

---

# 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 OOBE 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 "tactical" 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 tactical 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 tactical conjunction of the representative rays of everything. The tactical 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 "sensitivity," therefore, are not the same thing -- for a sensitivity involves IMPRESSIONS while a sense processes direct sensory data.

\*

In any event, it could be argued, at least for hypothetical wondering, that the tactical 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)

---