaningful others regarding sex, emotions, love, etc.

Yet potatoes and the earth they grow in have relationship to one other. In physics, various atoms and

particles have relationships to others. In psychology, the human psyche has a relationship to its past and future. Each born specimen of our species has a relationship to what it is to experience and become.

\*

In English, the term "relationship" is taken from "to relate" which, in turn, is taken from Latin terms meaning "to carry, to re-carry or carry back, and to bear or tolerate. Our modern meanings give (1) to give an account of, and (2) to show or establish logical or causal connection between.

Regarding the ancient meaning of INTUITUS, then, "relationships" appears to refer to connections or what goes on BETWEEN things --- but especially if the connections are causative and result in something.

\*

Now, the teaching in our modern times held that the human possessed only five physical senses. Yet, upon inspection of these Famous Five, none of them nor all of them together can account for directly perceiving or experiencing what goes on, can go on, or doesn't go on between things.

Indeed, you can easily confirm this yourself. Your taste receptors, for example, can tell you nothing about the connections required to make the cake. Your eyes alone cannot tell you if someone is, connection-wise, emotionally or sexually available to you.

Indeed, the realm of connections (relationships) within which we live is very much larger than the physical realms within which our physical senses operate.

But it now must be pointed up that the human species SPECIALIZES in discerning connections and relationships between and among things. Indeed, this faculty (as it is often called) is among our chief assets regarding creativity, inventiveness and survival --- none of which our physical-5-senses by themselves can establish, much less guarantee.

\*

The only possible explanation here is that we possess a spectrum of senses which are additional to our physical-5. And it is this spectrum of senses which are grouped together under the venerable terms of "intuition" or "intuitiveness."

If we add to this the concept that connections (relationships) themselves range along a spectrum from the grossly to the highly subtly perceivable, then we can get the idea that intuition itself ranges along a spectrum from gross to subtle. This would enable us to begin identifying the very many types of intuition, roughly so at any rate.

\*

The only real difficulty here is that in our modern period FEELING has not been considered a sense, except in the case of tangible touch. And so the phrase "felt relationships" is awkward regarding sensing something by, well, feeling-sensing it.

Even so, feeling-sensing is a carrier of information, almost precisely in the same way that our physical-5 senses are based in receptors that receive and identify information. Anything that carries information really should be called a "sense" --- and we could, if we want, begin to think in terms of intuitive receptors relative to the whole of the human sensorium. (See Part Two forthcoming.)

\*

Returning now to the differences between the modern definitions of INTUITION and the ancient definition of INTUITUS, we can begin to realize a number of inconsistent relationships between them.

\*

First of all, it is interesting to notice that none of the words used in the ancient definition of "intuitus" are used in the modern definition of "intuition."

Yet, even today when someone experiences or suffers an intuitive episode, they are very likely to speak of it as a "feeling," often as a "gut feeling" or a felt "hunch," or merely as "I've got a feeling about" thus or so.

\*

Second, the modern definition of "intuition" identifies apprehension, cognition, or knowledge --- but does not specify about what. The ancient definition, however, specifies that "intuitus" refers to felt RELATIONSHIPS (such as between or among things).

Indeed, if we consider this very carefully, relationships between or among things are not usually very apparent as far as surface observation goes.

Some relationships are easier to deduce, of course. But a very great many relationships between or among things are very subtle and often invisible to the cognitive intellect. And these seem to require intuitive feelings to identify and sort them out.

\*

Third, as given in the modern definition of intuition, immediate apprehension, cognition and knowledge are presented as states of and within themselves --- as states of INTELLECTUAL awareness. In other words, they are not attached to objects or subjects of any kind, nor to the relationships between them.

# Intellectus

It is now helpful to learn that the ancient Romans used a Latin term, "intellectus," whose meaning had to do with states of intellectual awareness --- such states as apprehension, cognition and knowledge, and all of which we today normally associate with intellectual processes.

Now, get ready for a real banger!

For we will see that in our modern contexts the ancient definitions of intellectus have been introduced into the modern definitions of intuition --- while the ancient definitions of intuitus have been lost altogether.

\*

If your head is spinning about now, don't worry. All that has happened is that rationalists have constructed our modern definitions. And rationalists don't like feelings. This will become clear when we compare the modern definitions of intellect and intuition below.

**INTELLECT** (the modern definition derived from the Latin "intellectus"): the power of cognition or knowing as distinguished from the power to feel or will; the capacity for knowledge.

**INTELLECTUS** (the ancient definition): to perceive and discern felt relationships.

**INTUITION** (the modern definition allegedly derived from the Latin "intuitus"): immediate apprehension, cognition, or knowledge.

**INTUITUS** (the ancient definition) to look at and contemplate felt relationships.

\*

Now, to increase our clarity here, let's talk our way through these four definitions.

First of all, we can immediately see that the concept of "felt relationships" has **DISAPPEARED** in both of the modern definitions of intellect and intuition. In their modern contexts, then, by definition neither intellect nor intuition deal with felt relationships.

\*

Second, we can see that "felt relationships" linked intuitus and intellectus together, but in two different ways. Intuitus looked at and contemplated felt relationships, while intellectus perceived and discerned among them. In a certain sense, then, intellectus and intuitus were two sides of the same coin, or twin brother and sister.

\*

Third, to now point out an oddity, in our modern English exists no conceptual term that has to do with dealing with "felt relationships."

\*

Fourth, we can see that intuitus/intellectus represented an interconnecting biomind holism by the definitional link of "felt relationships." We can also see that the modern definitions of intellect and intuition break them apart, and that neither deal with "felt relationships."

\*

Fifth, to now point out an oddity, in our modern English exists no conceptual term that has to do with dealing with "felt relationships" --- except one which is seldom used and is often considered obsolete: SENSORIUM.

\*

Sixth, the modern definitions of intuition DO NOT fit with the chief phenomenology of intuition -- - which is ALWAYS expressed as feelings by those who experience some kind of intuition. The modern definitions do not even include the word "feeling."

\*

Seventh, we can now perceive, opaquely so at least, that intuition is composed of sensed feelings which result in the hunches of intellect, for a hunch is a cognitive analysis derived from what has been felt

\*

The whole of this possibly torturous nomenclature discussion has been to point up that the modern definitions of intuition have eliminated the feeling component of intuition, and that the definitions of intuition and intellect have eliminated the concept of "felt relationships."

The modern definitions, then, are not only inconsistent with the historical terms from which they are allegedly derived, but inconsistent as well with real human experiencing. Yet, if there is one environment-system all of us live within, it is the all-inclusive environment of relationships of all things.

It is therefore of little wonder that there are so many problems regarding the "developing" of one's intuition. If definitions are being used by one's intellect which are inconsistent with the true aspects of intuition, then those mis-definitions will warp one's cognitive biomind grids regarding of what intuition really is.

\*

In the above nomenclature contexts, the use of the word "immediate" in the modern mis-definitions of intuition is suspect also. A laborous study of examples of intuition show that the greater bulk of them do not take place "immediately."

Some seem to do so, of course, as in a "flash" of intuitive insight. But the greater bulk of them "build up" over time --- as if the relationships they are working with are being readjusted until, in some kind of contemplative sense, they are got right. This is especially the case with creative or inventive intuitions. In these cases, once the relationships are got right, the familiar flash of creative hunch or insight occurs.

Additional mis-concepts regarding intuition will be discussed in the next two documents of this series.

\*

The great nomenclature carrier of the virtual definition of intuition has, of course, been "gut feelings."

This phrase, and in many languages, is actually a very ancient one. In modern times, however, it was considered as a vernacular element (common, vulgar, or gutter-speak.) It was therefore not suitable for literary, cultured, scientific, philosophical, or dictionary discussion. Thus hardly any scholarly discussions regarding gut feelings can be located.

The greatest jeopardy to our understanding of intuition, though, has been the elimination during modern times of the original definition of intuitus --- to sense and look at and contemplate felt relationships (of things, objects, subjects, topics, ideas, people, and whatnot.)

The emphasis here, of course, is on "felt relationships" or "feeling." Among all of the hundreds of examples of intuition I've studied, there is not one which is independent of the element of relationships --- and, as well, there is not one independent of sensing-feeling.

In other words, intuition always occurs relative to something else --- with the relationship often being felt before it is cognitively understood within the intellect.

Indeed, at the personal level, if you have ever experienced an intuition you might now have a look at it and try to find the felt relationships that were involved.

In any event, those individuals who are reasonably good at spotting-sensing-feeling relationships between things usually have a higher quotient of intuition. This aspect will be expanded upon in part three of this series.

\*

To complete the picture of the quagmire which has been the topic of this first essay, we now have to

account for why and how "felt relationships" disappeared as a concept during the modern period.

During this period (roughly about 1845-1980), our cultural environments became increasingly rationalism-oriented.

"Rationalism" was defined as (1) a theory that reason is in itself a source of knowledge superior to and independent of THE SENSE PERCEPTIONS AND feelings [emphasis added]; and (2) a view that reason and experience rather than the nonrational are the fundamental criteria in the solutions of problems.

\*

The modern term "reason" is taken from the Latin "ratio" which meant to compute or count. However, the modern definitions are: a statement offered in explanation or justification; a rational ground or motive; the power of comprehending, inferring, or thinking; the proper use of the mind (we can wonder, can't we, who is to decide what the "proper use" is to be.)

\*

The first difficulty here, and the first fatal flaw, involved decisions regarding what is rational and nonrational. As most of us are aware now, plenty that was earlier considered nonrational later became rational --- for example, space travel, geodesic domes, ecological relationships, as well as, by the way, the Internet itself, and etc.

The second difficulty and flaw concerned whether reason was superior and independent of the sense perceptions and feelings. Well, at base, the human biomind organism is first a sensing-feeling organism, and in each and every case it learns later to think (properly or not and depending on the accuracy of the information points in its grids.)

Since this is unquestionably so it is difficult to see how the fundamental sensing-feeling elements can be subtracted so as to free reason completely from them. It is now somewhat understood that when the sense-feeling components of an individual bio- mind organism are reduced or closed down, its reason also is reduced or closed down.

Additionally, what is held to be reason or rational is relative to environments, positive and/or negative nurturing situations and the extent of knowledge.

\*

All of these factors considered, it is difficult to see how "pure" reason can ever be arrived at --- except in some science-fiction sense, the very kind fiction that lent its character the rationalist modern age.

It is abundantly understood that intuition takes place without the benefits of rational reason --- a factor

which most modern documents labor to impress whether pro or con regarding intuition.

Indeed, there is hardly such a critter as a "rational intuition." All intuitions are sensed feelings --- and an overly large share of them fly directly in the face of reason and the so-called rational.

\*

In any event, the modern age of rationalism DID NOT evolve a science of sense-feeling --- because doing so was precluded by its theory that sense- feeling was inferior to "pure" reason detached from them, and as such was of no scientific or philosophical interest.

All of the human superpowers of biomind, including the many identifiable types of intuition, telepathy, clairvoyance, and remote-viewing are directly based in sense-feelings. And all of them have been stigmatized as nonrational, hence irrational, during the modern age of rationalism dominated by the pure science-fiction goal of "pure" reason.

## **--Brief Summary--**

1. The identifiable basis for intuition is species-wide and thus the most spontaneously and frequently experienced of all the other superpowers of the human biomind.
2. In the context of direct experiencing of intuition at the individual level, it is universally expressed as some kind of feeling. Examination of anecdotes and other evidence of intuitive episodes reveals that the feelings are always associated with some kind of connectiveness or relationship between two or more things which are felt before they are cognitively sorted out.
3. Modern definitions of intuition avoid the inclusion of the feeling-sensing always associated with real intuitive episodes. Thus the modern definitions are inconsistent with virtual intuition, and are hence intellectually misdirecting.
4. If the intellectual map of intuition does not accurately duplicate the real and virtual elements of intuition, then the map will act as "noise" regarding comprehension and understanding of intuition and probably decrease identification of the information loads the intuitive signals are carrying.
5. A review of the nomenclature history involved shows that modern definitions of intuition are actually defining intellect elements rather than intuition ones. The same modern definitions have eradicated the historical link between intellect and intuition --- which was "felt relationships." The direct link of intuitus/intellectus has therefore been destroyed relative to the modern grasp of what is involved.
6. The modern period, then, has not possessed either a correct intellectual or phenomenological map regarding intuition and its various elements and types. The reason these maps have not come into existence is because of ideological partisanship broadly affixed to the theory of modern rationalism which elevated intellectual reason and diminished the importance of the feeling-senses.



7. The result has been the emergence of a superficial quagmire regarding the identifiable elements of intuition as a biomind system of senses existing in addition to the well-known physical senses. This biomind system of senses transcends time-space in ways the physical senses alone do not.

\*

We now need to move expeditiously on to the second part of this discourse --- the Sensorium.

(End of part 1)