TEACHING AND LEARNING REGARDING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (15Aug97)

INTRODUCTORY

This essay is the first of a series in which the various topics of teaching, training and learning will be discussed regarding their relationship to various identifiable elements of the superpowers.

*

In getting into these topics, it must frankly be stated up front that new ideas and concepts will need to be introduced -- these new concepts, of course, being presented for whatever they may be worth as knowledge develops in the future.
About the only thing that can more or less be said for sure is that past concepts have not been sufficient regarding either identifying the nature of the superpowers, or sufficient as enabling ways and means for teaching and learning.

*

However, in approaching the new, the old must be examined in a preliminary way and as informative background -- if only to help illustrate why the new should be searched for and incorporated.
At this point, I have been intimately involved in these matters for nearly three decades -- and throughout this time experience has shown that comprehension regarding the superpowers is benefited by larger rather than lesser amounts of background knowledge and information.
Experience has also shown that people like to get quickly to the racetrack and get on with the race. However, if one can't find the racetrack . . . or the racetrack found is the wrong one, one in which illusory rather than real races are run . . . or the racetrack is merely a facade in a Hollywood lot with nothing behind it except imagination . . . well?

*

For example, the superpowers have been thought of as "powers of mind." However, the powers of mind models (or facades) have produced no significant increase in the population of achieved "psychics."
If, then, I were to say (as I will at some point ahead) that some full part of the superpowers constitute

problems not of mind but of aesthetics, then no one would even begin to comprehend what is meant in the absence of any background orientation to help point the way.

*

From the outset here, the essential definition of the superpowers within the scope of this database should constantly be carried in mind -- largely because that definition is germane as to why, in the past, fruitful approaches to teaching-learning of the superpowers have been so difficult to discover.

*

As used in this database, the term SUPERPOWERS refers to those processes or functions of the human biomind systems that transcend the "normal laws" of time and space, and matter and energy.
This definition has been expanded upon in other essays already installed in this database.

*

To help bring some advance clarity, anyone who has investigated teaching and learning probably realizes that the processes involved are easiest if whatever is being taught and learned focuses on something tangible and identifiable. In such a case, teacher and learner can literally look at whatever is involved. Thus, agreements can be reached, and information accepted and understood about the tangible.

*

At a slightly more complicated level, teaching and learning can take place regarding ideas. But if ideas don't necessarily or somehow refer back to tangibles, then difficulties can arise.
There is also a distinction between ideas that are required to end up DOING something, and ideas that are not required to do anything except be talked about.
There is also a distinction between ideas that are correct, or at least applicable, and ideas that are not correct and are applicable only to those who think they are correct.

*

In any event, it is possible to say that anything that can be included in the realm of matter, energy, space and time is also thought of as tangible, at least more or less. Thus, methodological teaching-learning approaches are facilitated because the tangible is at least thought of being THERE.

*

By comparison, the superpowers wheel and deal in the intangible -- or at least in what is considered within the present realms of knowledge as transcending the tangible.

*

Now, the usual approach to teaching-learning the intangible is to seize upon the methods utilized in teaching-learning the tangible -- because the latter are familiar in the historic sense.
In other words, it is tangibly possible to teach a learner how to bake a tangible cake and have some expectation of succeeding. All one really needs is a list of the elements and procedures regarding backing the cake, and the formulation of a procedural recipe regarding what to do and how to combine the elements.

*

There have been very many attempts to teach and increase superpower functioning by teaching via methods best fitted to teaching and learning how to deal with the tangible.
However, human societies (at least in their modern forms) are. But human society is not yet overloaded with powerful superpsychics. Indeed, many stipulate that the superpowers CANNOT be taught, especially among materialists and parapsychologists who have had no luck at all along these lines.
However, in other quarters expectations remain high in some quarters even so.
This factoid more or less indicates that the mere superimposition of teaching-learning methods appropriate to the tangible don't really work as advertised and hoped when it comes to the intangible.
And so it might rationally be supposed that the superpowers have to be approached quite differently than cake-making-via-recipe processes and procedures.

*

There are two implications here, the first being that the "normal laws" of time, space, energy and matter (all being relevant to the tangible formats of these) cannot be used with any great efficiency to define what the superpowers consist of.
Second, it is true that various social groupings have established nomenclature bytes to specify some of the phenomena that result or down-load from the superpowers.

*

For example, PRECOGNITION refers to "seeing the future," and which implies at least transcending time and matter. MATTER is tangible, and TIME is derivable only via some movable or motional aspects of tangible matter.
Thus (and please consider with some attention what now follows), when classes are set up to teach precognition, what it usually taught are concepts regarding how to transcend matter and time, these being tangible -- and then the major concept focuses only on visualizing doing the transcending of those two tangible components.
Various statistical studies of such teaching-learning (IF they are undertaken) show very little in the way of increasing future-seeing. This failure easily leads to the concept that precognition cannot be taught.
It is worth noting in this regard that some statistical studies along these lines have been undertaken in

parapsychology. But a far greater number of them have been undertaken in that now somewhat defunct discipline called FUTUROLOGY -- because at a certain point futurologists were exceedingly interested in whether the "psychic component" could be added into making futurology more effective.
In any event, if we refer back to the concept of PRECOGNITION, it can become apparent that the active term is COGNITION -- and so someone might chance upon the idea that teaching how to increase the scope of cognition per se might be worthwhile.
After all, it is understood of COGNITION that people can suffer cognitions only with regard to their "cognitive capacities." These capacities are understood as being bounded within the LIMITS of an individual's knowledge, understanding, or familiarity -- with the exception of DREAMS which frequently exceed the one's cognitive capacities.

*

Meanwhile, the existence of the nomenclature bytes (such as "precognition") makes it SEEM that the superpowers and their down-loaded phenomena are on a par with the normal laws. Even so, having a word for something doesn't automatically mean that we understand important details of whatever it is the word refers to.
For example, many are willing to try to have precognitions. But very few have any real idea of what a COGNITION consists of, or how one of them comes about, or even why they do.
The direct implication here is that few can manage or expand their cognitive basis because of an absence of information or knowledge about that basis. Thus, the statistical rate of successful taught-learned precogniting remains very low overall.
In case a reader might be wondering by now, this is not a matter merely of semantic difficulties.

*

Briefly alluding to other possible examples, we have the terms "telepathy," "out-of-body" and "remote viewing." The first refers to the so-called mind-to-mind thing, the latter to the so-called seeing-at-a-distance thing.
So people think they understand what is being talked about when the terms are used in that the two "minds" have a certain tangibility, and of course distance is a tangible thing. And so some are likely to set up teaching courses regarding how to achieve mind-to-mind contact, how to "get out of your body" (this also a tangible thing), and how to see at a distance.

*

As it is, the terms we utilize are sort of like an old fire arm whose buckshot when fired spreads across a distance in the hope that a piece of the shot would hit something. If this is judged against the notable lack of taught-learned courses, our terms don't seem to hit very much of anything even when fired close up.

*

The second immediate factor to mention is that although we believe we understand what teaching, training and learning mean, very few know anything at all regarding the important fundamental and detailed processes involved. Most know only that teaching and training are supposed to result in learning.
And so if someone says they can teach something, many people sign up, pay the fees, and sally forth under the wide-spread assumption they will learn whatever is being offered as teaching.

*

The expectation behind the assumption exists in the fact that teaching-learning system works best regarding simplistic, non-complex, and easily understood matters -- and which matters can be confirmed within the contexts of tangible physicality. In this simplistic sense, there appears to be a one-to-one relationship between teaching and learning.

*

This direct relationship, however, begins to falter to the degree that information being taught become less simple and more complex. If the degree of complexity increases, one will soon encounter understanding (i.e., "cognitive") levels that are not on par with, or not parallel to what is being taught. When this happens, teaching might still proceed with gusto, but problems regarding learning might be encountered.

*

Eventually, the relationship between teaching-learning becomes ambiguous -- especially when (1) what is being taught and learned DOES NOT result in the activities promised by the teaching; and (2) when confirming evidence cannot be located anywhere regarding what has been learned.
This implies that although just about anything and everything can be proposed as teachable, LEARNING can be confirmed only by outcomes that significantly reduce ambiguities as to whether ANYTHING has been LEARNED via attempts to teach learning. Of course, one might exempt here the teaching and learning of useless things -- and which can include, as we will see ahead, the teaching and learning of ignorance.

TWO IMPORTANT DISTINCTIONS

I am of the opinion that most people already comprehend that the two distinctions I'm about to outline do exist -- but which they can observe others somehow managing to avoid for various reasons.

*

First, on average, the teaching-learning procedures in most societies (especially those of the Western world) seem successful enough. So there arises the assumption that there is a direct relationship between teaching-learning -- and that this relationship holds true in general AND for everything.

*

In actuality, however, there are (1) many different formats of "learning;" and, (2) individuals can be identically taught the same thing, but end up learning it in far different ways, and learning it on a ratio of "not very well" to "exceedingly well."

*

A partial explanation for (2) above is that all humans are not identical in all ways. Rather, they are independent systems which may be similar in many ways, but can be alien to each other in other kinds of ways. And so ahead the more exact nature of these "independent systems" will need to be commented upon in these present essays.

*

In the sense of (2) above, however, the direct relationship of teaching-learning would work best, and also be more obvious, regarding areas in which all humans are most similar -- and are more identical even though they are independent sensing and experiencing systems.
The direct relationship would become less steady, less predictable, regarding areas in which the independent systems ARE different, even though on the simplistic surface they might be recognized as similar.

*

For example, systems of human biobodies are "similar," roughly speaking, anyway.
But each individual system does have differences, as, for example, regarding their mental information processing grids.
Since this latter aspect is beyond argument, it becomes possible to comprehend that all humans probably will not process taught information in the same, or perhaps even similar, ways.

*

With regard to (1) above, it can be seen that the direct relationship of teaching-to-learning is most efficient only where tangible factors are involved -- and in which the necessity of deduction and/or inducing are not all that paramount.

*

In cases where only tangible factors are involved, teaching can become precise enough so as to enable formulas or exact procedures to be learned and followed -- with the result that more or less identical learning DOES occur, and which in turn DOES enable the production of more or less identical activity being derived from this kind of learning.
Thus, there is what can be referred to as the direct relationship of teaching to learning. It is very wide-spread, and might also be referred to as Model A of Teaching-Learning.

*

This is also the model most seek to superimpose on any prospective teaching-learning procedure -- and which model is easy and simple because it does not involve much in the way of the deduction-induction processes.

*

However, in those teaching-learning efforts that require the functioning of deduction and induction, we can easily say that there is NO direct relationship between teaching and learning -- because intervening in the relationship IS the need for those two twins (deducing and inducing) that are famously and notoriously indirect in the first place.
Thus, THIS kind of thing can be referred to as Model B of Teaching-Learning.

*

For clarity.

MODEL A can more dependably be seen as:

Teaching -> Learning -> that Stands a Good

Chance of Activity => Ability or Product Commensurate With

What Has Been Taught.

MODEL B can be roughly seen as:

Teaching(?) <-> Learning(?) -> that

May or May Not arouse Activity => Ability(?) or Product(?)

Commensurate With(?) What May or May Not

Have Been Taught or Learned.

Please note that the two formulas above are general, possibly inept, and for the following reason.
While it is true that TEACHING can be rather straightforward, LEARNING is not and never is. Various elements to be TAUGHT can be organized. But LEARNING is a more complex endeavor -- in that, for one thing, learning can be seen to have occurred only by testing.
The two Models above are given ONLY to help illustrate that within different circumstances there are differences in the relationship of teaching to learning. Indeed, there may be dozens of teaching-learning models.

TEACHING-LEARNING "DYNAMICS"

Moving briskly on, now, LEARNING in general is seen and generally accepted as the dynamic product of TEACHING, and this is seen as a FACTUAL relationship -- even though the factual relationship might be based in experiencing, and which then becomes the "teacher."

*

In any event, the general surmise of TEACHING is that information can be organized in ways that lead from basics to increasing detail and complexity, and that if this is done expertly enough, then LEARNING will result in students who subject themselves to those "organized ways."

*

In this sense, teaching is seen as the active measure while learning is seen as the passive something or other into which the active measure is to be duplicated or copied.
Thus, one can find a rather largish literature having to do with the dynamics or ways of TEACHING (as will be illustrated in the next essay in this series.)
However, although information about the dynamics of learning does exist, the nature of learning dynamics seems to be in its infancy.

*

In any event, the general process of teaching is generally seen as consisting of organizing and transferring information to the learner(s). This sounds simple enough -- and in some cases actually is. The general process of learning is generally seen as in-taking or absorbing the information that is transferred via the teaching. This, too, sounds simple enough. But whether it is or not seems completely to depend on a number of associated factors, the existence of which those who design the teaching of

information transfers cannot altogether predict.
However, this slight difficulty is usually gotten around in that a sufficient minority do learn enough to keep societies working -- at least for a time.

*

But indeed, although information can elegantly be organized in ways that can be assumed to effect the ease and speed of the transfer, it is highly doubtful that the information is in-taken in the SAME organized way, or in-taken in any organized way at all. The broad significance of this will, of course, be discussed throughout these essays.

A STABLE AND NON-STABLE BASIS REGARDING LEARNING PROCESSES

As already mentioned, the general surmise of the teaching-learning relationship is that the learner can duplicate the information being transferred -- and IF the information is transferred and duplicated by the learner, then he or she or it (as in the case of dogs and horses, but not often in the case of cats) will demonstrate phenomena appropriate to what has been taught.

*

This general surmise is somewhat workable if (again) tangible things and matters are the issue -- since both teacher and learner can refer to those matters or things as a STABLE BASIS for what is being taught and learned.
So, we can posit, for hypothetical illustration purposes, the following formula:

TANGIBLE STUFF =

TEACH <-> STABLE BASIS <-> LEARN

In this sense, then, there can be a mutual assurance between teacher and learner that they are dealing with the same stuff -- because it is tangible. The above formula, of course, refers best back to Model A of teaching-learning.

*

However, a contrasting formula also exists as:

INTANGIBLE STUFF =

NON-STABLE BASIS

or

TEACH <-> INVISIBLE BASIS <-> LEARN

THIS contrasting formula can sometimes (but not always) refer best back to Model B of teaching-learning. In any event, those who are perceptive can sense that there is a great gulf or abyss between the information-organizing processes of these two formulas. But I get ahead of myself here.

*

As it is, if a STABLE BASIS is not identifiable in tangible or concrete terms, then the teaching surmise that serves so well for Model A is not entirely, if at all, applicable to the teaching-learning situations characterized by Model B (and its plethora of variants).

THE SUPERPOWER FACULTIES OF THE HUMAN BIOMIND

By definition, the superpower faculties involve phenomena that transcend the known laws of the tangible, and do so both as cause and effect, as source and result -- although the RESULTS of superpower phenomena can impact within the tangible.
And so a rather simple but obvious conclusion has to result: that teaching-learning ANYTHING regarding the superpowers does not have much of a tangible, stable basis that both teacher and learner can refer to and rely on as REALITY CHECKS regarding any mutually assurable certainty.

*

It is for this reason that some say, even some parapsychologists, that the superpowers CANNOT be taught -- in that "there is nothing to teach." This skeptical attitude is especially the case if IDEAS of WHAT to teach are erroneous and/or non-existent.
And, in a simplistic, superficial sense, this skepticism may seem true enough -- at least in the minds of those who assume that the intangible is "nothing," or that the non-tangible is something one cannot get hold of.

*

But the meaning here is a somewhat respectable one -- in that it IS generally true that IF a STABLE BASIS of some, or any, kind tends to be absent regarding any teaching, learning, tutoring (or even any

self-learning of the superpower faculties), THEN learning regarding the faculties is open to any number of opinions or beliefs.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

On the surface of these issues, there can be little doubt that teachers and learners are of equal importance. But just beneath the surface the teaching-learning relationship begins to exhibit strategic differences.

*

Although I cannot say it is the first difference, it is normally conceived that teachers are somewhat more important than the learners -- one simple phenomenology of this being that teachers sometimes posture as having more importance.
However, if learners did not exist, then there would be no reason for the teachers to exist. But I'll leave it to each reader to sort this out.

*

A second strategic difference might be that while teachers usually have learned how to organize information in preparation for its transfer to learners, the learners usually have no idea of how information, per se, is organized in themselves.
The assumption, then, among both teachers and learners is that the learner will receive the information in the way the teachers have organized it, and that therefore the learners will organize it in themselves in the same way.
If something along these lines DOES ensue, then both the learners and teachers will be gratified, especially the teachers.

*

However, IF this assumption is transliterated into a more exact representation of its meaning, it means that the learners ARE SUPPOSED to receive the information in the exact formats it is transferred to them. At the very least, if the reception of the information is not all that exact, there is NOT supposed to be a wide latitude of variation or distortion within those having learned.
However, whether this happens over all is somewhat speculative, while most certainly there is a ratio involved ranging from little failure to a lot of success -- or a ratio of from a little success to a lot of failure.
As it is, though, somewhat more success can be predicted regarding Model A (discussed above) when deployed with respect to tangible, stable bases stuff.

*

Somewhere in all of these matters of relative importances between teaching and learning is the irksome detail regarding how many do learn how much -- and of WHAT they learn if they do. Perhaps some quantitative studies do exist along these lines, but I've not been able to locate them.
On the surface of things, though, it would seem that some few learn a lot while a larger majority learn little, or certainly not enough. But much beyond this observation, the per capita distribution of learners with regard to what they have learned or not learned seems up in the air -- and of little real social or scientific, philosophic or religious interest.

*

In seeking relative similarities and dissimilarities between teachers and learners, it turns out that they have one thing in common.
On average, most teachers have no idea of the mental information processes they have undergone in order to learn what they have, and to organize information so as to transfer it to learners.

*

Likewise, most learners have no idea of the mental information processes they have undergone in order to learn what they have, and especially have no idea at all how to organize their INFORMATION-RECEPTIVE qualities in order to expedite their learning.

*

In this sense, then, although I'll not insist on it, it would seem that whatever does transpire in the way of teaching and learning does so on a rather fortuitous, chancy basis.
Only one thing seems to have a higher ratio of certainty and/or predictability:
Many strive to teach -- and don't necessarily succeed.
Many strive to learn -- and don't necessarily succeed.

*

Failure along these lines is usually interpreted as embarrassing (although I don't really understand why this should be seen as such.) So, somewhat like some aspiring or ostensible psychics, some teachers and learning to emphasize their few successes -- while avoiding discussing their failures.

*

If asked to consider various teaching-learning issues -- for example, if either teaching or learning have the greater importance -- most might point up that teaching is the active measure, so it might be considered the most important.

Although I've been able to point out certain factors and factoids in this essay, I don't really know if teaching or learning is more important. But I do know that teachers and learners focus on what is being taught and learned, and that most of them know nothing of the fundamental LEARNING PROCESSES involved.

*

On the one hand, TEACHING PROCESSES are all well and good, of course, and needed. But if LEARNING PROCESSES didn't exist also, then ostensible teachers would have no one to teach anything at all.
So, TEACHERS are somewhat lucky that specimens of our species are freshly born in increasing abundance and all of which need to be taught something or others.

TEACHING AND LEARNING REGARDING THE SUPERPOWERS OF THE BIOMIND

Ingo Swann (17Oct97)

PART 1

ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

It would be wonderful to organize information about LEARNING by following the step-by-step method that can be so effective regarding other areas of information.
Within a superficial approach to learning, or within a cursory glance at what's involved, it might seem that learning is straightforward, and that the steps involved are only one -- and which step consists of STUDY, study of simple stuff first, and then increasingly difficult stuff anon.

*

It is quite surprising how this idea of learning hangs on, and more or less is endlessly preached; surprising in the face of the familiar fact that someone can study something -- and end up not learning much or any of it.

*

When lots of study ends up in minimal learning, educationalists like to introduce matters such as the student's questionable motivation, snarled learning skills, memory retention lapses, early nurturing that was somehow deficient, and etc., until it becomes clear to everyone, including the student, that the fault is with the student for reasons both visible and invisible.

*

It if were not for the fact that one can sometimes encounter someone who HAS learned a good deal, but studied very little, then it might seem that failure to learn is somehow a student's fault.

*

Whether this kind of situation is perceived as important and significant by this or that reader of this essay, I'll simply say, at the risk of making a categorical pronounciemento, that it IS important and significant. I'll even offer up three suitable reasons:
1. Study and learning are two different species of processes;
2. Learning is always judged against WHAT is being taught, and if one fails to learn, well, what has been studied might be at fault, not the learner.
3. True learning (so called) is also always judged against what has been taught by a teacher or some teaching system. In other words, true learning requires a teacher. Thus, if someone manages to learn something WITHOUT having been submitted to teaching procedures to learn it, well, he or she is considered as yet among the unwashed and unlearned.

*

Of course, 2 and 3 above may be products only of what is referred to as civilized cultures and societies in which the STATUS of teachers and teaching systems whose monopoly over teaching AND learning need to be protected. So within such civilizing aspects it doesn't really matter what one learns. It only matters that one has been taught it, and thus the actual meaning and value of diplomas and higher sheepskins.
Thus, in such kinds of systems, learning per se is not considered as meaningful -- since one can learn only what is being taught, and if whatever is learned has not been taught then it also is not considered as learning.

*

Also in such kinds systems, one usually can discover the existence of approved and disapproved learning, or tolerated and intolerated learning -- this being a subject I'll expand on here and there ahead while attempting not to drool too much venom.

*

I'm not merely bitching here, but am indicating that learning almost always is seen as an extension of teaching -- and in which context a certain number of students are expendable, or constitute permissible learning failures.
But I'm also hinting that teaching could be considered an extension of learning -- since if the need or desire to learn didn't exist, then there would be no occasion at all for teachers or teaching systems come into existence and flaunt their knowledge, mind-shaping wares, snake oils and other educational whatnot.

*

It has also been necessary to expand a little on 2 and 3 as itemized above, since those two contexts have a great deal to do with 1 as itemized above.
Or, perhaps, it might be said: have a great deal to NOT DO with 1 above.

*

To clarify a little. IF the processes of learning and the processes of teaching are different species of processes, then it might follow that the processes of teaching should be formulated within the light of the processes of learning. IF learning IS the goal.

*

However, IF learning IS NOT the goal, then the processes of teaching need never take into account the processes of learning.
In such a case, no one (including both teachers and learners) need know anything about the processes of learning. So, if someone manages to identify some of the different kinds of learning processes, well, these can be ignored, played down, eradicated, etc. -- or safeguarded from public access by machinations of mind-programming operations.

*

In any event, if we examine some terms and their definitions, we shall be able to note a rather curious thing as a result.

T E A C H

Our English term TEACH is taken from a Middle European term, TECHEN, which meant "to show." In English it means "to cause [someone] to know a subject," and "to cause [someone] to know how."

*

Here we immediately, and unfortunately, encounter a gross fundamental difficulty. The difficult, in the most simple words possible, is this: "to know a subject" and "to know how [to do or effect something] are radically different activities. But both activities are included, and somewhat obfuscated, within the contexts of the same descriptive term.

*

Additionally, most dictionaries defining TEACH somehow manage NOT to refer to the concept of "to cause [someone] to learn."

*

Thus, at first official nomenclature contact with the term TEACH we find as follows:

T E A C H

.

.

to cause

.

. . . . . ./\ . . .

. . .

to know to know how to learn(?)

*

Moving on, then, the term TEACH is usually broken apart into active measure nuances:

INSTRUCT: methodical or formal teaching.

EDUCATE: attempting to bring out latent capabilities.

TRAIN: stresses instruction and drill with a specific end in view.

DISCIPLINE: implies subordination to a master for the sake of controlling.

SCHOOL: implies training or discipline, especially in what is hard to master or to bear.

TUTOR: to teach or guide, usually in a special subject or for a particular purpose.

GUIDE: to provide with guiding information, to direct a person in his or her conduct or course of life, to superintend training or instruction.

*

Thus, including TEACH we can quickly encounter EIGHT categories all relevant to teaching -- and in whose basic definitions the term LEARN is not mentioned.

L E A R N

Our English term LEARN is akin to the Old High German LERNEN -- and which apparently meant "to acquire knowing," this later evolving into "to acquire knowledge."

*

Thus, in English, LEARN came to refer to "to gain knowledge or understanding of or skill in by study, instruction, or experience.
LEARN also refers to "memorizing," but beyond that the term is not broken down into more refined categories as is TEACH.

S T U D Y and S T U D E N T

Our English term STUDY is taken from the Latin term roughly meaning the same thing, with the exception that the Latin STUDERE either did or did also refer to "contemplation."
In any event, our term STUDY is defined (get this) as "the application of the mental faculties to the acquisition of knowledge; a careful examination or analysis of a phenomenon, development, or question; something attracting close attention or examination; also, the activity or work of a student."

*

Our English term STUDENT is defined as: one who attends a school; one who studies; also an attentive and systematic observer.
Most dictionaries allow the term LEARN to somehow be pendant to a CONCEPT of STUDENT, but that term is not included in most of the formal definitions.
Beyond that, a STUDENT is presumably one who proposes to attempt the application of the mental faculties to the acquisition of knowledge, a careful examination or analyses of something, even if only regarding whatever attracts close attention or examination.
Whatever is involved is then the student's WORK or ACTIVITY.

K N O W L E D G E

(1) Cognizance.
(2) The fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association.
(3) The fact or condition of being aware of something.
(4) The range of one's information or understanding.
(5) The fact or condition of having information, or of being learned.
(6) The sum of what is [was(?) or can be(?)] known and which consists of the body of truth, information, and principles acquired by mankind.

*

I might add that the body of truth, etc., presumably includes what was once known but forgotten, rejected, or avoided.

*

In dragging the reader through the foregoing nomenclature bytes, I have reviewed what would seem to be the major constituents of teaching and learning. Some might assume that these constituents are all that is needed in order to undertake expeditions into teaching and learning.

*

But while I suppose that most of the major constituents of teaching are included (at least regarding superficial formats of teaching), it seems to me that the idea of LEARNING seems to hang about as sort of a vaporous fantasy.
True, people assume that learning will occur because of teaching. But it can be noted that whatever the elements of learning might be, they are rather vague within the contexts of the nomenclature considered above.

*

Anyhow, the nomenclature autopsy is concluded (for now.) And this frees us to move expeditiously on to another matter.
There can be little doubt that teaching and learning are among the most important attributes of our species -- and indeed of almost all social groupings within it.

*

As it is, our species seems to HAVE TO LEARN what it takes to survive.
Which is to say that specimens of our species are not born completely or even partially programmed with broad-band survival knowledge -- a type of knowledge once referred to as NATURAL,

INDWELLING INSTINCTS as regards other life forms.

*

Since the above idea IS the case, it would then seem that the necessity of teaching and learning might have achieved enough conceptual importance to have become included as significant topics within the scope of philosophical inquiry and discussion.

*

I will now refer to THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY compiled under the editorial auspices of Paul Edwards, and published in 1967 by Macmillian Publishing Co. in New York, and by Collier Macmillian Publishers in London.
I have already referred to this encyclopedia in the course of other essays in this database. Although this encyclopedia was published in 1967 (thirty years ago as of this writing,) it represents an excellent compilation of philosophy up until then, and how things were considered.
Additionally, in my own estimation the year 1967 more or less signaled the end of what had been called the Modern Age, and so the encyclopedia serves as a kind of summarization of philosophical thinking as of the end of that Age. Whether anyone will agree with me on this estimation, most certainly after 1967 overall human affairs did depart into directions and necessities so new that former philosophical approaches to things and stuff grew increasingly useless.
For one thing, as human affairs went into the 1970s, interest declined in, of all things, PHILOSOPHY -- with the result that philosophical curricula began to be curtailed, and some institutions of higher learning canceled such courses and departments altogether.

*

Now, PHILOSOPHY was once thought of as "the search for wisdom."
However, when WISDOM proved either too elusive, complicated or inconvenient, the definition was shifted to "a search for truth through logical reasoning rather than factual observation." I invite you to consider this definition with some care and interest.

*

On average, though, one of the central ideas of PHILOSOPHY was to consider the meaning of things, especially if they were important not only to human thinking, but to survival, progress, understanding, and the accumulating of that stuff referred to as "knowledge."
In this sense, then what is NOT included in the 1967 encyclopedia may be as important as what is.

*

The concepts of TEACHING and LEARNING are not found in the encyclopedia as worthy of identified

entries.
In that the concepts of teaching and learning might be included in other entries, one of course consults the encyclopedia's index to discover if this is so.

*

In the Index, one finds only one reference to the topic of TEACHING -- and which reference regards "teaching machines."

*

The topic LEARNING fares a bit better.
First, the Index refers to "Learned Ignorance" as found mentioned in the entry for one Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464), a theologian, philosopher, and mathematician.
Apparently, this Nicholas of Cusa held that "a man is wise only if he is aware of the limits of the mind [his own?] in knowing the truth."

*

This Nicholas of Cusa, having said this, it is then of little wonder that no one has ever heard of him -- largely because his statement is sort of worrisome to the idea that "knowledge is Power," this a much more popular concept.
This Nicholas also wrote DE DOCTA IGNORANCE, a treatise in which he proposed that "Knowledge is learned ignorance." The idea that there may indeed exist doctrines of learning how to be ignorant would clearly be unpopular, all things considered.

*

In any event, the 1967 encyclopedia also mentions "learning" in connection with the entries for Perception, Psychological behaviorism, and something called the "Learning of the Mind School." The term "learning" is also mentioned in connection with the entries for to individuals, one Maine de Biran, and Jean Piaget.

*

So, as it turns out there is no formal entry in the 1967 encyclopedia for teaching or learning. The index mentions teaching in only one context, while learning is mentioned six times (only).

*

Before moving on, it is of some minor interest to discover that the 1967 encyclopedia DOES have an entry for "Laws of Thought." This is worth minor interest in that it might seem that TEACHING and

LEARNING might have some relationship to the Laws of Thought, or vice versa.
At least my humble self can't really conceive that teaching and learning somehow DO NOT involve THOUGHT, whether lawful or lawless.

*

In any event, regarding the Laws of Thought, the 1967 encyclopedia indicated that such laws consisted of three principles "frequently discussed from the time of the Greeks until the beginning of the twentieth century [at which time] the term has become obsolete."
The three principles are noted as "the principles of identity, of contradiction, of excluded middle, and occasionally [presumably as a fourth principle] the principle of sufficient reason." Now, "reason" in this instance, refers to the sister of "logic" -- the two otherwise known as logic and reason.
The implication here is that it takes a certain amount or quota of reason to be able to deal with the laws of thought, and so interest in the Laws or Thought became "obsolete" at the beginning of the twentieth century.

*

Earlier above, I have introduced the term KNOWLEDGE.
The 1967 encyclopedia does not have an entry for KNOWLEDGE as a "thing" in its own right. The encyclopedia, however, does have three entries regarding knowledge as:
The Sociology of Knowledge;
The Theory of Knowledge:
Knowledge and Belief.

*

Regarding KNOWLEDGE, at the beginning of the entry KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF we find: "The nature of knowledge has been a central problem in philosophy from the earliest times. . . .
"The problem of knowledge occupies an important place in most major philosophical systems. If philosophy is conceived as an ontological undertaking, as an endeavor to describe the ultimate nature of reality or to say what there really is, it requires a preliminary investigation of the scope and validity of knowledge. Only that can be said to exist which can be known to exist.
"If, on the other hand, philosophy is conceived as a critical inquiry, as a second-order discipline concerned with the claims of various concrete forms of intellectual activity, it must consider the extent to which these activities issue in knowledge."

*

Well, I dare mention that few will consent to a preliminary investigation of the scope and validity of THEIR OWN PERSONAL knowledge -- and so whether knowledge is ontological or a second-order discipline is more or less relevant.

*

Regarding BELIEF, in the entry for KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF we find: "Belief has had less attention [than knowledge] from philosophers. It has generally been taken to be a more or less unproblematic inner state, accessible to introspection. But there has been disagreement about whether it is active or passive."

*

Well, insignificant little Moi might observe that the world turns more on belief than knowledge.

*

As it is, though, the 1967 encyclopedia more or less might agree with my comment above, in that in the KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF entry, THE DEFINITION OF KNOWLEDGE is given, and I quote:

"According to the most widely accepted definition, knowledge is justified true belief."
Ergo, it must follow that "true belief" is "knowledge." And which means that our species, although extant, is lost (or at least quite confused) -- and it is of little wonder that the finer points of teaching and learning have been irrelevant all along.
