THE COMING IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION: CAN THE SUPERPOWERS BE TRAINED?

Ingo Swann (8Aug05)

NOTE OF EXPLANATION

THIS essay is a slightly adjusted version of a Situational Paper prepared by this author at the request of two representatives of "interested parties," the identities of which, as well as the contents of the Paper, were not to be disclosed. This author does not at all favor such mumbo-jumbo affairs cloaked in mystery if they come out of thin air. But the initial go-between came through a dear friend of highest integrity and knowledge who referred, rather obliquely, to a sort of behind-the-scenes venture capital group interested in funding advanced directions in what was more or less referred to as "super-consciousness activities."

As it eventually turned out, to this author's surprise, and for reasons quite obscure, the unidentified group nonetheless urged open presentation of the Paper in this Website.

The central issue involved has to do with increasing interest in potential ways and means of superpower training. As will be discussed in the text ahead, one doesn't need to be a rocket scientist to assume that this interest has undergone stimulation because of the recent discovery (during the 1990s) of "empathic mirror neurons" in the premotor cortex of the brain via which the "motives and intentions of others" can be detected.

Detecting the motives and intentions of others is also one of the formal definitions of that super sensitivity categorized as "telepathy," and the discovery of mirror neurons implies that empathic telepathy does exist, does have a physical explanation, even if only in "raw" potential.

The discovery furthermore means that searches for ways and means of developing the raw potential via applied training-enhancement methods will (if not already) seriously be undertaken by any number of "behind-the-scenes interested parties."

Situation Papers are often requested to help recognize missing elements of a missing bigger picture.

THE COMING IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION: CAN THE SUPERPOWERS BE TRAINED

Ingo Swann

1. SITUATIONAL FOREW0RD

THIS AUTHOR has been requested to provide an in-depth Situation Paper concerning potential training of human superpowers such as those commonly referred to in the modern West as PSI or ESP faculties and which appellations include clairvoyance, telepathy, precognition, etc., and more lately collectively referred to as "superpowers."

The request does not principally ask for intimate discussion of the superpowers themselves, but rather for a consideration of them from the EXPERIENTIAL viewpoint within the human species in general.

What this "experiential viewpoint" might consist of needs clarification here at the beginning.

*

For about 150 years now (roughly demarking the Late Modern Age circa 1920-1990), positive and negative interests in the superpowers have usually been built upon viewpoints more or less in keeping with various attitudes, opinions, ideas and concepts consistent with "old" philosophic-scientific theories and doctrines; and viewpoints that characterized various social groupings and their vested principles.

This complicated mélange fomented a Situation in which it hardly mattered what people actually experienced of their super sensitivities. What mattered was how such experiencing fitted in with this or that mélange of "old" concepts.

*

Within this not insignificant modernist mélange, the probability that super sensitivities might have some kind of innate status in our species was avoided and became, as it were, a nebulous ring-pass-not kind of thing that hardly anyone officially dared look at much less challenge.

Innateness of a given phenomenon or activity in our species is first established by finding out how "universal" or "generic" it is throughout, or how often it actively manifests within the sum of human experiencing.

Thus, when some form of human activity is found occurring everywhere (i.e., including or covering all or a whole collectively or distributively more or less without limit or exception), it can be surmised that it is inherently, generically, and innately existing – at least potentially so.

However, when the probable innateness of super sensitivities is avoided and shunted aside altogether, then data reflecting the sum of human super sensitivity experiencing is NOT likely to undergo anything resembling organized itemization – and certainly not in any societal-relevant philosophic or scientific contexts.

*

Since this cast-in-cement Situation has been ongoing for so long in modernist contexts reflecting powerful resistance to super sensitivities, it could easily be predicted that it would be projected, largely unchanged, into the decades ahead.

Suddenly, however, at about just after the turn of the millennium, one finds a sort of Embryonic Situation growing within the cement of the long ongoing one, one that carries a particular characteristic that needs to be emphasized.

To help distinguish between the "old" and emerging "new" approaches, one might find increasing interest in extending research of the super sensitivities based on traditional "old" psychical or parapsychological concepts and models.

But this is not the case at all with the emerging Situation, for the new interest is on seriously organized TRAINING of super sensitivity potentials – i.e., an interest that had

hardly ever seen the light of day before in broad societal contexts.

Simply put, this aspect boldly jumps across mere super sensitivity research into a pursuit of applied super sensitivity activity – simply because hardly anything is trained unless it is meant to be used.

*

Before entering into discussions relative to the question of whether the super sensitivities can experientially be trained, there is the rather complicated Experiential Situation involving whether specimens of our species in general fundamentally experience super sensitivities in a more or less species-wide manner.

For example, it is quite well documented that instincts, gut-feelings, intuitions, and premonitions are experienced broadly, at least sufficiently enough to qualify as "universal" to our species.

These age-old and enduring phenomena are not generally thought of as examples of experiential super sensitivity – largely because modern parapsychologists could not figure out how to experientially drag them into the laboratory and empirically test them.

One of the subtle problems involved here is that the vast expansiveness of human experiencing has never quite fitted into empirical models - or, as it might better be put, fitted into empirical models that are usually structured upon limited contexts thought to be evidential and thus valid, but which do not allow for evidence outside their limited contexts.

Simply put, human experiencing that fits into empirical contexts is thought to be scientific; human experiencing that does not fit into such contexts is thought to be unscientific. End of story.

*

At first sight, the difficulties discussed just above are usually thought to emerge out of flawed empirical concepts

– which is at least partially the case.

But there is an additional facet involved that is seldom, if ever, considered. You see, the contexts and phenomena of human EXPERIENCING are not very well understood, although it is taken for granted that they are.

So the overall Experiential Situation has to do with a couple of significant problems that subtly surround the term EXPERIENTIAL, and these need to be worked through before going on. Please try to do so, and see if the subtle fallacies involved become apparent.

That term is of course taken from the word EXPERIENCE ehivh has at least eight definitions.

In general, it is first officially defined as "The (usually) conscious perception or apprehension of reality or of an external, bodily, or psychic event." Please note the "usually conscious" element here.

The term is also narrowly defined as "The conscious events that make up an individual life."

Lastly, the term is vaguely defined as "Something personally encountered, undergone, or lived through."

EXPERIENTAL is defined as "Derived from, based on, or relating to experience – empirical" – i.e., usually conscious empirical experience.

The insertion into this definition of the term EMPIRICAL engenders subtle difficulties, because it has three somewhat conflicting definitions: (1) Relying on experience or observation alone often without due regard for system or theory; (2) Originating in or based on observation or experience; and most importantly, (3) Capable of being verified or disproved by observation or experiment.

All of these definitions might seem okay at first. But in seeking the definitions of EMPIRICAL, one finds that its major definition is rendered as "capable of being verified or disproved by observation or experiment."

In other words, it confines the EXPERIENTIAL to whatever is "capable of being verified or disproved by observation or experiment." Please note that this particular definition is very meaningful in that EMPIRICAL (i.e., empiricism) was THE chief hallmark of the modernist sciences and philosophies.

This is to say that "something personally encountered, undergone, or lived through" must be submitted to empirical verification or disproving via empirical observation of experiment.

Bluntly put, this Empirical Situation involves WHOSE and WHAT experiment via what and whose attitudes, opinions, ideas; via what and whose philosophic and scientific theories or doctrines; and via what and whose adherence to various social groupings and their invested principles.

Thus, what is empirical to some may not be considered empirical by others, this being a very old story. But within the ongoing mélange, specimens of our species experience what they do whether such is empirical or not.

*

It is worth noting that the contexts of both EXPERIENCE and the EXPERIENTIAL have traditionally been discussed AFTER examples of them have manifested.

But both terms imply the existence of potentials that might, could, or can manifest whether they do or do not.

In other words, there probably exists a lot of experiential Stuff that might never enter into one's experiencing of it, or into empirical observation and experimentation of it.

Additionally, empirical observation and experimentation might NOT be capable of addressing Stuff outside of criteria being empirically utilized.

Thus something, such as sudden emergence of super sensitivity experiencing formerly not experienced might take place, often in ways that objective, empirical realities cannot account for.

*

2. SOME OLD SITUATIONS

WONDERMENT about whether training of the superpowers is possible is made difficult because the question is entangled in numerous Situations some of which are quite subtle and not easily recognizable.

Most of these Situations are locked into old realities, some of which are fortunately in process of being replaced by new ones with staggering implications. If this were not the case, then constructing this consultative document would be rather pointless, and boring as heck to boot.

*

One of the "old" Situations consists of two somewhat related parts, the first of which has to do with the question of whether or not parapsychology has failed in the sense that it once was an idea whose time had come, and thence, after a few exciting decades, declined and went leaving behind a confused residue.

Among this residue, parapsychology contexts and frames of reference still endure, even if now becoming slightly obsolete. But if those contexts are not depended on or utilized then no one knows what is being talked about.

The best (and shortest) definition of Parapsychology is found in PARAPSYCHOLOGY: SOURCES OF INFORMATION published in 1973 wherein (on page 13) it is stated that "Parapsychology (the modern and more restrictive term for psychical research) is the field which uses the scientific method to investigate phenomena for which there appear to be no normal (that is, sensory) explanations. Basically this refers [only] to phenomena subsumed under the general term psi . . . [that] refers to the building blocks of telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, and psychokinesis."

The operative key of this definition is "the scientific method," one part of which involves utilizing the empirical statistical method to establish scientifically acceptable epistemological evidence of the real empirical existence of

something, such as telepathy, etc.

The second part of this two-part Situation also involved "the scientific method," but as seen not from parapsychology hopes but from the empirical contexts of modernist Science itself – i.e., the empirical context resolutely marked by the firm conviction that nothing but Matter existed, and that unless a phenomenon could be explained as a result of identifiable material sources and process it could not be accepted as "scientific."

In other words, mere statistical evidence was Not Enough, even if obtained via strict empirical procedure. So, in this sense, parapsychology failed in obtaining its ultimate goal of scientific acceptance.

But it is important to stipulate that overall it did not fail in its basic, cumulative statistical approach to researching PSI and its several manifestations among the human species.

*

However, as mentioned by others, it can justifiably be said in retrospect that the parapsychology approach to PSI was too narrow for any number of reasons, especially in that it did not, in general, incorporate fundamental study of such phenomena as perception, consciousness and its capacities, or the fuller spectrum of exceptional human experiencing – or the possibilities of TRAINING of anything.

At about 1970, parapsychology was already more or less moribund when this author inadvertently entered it as an experimental (and, at first, a somewhat abused) guinea pig.

Since then, Science has discovered that Matter is NOT the only reality, and that at least telepathy DOES have a physical basis – both of which ironic events are sardonically delicious to those who have strongly experienced some kind of super sensitivity.

*

One of the working definitions of the term SITUATION is given as "relative position or combination of circumstances at a

certain moment, place, or time."

When this definition is connected to the topic of the super sensitivities, it simply signifies that concepts of the super sensitivities are seen as relative to various kinds of circumstances within which they are being considered pro or con.

Such relative circumstances can be cultural, social, individual and/or "group think," philosophic, or scientific, etc., and they also depend on what kinds of dominant intellectualisms are holding sway at any given moment, place, or time.

All of this makes for a massively complex and messy picture that writers, analysts, historians, etc., try to wade through - and usually end cognitively mired up to their brainpans. More simply put, this simply means that there are very many conflictive INTELLECTUALISMS via which the superpowers and their associated super sensitivities can be viewed in various conflicting ways.

*

In order to TRY to cut through, or downsize, this complex and messy entanglement, this author will consider only two situational characteristics that are obviously involved.

The second of these might be styled as the DEEPER SITUATION, while the first can more precisely be referred to as the SUPERFICIAL SITUATION that is absolutely known to exist - if only because of the vast abundance of popular books, theories, guesstimates, etc., that "say" what they do pro or con, but don't provide all that much depth into the essential, fundamental nature of the superpowers.

A very long paper could be written dissecting this superficial situation, but it seems the better part of valor to suggest why it exists in the first place, and exists in such a continuing manner.

You see that term INTELLECTUAL-ISM just above? Let us start dissecting that.

The INTELLECTUAL part seems okay, in that the term is defined as "of or relating to the intellect or its use" - although what use is made of intellect is sometimes to be wondered about.

Depth diving into this particular issue, it can be found that the definition of the ISM part is given as "doctrine, theory; adherence to a system, doctrine, or theory identified by the particular class of principles incorporated into them."

DOCTRINE is merely defined as "something that can be taught [including its 'principles'], while THEORY consists of "a hypothesis assumed for the sake of argument or investigation based on analysis of a set of facts in their relation to one another."

However, a more perceptive actuality is this: until they are proven factual, such theories, doctrines, principles, isms, etc. don't always need to incorporate facts – and especially cannot really do so if important facts are intellectually unknown within the sometimes fact-less principles incorporated into them.

If and when important hitherto unknown facts come to light (if they are allowed to do so, or can't otherwise be prevented or resisted}, then former principles, theories, doctrines, isms, begin to dis-incorporate – or, as it might better be said, "become undone, to come apart."

Anything that is in process of dis-incorporating quickly sheds its former vogue and fashionable allure. And pundits will begin pointing up that such were composed only of mere and sometimes stupid intellectualisms all along.

*

In the sense of the above observations, it can be wondered if both modern Parapsychology and modern Science treated the superpowers in superficial ways.

In the case of modernist Science the answer is in the absolute positive, because the superpowers were simply (and officially) dismissed via ways and methods overall characterized by one of the most dogmatic forms of crass superficiality.

In the case of modernist Parapsychology, it could be thought that its empirical/statistical searches might not constitute a superficiality – until it is realized that most (but not all) of such searches were more politically motivated toward gaining scientific acceptance (and hence more funding) rather than by more profound depth-diving into the PSI phenomena being considered.

So, both parapsychology AND empirical science missed two of the most important and enduring facts of the superpowers, two facts that have long stood the tests of time – whereas parapsychology came and went, and the ever-so-neat-packaged materialistic Science is now in the process of going, too.

*

The two tests-of-time FACTS relative to the superpowers are:

(1) That their reality existence within our species has been noted in all cultures from time immemorial; and

(2) That their manifestations erupt spontaneously even within populations otherwise shackled by various types of negative attitudes against them.

In other words, while negative intellectualisms, theories, doctrines, etc. might come and go, super sensitivity phenomena have a much longer and deeper history – and it is these two tests-or-time facts that principally constitute the DEEPER SITUATION as contrasted to the more familiar Superficial ones.

All of the foregoing having been joyfully pointed up, we can now move into the post-Modern arenas of super sensitivity recognition – and why attempts at training will certainly be future-forthcoming.

3. EMERGING NEW SITUATIONS: I.E., SOME ASTONISHING SCIENTIFIC "COSMIC" SURPRISES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

AS ALREADY briefly discussed, the parapsychology goal of achieving scientific acceptance based on empirical statistical data was successfully resisted on the grounds that PSI phenomena could not additionally be explained as the

empirical result of empirical material processes. Mere statistical data alone were not completely scientific of and in themselves.

This scientific resistance was completely logical IF matter WAS the Only Reality – meaning that nothing else other than Matter could exist or co-exist with it.

So, from the scientific viewpoint, it was generally thought that parapsychology research was in scientific default by failing to provide direct physical evidence for the existence of PSI items such as telepathy, clairvoyance, etc.

The idea that the modern scientific theory-doctrine holding that Matter was the Only Reality could, itself, be in default was unthinkable.

*

To segue into the possible confusions that are to follow, the term STUFF is usually considered as having very low philosophic-scientific dignity and even lesser merit.

Among its several definitions in addition to "rubbish," one can discover that the term refers to: (1) fundamental material, substance, or essence; (2) the aggregate of something; (3) special knowledge or capability.

The contexts of these three definitions, however, usually refer to Stuff that is more of less known to exist if only in a theoretical manner, even though few if any details of what is involved are clear.

As a case in point, advancing sciences (IF they ARE advancing) tend to discover Stuff that can't be explained within the contexts they are advancing out of. Philosophies are also reluctant to have advancing Stuff discovered - because such discoveries would entail bothersome rewriting of the philosophies.

As a general rule of thumb, scientists and philosophers usually don't appreciate discovery of the real existence of Stuff that is outside or beyond the reality boxes they don't want to advance out of, probably because of the dreaded loss

of face that would be involved.

*

As of about 1890, scientific investigations of Matter were doing quite well – until unanticipated Situations began entering into the Only Reality when the cutting edges of physics began dissecting Matter into smaller and smaller particles, and, as a result, eventually encountered Stuff (during the early 1920s), which was dubbed as the sub-atomic quantum realms.

Quantum theory thence yielded the advanced, cutting-edge concepts of non-continuity, non-causality, and non-locality. The details of these concepts are too involved to include here, and if interested, one can bone up on them via Internet resources.

But briefly put here, quantum theory began establishing that Matter was actually coinciding and interfacing within conditions of some Other Realities Stuff that could neither be measured nor understood by empirical scientific measuring and testing in ways consistent with the Only Reality of Matter.

Perhaps too simply put, the Other Realities consisted of "radiations" emerging, in the strict material sense, from "no-material-thing," but which were anyway interpenetrating the Only Reality of Matter.

Did you "get" all of this? If not, don't worry too much because there is worse to come, but which, even if worse, is a bit more understandable.

*

To jump a bit ahead from earlier beginnings of quantum mechanics and theory, during the 1980s and 1990s, the "cutting edges" of physics found themselves capable of mathematically deducing the real existence of Stuff dubbed as dark matter, exotic matter, dark energy, multiple dimensions, and multiple universes.

As all of this stands so far:

DARK MATTER may or may not interpenetrate the

physical realms; but

EXOTIC (SUBTLE) ENERGIES interpenetrate; while

DARK ENERGY certainly does interpenetrate;

As well as do MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS that simultaneously

co-exist with and interpenetrate within each other.

One of the outcomes of all these "Other Realities" (including PARALLEL UNIVERSES and the HOLOGRAPHIC UNIVERSE), is that the former "only reality" of Matter now is thought to constitute only about some 4 percent to 7 percent of the Universe.

(NOTE: Those interested in these items are invited to check the appropriate Internet sources. Google It, as it is said.)

For an attempt at clarifying, practically everyone comprehends what is meant by PENETRATE, an English word officially defined as: "To pass into or through; to see into or through; to discover the inner contents or meaning of; to pass, extend, pierce, or diffuse into or through something."

At a lower, more gross level of understanding, the term is understood as merely shoving something into something else – and/or gaining access to something that is thought to be shielded against access, such as secrets, motives, intentions, and other hidden or concealed whatnots, etc.

That much having been said, there is another English term that is less understood – INTER-PENETRATE, defined as: "To penetrate between, within, or throughout; to mutually penetrate; to spread or diffuse through; to permeate."

The conventional modernist definitions, functions, and activities of PENETRATION are quite well comprehended, largely because concrete demonstrations of them are rife everywhere.

However, although the term INTERPENETRATION is occasionally used, there is always the elusive issue of what is mutually

interpenetrating what – especially if such cannot strictly be explained as the result of material processes.

What all of this interpenetrating scientific STUFF means with respect to super sensitivities is by no means clear. But many super sensitive individuals have referred to perceiving "radiations," other dimensions, multiple realities, and all kinds of information not available via the five physical senses.

But a sort of parallelism is implied between the existence of interpenetrating Stuff and, let us say, interpenetrating capacities of human consciousness whose functions are not strictly confined to objective perception of the matter-only reality.

*

Enlarging upon this a little, as far as the objective physical universe of Matter is concerned (and in the modernist rational sense of it), that universe is generally assumed to be composed of physically objective things that might penetrate other things, but which don't mutually interpenetrate, and thus do not mutually co-exist with and within each other.

THIS context is the central reality of the modernist Western philosophies and sciences. Or, as it might better be put today, it WAS the central reality in the conventional modernist West.

The modernist philosophy of Materialism held that Matter was the Only Reality. End of story.

The modernist sciences followed suit, additionally holding that anything that could not be explained as a manifestation or resulting processes of Matter could not have real existence.

It is quite easy to understand the utter allure of this, in that we do exist in our local section of the material universe and have, by necessity, to grapple with its local vicissitudes all of the time – THIS even before we have to grapple with the more complex vicissitudes of human nature.

There are lots of old stories about this state of material affairs, but there is one somewhat complicated aspect that

has seldom undergone examination and discussion.

Briefly put: The Matter universe is filled with OBJECTS, i.e., things "that are capable of being seen, touched, or sensed via the physical senses" and/or via physical equipment designed and engineered to do so.

These objects are LOCAL to and within the Matter universe, meaning they are "characterized by or relating to position in space; characterized by, relating to, or occupying a particular place" in that universe.

Such "position(s) in space" and "particular place(s)" are of course OUTSIDE of US, and they all locally "belong" to what and where they are at any given time.

Hence the term OBJECTIVISM, defined as "Any of the various theories [including philosophic and scientific ones] stressing objective reality, especially as distinguished from subjective experience or appearance."

Now, in these particular objectivistic contexts, it is quite easy to comprehend that the first level of conscious-of-ness development simply has to focus, or centralize, on external objects external that exist in their local positions in space and in their particular places.

It is generally thought that THIS is achieved via the five physical senses, and by tutoring and training them to function at least somewhat properly and efficiently within the contexts of objectivity as found among the vicissitudes and hazards of the Only Reality of Matter.

(As a brief aside here, please note that this kind of training does not include efficiency training for dealing with the vicissitudes and hazards of human nature itself for which other kinds of "senses" are certainly required in addition to the famous physical five ones.)

For reasons that have never exactly been objectively explained, it is taken for granted, in objective materialistic contexts, that all of the objects in the local universe of Matter do not violate the local "laws" that are assumed to govern the local objective existence of matter,

energy, space, and time.

Therefore anything that does so cannot be explained – at least in objective terms.

So a rather pregnant question can emerge from all of this: Why does human consciousness seem to have capacities that dare to violate the local "laws" of objective existence?

*

To remind: The term SUPERPOWERS refers:
(1) to any sensitivities that cannot be attributed to the five physical senses;
(2) to any sensitivities that transcend whatever is passing for conscious reason and logic based only on the restrictions of material objectivity;
(3) to any sensitivities that transcend the materialistic understanding of matter, energy, space, and time; and
(4) to the acquisition of efficient information that can, if well trained to do so, result from such transcending.

Also to remind: The term itself is not original to this author or to this Website, having, as it does, a rather long history in other languages. The prefix SUPER (and its many linguistic equivalents) merely denotes "over and above; higher in quantity, quality, or degree than; exceeding or so as to exceed a norm; surpassing all or most others of its kind."

*

The key concept in all of the foregoing is INTERPENETRATE. This is a point to be emphasized for several reasons.

One can easily think or speculate about the existence of other realities, realms, dimensions, and so forth. But there is a general tendency to think of them as being outside of, elsewhere, and as having their own versions of objectivity independent and separate within the realms, dimensions, etc., of our material realities.

The difficult problem here is that although other realities,

etc., probably do have their own objectivity versions within them, our own scientific quantum and sub-quantum discoveries are indicating that they are NOT ELSEWHERE.

Instead, they are mutually enfolded and interpenetrating each other and thus are simultaneously HERE, simultaneously co-existing at sub-quantum levels (including co-existing with our own material realities), and, as one might suppose, doing their own thing whatever that might be.

All of this is quite "alien" to our standard Western ways of thinking about reality, because they are more less firmly locked into the physical objectivity of things that can be perceived via the five physical senses, even if it takes microscopes, telescopes, and all other sorts of technical mechanisms to do so.

Indeed and on average, our consciousness is more or less programmed to function only with what is objective in this or that material sense, and which can objectively be "explained." Thus, when some sort of spontaneous super sensitivity experience takes place, everyone is befuddled, including the experiencer.

The foregoing is probably too amazing to take on board, so don't worry too much about it. It takes time to digest this kind of STUFF.

The larger point being made is that INTERPENETRATION with and of Other Realities is now a big deal, at least at quantum scientific levels. Mainstream science magazines are full of it, even including the venerable SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN whose earlier editors carefully clung to objective-empirical precepts acceptable to scientific materialism.

*

If advanced interpenetration-realities are alien and absolutely too amazing, it is likewise even more astonishing to find that something like such has been known for a long time – but objected to by modernist materialism, thus rejected and ejected from the arenas of material objective-thinking-only.

As already mentioned, this is revealed by searching other languages for relevant word-references, a good many of which are found, for example, in Amerindian languages that are redolent with such.

But it is astonishing to find that ancient Sanskrit . . . Well, let us start over here.

Sanskrit has, of course, its share of terms dealing with objective, material things, including actions and interactions within the realms of Matter.

But these material references are far overshadowed by the proliferation of terms relevant to Other Reality interpenetrations of all sorts, and the sum of which has long ago been encoded on behalf of possible and probable innate states of consciousness that can and do deal with them.

This is to say that while our extraordinary present scientific approaches to interpenetration Stuff have now been unavoidably underway for about twenty years, there was a language dating back 3,000 or more years ago that had its own versions of such Stuff.

This is not at all to say that the contexts of our own post-modern quantum discoveries are the same thing as are (or were) the ancient Sanskrit Other Realities thing. But the Sanskrit contexts do identify what we today refer to as "mutually interpenetrating quantum and sub-quantum levels."

Thus, there is at least one somewhat discrete concept that the two contexts do share, if only recently so – i.e., the actual existence of multiple interpenetrating realities.

The Sanskrit contexts insist that human consciousness is possessed of ways and means to interact with multiple interpenetrating realities. Our post-modern quantum sciences seem to be lagging a bit behind in this.

It is also worth mentioning that it should be obvious that super sensitivities are principally distinguished by their interpenetrating nature – which is to say, to interpenetrate Stuff and things that the mere five physical senses cannot. More discussion on this later. We now need to move

onward.

4. A NEW ASTONISHING SITUATION: THE SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY OF "TELEPATHIC" NEURONS IN THE BRAIN

AS ALREADY pointed up, it was held within modern materialist philosophies and sciences that parapsychology research was in default by failing to provide direct physical evidence for the existence of PSI items such as telepathy, clairvoyance, etc.

Put another, perhaps more significant way, science itself had not discovered any such kinds of physical evidence that could have aided parapsychology's work – and so parapsychological data could be excluded from scientific appreciation of it.

This exclusion was especially focused on super sensitivities which, after all, transcended the "laws" that were thought to govern matter, energy, space, and time, including the electromagnetic, chemical, and quantum arrangements within them. And it was thought to constitute a necessary, neat, tight, and seamless example of pure scientific reason and logic based in confidence that nothing of the kind would ever be discovered.

As a result, the exclusion has been socially enforced in rather serious unforgiving ways, while proponents of the super sensitivities, no matter their standing otherwise, have been socially stigmatized, at least in the sense of mainstream acceptability.

*

And yet, as already discussed, by the beginning of the twenty-first century, mainstream science periodicals (such as the venerable SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN and the data-crunching NEW SCIENTIST) were bristling with reports about Parallel Universes, Multiple Dimensions, Holographic Universes, the mysteries of Dark Matter, Dark Energy, Subtle Energies, and Exotic Stuff.

But before the twentieth century was over, a new kind of mind-boggling discovery had been made during its ultimate decade.

While dark matter and energy etc. might not yet mean too much on average to mere individuals plodding along in their local "universes," this new discovery, once its ramifications begin to sink in, IS particularly significant at the individual level.

*

Now, perhaps to over emphasize, it was held that telepathy did not exist because:
(1) There wee no brain-mind mechanisms that could account for direct, mental mind-to-mind exchanges of information especially of the long-distance kind; and
(2) There was no known physical medium through which the mental information could directly be transmitted – since in the matter-only-reality universe, there was no non-matter Stuff simply because no other realities existed.

Such WAS the scientific situation.

*

An expanded version of what will now briefly be outlined below can be found in this Website under the heading of TELEPATHY – THE OPENING UP OF, and those interested are invited to surf the Internet under the topics of TELEPATHY and MIRROR NEURONS.

In the April 30, 2005 issue of SCIENCE NEWS (Vol. 167, No. 18), their appeared a brief article entitled "Goal Oriented Brain Cells – Neurons may track action as a prelude to empathy."

This somewhat obtuse heading was then clarified as: "Neuroscientists in Italy listened in on monkeys' brain cells that they say may lie at the root of empathy, the ability to discern others' thoughts and intentions."

The scientific name given to these special brain cells was MIRROR NEURONS (possibly because they "reflected" what was going on in the neurons of others.)

Mirror neurons were first discovered in Macaque monkeys and later confirmed by MRI scanning also to exist in humans where

they are located in Brodmann's area 44 (Broca's area) of the brain's cerebral cortex and elsewhere.

Mirror neurons are now scientifically defined as specializing neurons that (detect? respond to?) the "intentions and motives of others."

"Detecting intentions and motives of others" is, of course, the official, long-standing definition of TELEPATHY – and some scientists have noted (in print) that such neurons actually seem to place one in the minds of others, or, at least "mirror" what is going on in others' minds.

Among others, a neuroscientist scientist (at the University of California) indicated that via the special premotor cortex neurons "we are practically in another person's mind."

*

At this juncture, it is again worth reminding that in this Website, SUPERPOWERS more or less refers to any perceptual processes that range beyond the limited powers of the conventional five physical senses that "sense" physicality – which is to say that super sensitivity perceptive processes transcend such limits.

"Telepathy" is a modern term that has been assigned to one such

superpower, although the processes involved were earlier referred to as "thought transference," a definition that is much in keeping with the new scientific definition of "mirror neurons."

As it is, the results of "thought transferring" and "thought mirroring" seem, if not identical, at least quite similar. Telepathic super sensitivities can easily be thought of as a superpower, in that thoughts of others are not exactly comprised of any identifiable physicality – and hence are not sensed by the usual physical five.

At this point, it would be de rigueur to provide reference sources that attest to the actual scientific existence of mirror neurons. But by now there many of such sources

available in the Internet under the subject of mirror neurons. Rather than list them here, interested readers are now referred to that greater electronic source.

However, one such source is pointed up here, principally because it contains a long list of references. So, See: Gallese, Vittorio, "Action, goals, and their role in intersubjectivity: from mirror neurons to the 'shared manifold' hypothesis" (gallese@ipruniv.cce.unipr.it).

*

Before the recent discovery of mirror neurons in the brain, it was scientifically thought, in crass materialistic terms, that telepathy could not exist because there was no physical explanation for it. So, the discovery came not only as quite a surprise, but also engendered a number of ancillary questions.

One such question (not yet very openly being discussed, but nonetheless quietly circulating here and there) consists of the following wonderment:

WELL, if telepathic neurons exist, do similar kinds of them also exist for, say, remote viewing, for various forms of clairvoyance, for various kinds of intuitions, for premonition-sensing of future events, and etc?

Since it is generally realized that motor cortex functions and responses CAN be trained, well, you see, this wonderment is now beginning to represent a VERY seriously sensitive one for any number of reasons.

*

Because of the recent discovery of mirror neurons in the premotor cortex of the brain and elsewhere in the biobody, interest has been stimulated behind the public scenes as to whether some kind of training might be possible so as to enhance and achieve higher performance efficiency of their functions.

This developmental interest is probably not so much inspired by the mere existence of such neurons, but more by the

possibility that if "we don't try to develop them, others are sure to do so." Right?

So, you see, telepathy under any other name IS here to stay – if not in the general public per se, but certainly in the worldwide espionage games. Ironic, isn't it, that a cutting edge of science itself should discover the physical existence of little gray cells that substantiate the actual existence of something on which science itself expended much debunking.

*

Now, it must be pointed out that theoretical enhancing of mirror neuron efficiency begs the question of whether ANY super sensitivity can be enhanced. The only way we can judge this is by the actual substantiated RESULTS of such enhancement.

ENHANCEMENT, by the way, is defined as: "to raise; to make greater; to heighten; to intensify."

NOTE: As this document was in preparation, in its Science Times section of Tuesday, January 10, 2006, the very venerable NEW YORK TIMES featured a lengthy article entitled "Cells That Read Minds." The lead observation: "Scientists plumb the secrets of mirror neurons, which allow the brain to perform its highest tasks – learning, imitating, empathizing. One mystery remains: What makes them so smart?"

The "telepathic" issue was not enlarged upon all that much, but just about everyone realizes what "Cells that can read minds" means.

5. CAN EFFICIENT SUPER SENSITIVITY FUNCTIONING ACTUALLY EXIST?

ALTHOUGH they portend coming Situations quite different from modernist ones, the scientific discoveries of various kinds of non-locality-quantum Stuffs that interpenetrate our local Matter realities probably, at first sight anyway, don't yet mean that much to us who everyday struggle amongst the local Matter vicissitudes involved.

However, the discovery of "cells that read minds" is probably a quite different Situation - because such "cells" are part

and parcel of the vicissitudes of our local, everyday, Matter realities – in that the deciphering of another's hidden intentions and motives is now scientifically possible or at least theoretically feasible.

In other words, an important shift has suddenly taken place with respect to how super sensitivities as a whole (and telepathy in particular) are viewed. In the modernist past, the super sensitivities were viewed, at best, as non-normal psychological phenomena for which there was thought to be no material explanation.

Now that "cells that read minds" have been discovered in the brain, the apparent lack of material explanation for telepathy has been filled in - rather ironically it seems, because the greatest modernist opponents of telepathy were the modernist sciences themselves.

One possible factor about all of this seems so far to have escaped what passes for frequently changing scientific realizations – in that cells that can read minds might have the capacity to "read" a lot more than just minds.

*

That parapsychologists in the past have gotten up words and terms in an attempt to differently categorize what appeared, to them, to be various kinds of super sensitive phenomena is no sign that the actual workings of super sensitivities MUST correspond to them.

For example, in the modern cultural West, a number of words and terms have conceptually evolved that supposedly identify this or that type of super sensitivity – such as telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, premonition, sixth sense, second sight, intuition, etc., as well as remote viewing, a term that this author helped to coin in 1971.

Such words and terms are useful at a superficial level, but they don't at all provide cognitive access to the deeper particulars of the functioning processes involved.

In terms of possible training of those deeper processes, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that if something

is going to be trained, one does not get very far by trying to train any superficial concept of it.

One rather has to go to work and try to identify whatever deeper processes are involved, processes that are amenable to training via cognitive training, development, strengthening, and enhancement of them.

So, even if the terminological categorizing might serve some purpose in parapsychology labs experimenting within objective empirical methods, if one takes time to observe super sensitivity functioning in real life situations, an entirely different picture tends to emerge.

*

The question that emerges from the brief discussion above has to do with where, in real life, can one actually witness super sensitivities in efficient activity.

One of the definitions of EFFICIENT is given as "productive without waste." One of the synonyms is EFFECTIVE, defined as "The quality of being efficient; producing a decided, or desired effect or result."

Two further observations might be appended to these real-life definitions: (1) if super sensitivities do not produce information that is usable, practical, or verifiable, then there is little reason to consider them as much of anything; and (2) many may actually experience active super sensitivities, but produce distorted information down to and including gobbledygook that might be fascinating in terms of entertainment, but having little merit beyond that.

In this particular contest, it might be observed that super sensitivities turn into super POWERS only if they more so rather than less so demonstrate useful, organized, efficiency.

*

So, where do we find demonstrations of efficient super sensitivities? During the last hundred or so years, there seems to be only one social real-life context within which efficient super sensitivities have achieved a modicum of

social tolerance and reality.

This is the area now familiarly known as "psychic detectives" who help solve crimes when police detectives find themselves either between a rock and a hard place or up against a clueless brick wall.

Professional police detectives, working toward building an airtight case must of course totally depend on accumulating logic-reason evidence that will stand up in logic-reason courts of law.

As is well known, although they usually won't admit it, many police detectives themselves are in possession of modicums of intuition or gut-feelings. But even so, they occasionally encounter clueless brick wall situations, after which they are up against whatever they ARE up against, such as crimes not solvable by logic-reason-detecting alone.

In general, any super sensitive sleuth worth their own water is expected to "see" through clueless brick walls and provide informational clues not apparent via mere logic-reason contexts, but which COULD become apparent if mere logic-reason knew where and how to look and test for them.

About the only thing a super sensitive sleuth can do is to provide information that, if ultimately proven efficient, can help resolve clueless situations.

There is, of course, a lengthy history of failure along these lines, but there is no real need to throw the baby out with the bath water – because the point here is that the baby does exist.

As this essay is being constructed, there are several quite remarkable contemporary super sensitive sleuths here and there, and which some few really stressed cops are no longer too reticent to consult. (If interested in names of these contemporary super sensitive sleuths, do consult the Internet.)

However, in the general contexts of this essay, there are a number of reasons to review two deceased super sensitive sleuths.

Both of these are of Dutch fame. Both were assiduously investigated by detractors and European parapsychologists – and, without much help by the investigators, both trained themselves well enough to efficiently deploy their remarkable super sensitivities.

*

Gerard Croiset (1909-1980), born in Enschede, Netherlands, was plagued as a child with all sorts of confusing super sensitivities. As he grew up, he somehow managed to train himself and thus achieved some kind of efficient, heightened, volitional control over them.

At a rather early point in his life, he began working unobtrusively with the Chief Justice of Leeuwarden and with the Chief Justice of Haarlem, in tracing the activities of criminals or missing persons, thereby helping to solve many crimes via different aspects of his super sensitivities, thereafter becoming internationally known as a "super sleuth."

Croiset's super-sensitivities were intensively investigated by leading European and some American parapsychologists who established that the sensitivities were multiple and included various extraordinary forms of clairvoyance, telepathy, pre- and post-cognition, the "sixth sense," and psychometry roughly defined as "using extrasensory perception of a physical object to gain information about events or people once associated with it."

His "crimebusting" was utilized in close collaboration with police departments in many European nations and even in the USA. Although some failures occurred, his overall verified success rate remained extremely high.

Since his remarkable sensitivities were present while very young, it has everywhere been assumed he was especially naturally born with them.

This assumption fitted with the then fashionable idea that certain specimens of our species are, via some special genetic combination, naturally born with such sensitivities, while

all the rest are not – i.e., unless you are naturally born with them you will never have them. (This point of view will be dissected ahead.)

(Those interested in Croiset might avail themselves of his biography, CROISET: THE CLAIRVOYANT (1964) by Jack Harrison Pollack.)

*

However, the "naturally-born" hypothesis underwent stress just as Gerard Croiset's naturally-born fame was nearing its highest ascendancy.

Peter Hurkos (1911-1988) was also born in The Netherlands, in Dordrecht, and early worked as a laborer and merchant seaman, later becoming a member of the Dutch underground after Holland was occupied near the beginning of World War II. During this period, he didn't have a clue about any kind of super-sensitivity.

However, in 1941, at the age of 30, while painting a house he fell thirty-six feet from a ladder and landed right on his head.

After more or less recovering from his injuries, he found himself in sudden possession of super sensitivities enabling him "to obtain information about people and objects" in telepathic and psychometric ways.

He thereafter underwent a period during which he had to work out various confusions, and was finally able to bring at least some of his new sensitivities under heightened voluntary control. About this same time period, he was captured by the Gestapo and imprisoned in Buchenwald, Germany where he remained in hard labor until that camp was liberated by U.S. and Canadian troops in 1945. So he had plenty of time to test and train his newly found super sensitivities,

Regaining his freedom, his increasing super sensitivities were too distracting for him to follow a normal occupation. So he took to appearing on the stage to demonstrate his newly self-discovered sensitivities, more or less obtaining the reputation of a mere trickster. But he

also began trying to help police in several countries solve many cases of murder, theft, and missing persons.

His verified success rates were slightly less than those of Croiset, but in any event Holland found itself possessed of TWO internationally known "super-sleuths" during the same time period of its history.

(For those interested, Hurkos wrote his own autobiography, entitled PSYCHIC: THE STORY OF PETER HURKOS (1962).)

*

The foregoing brief sketches of Croiset and Hurkos are but two examples of many that are available.

The first reason for reprising these two sketches is to focus discussion of the long-standing assumption that one won't have such sensitivities unless one is born with them - end of story.

Within the contexts of this assumption, Croiset WAS born with them, since the super sensitivities were already naturally blipping on his radar as a child.

It could therefore be concluded that Croiset was especially naturally hardwired and thus equipped with them at birth.

In the case of Hurkos, however, the super sensitivities did not begin blipping on his radar until after he quite dramatically fell on his head and knocked himself out.

Apologists for the "naturally-born" hypothesis thus explain that Hurkos was also naturally innately hardwired for such sensitivities, but didn't know it, because they had not turned on earlier in his life.

If such WAS the case, then who is to know whom is similarly innately hardwired, but doesn't know it? Most of us, perhaps?

YES? From this, it could be deduced, hypothetically anyway, that many, most, or all are hardwired for super sensitive capacities but don't know it.

*

To get into the second reason mentioned earlier, the term PREMONITION is defined as "a warning presentiment or anticipation of a forthcoming, usually dangerous event without rational or logical conscious perception or reasons for it."

One doesn't need to be a Croiset or Hurkos type to experience premonitions, because such have been experienced by "ordinary" individuals in all times, societies, and cultures, backwaters, battlefields, nature, streets, homes, etc. – and, it might be added, experienced in ways that the experiencers themselves cannot account for.

*

The efficiency value of any super sensitivity can be determined, only or mostly, by its practical results – and the practical results of premonitions, when they are heeded, are obvious.

For every ten famous specimens of the Croiset or Hurkos types, thousands or more of no particular fame spontaneously experience premonitions, this somewhat indicating the innate hardwiring for premonition sensitivity is far more indigenous to our species than heretofore acknowledged.

As already mentioned, PREMONITION is defined as "anticipation of an event without conscious reason; forewarning."

It is rather safe to say that premonitions of some kind occur, perhaps only infrequently, to just about everyone, and there is a vast anecdotal literature describing many such events, most of which are fascinating.

When a premonition occurs "without conscious reason," the implication is that somewhere in one's systems exists "something" that is obviously conscious of whatever is involved in the premonition.

Thus, premonitions are usually attributed to some perceptual aspect of the "subconscious" – which seems somehow to be aware

of something that is going to happen in the immediate ordistant future that "conscious reason" is not foreseeing.

In this sense, it seems possible to suggest that the subconscious is equipped with innate hardwiring sufficiently enough to achieve such perceptions, whereas the hardwiring, if any, of conscious reason seems rather unequipped to do so.

Indeed, in at least some few specimens of our species, conscious reason seems singularly inadequate with respect to playing with a full deck of reasoning attributes.

*

There also exists a quite large, often dramatic and poignant, anecdotal literature having to do with spontaneous cases of mother-child telepathy during which mothers "sense" their child is in distress or danger, even if the child is at a great distance away.

Fathers sometimes experience such events. But mothers seem in particular to be hardwired along these lines, and in their cases it seems that the barrier between sub-conscious and conscious perceptions is very permeable indeed.

In any event, they spontaneously and easily abandon their "conscious reason," and, if at all possible, make impulsive haste to aid and abet their children.

This particular literature is well worth reading, especially now that innately hardwired mirror (telepathic) neurons have been discovered actually to exist.

*

So, what have spontaneous premonitions and telepathic linkages have to do with teaching, learning, and training any of the super sensitivities?

To try to get into THIS, it is necessary to review the definitions of SPONTANEOUS, which, in its most important nuances, is altogether defined as "involuntarily originating, being produced, or becoming activated without conscious deliberation, without apparent external influence, force,

cause, or treatment."

The term has four synonyms: INSTINCTIVE, IMPULSIVE, AUTOMATIC, MECHANICAL,

Everyone has, of course, heard of INSTINCT, but might not be too familiar with the term's formal definitions: "A natural [innate] aptitude, impulse, or capacity; a complex and specific response by an organism to environmental stimuli that is hereditary and unalterable, does not involve reason, and has as its goal the removal of somatic tension."

The "goal" part referred to in this definition might more specifically be defined as "the preservation of the organism," in that threat of non-preservation probably would result in all kinds of "tension" in addition to somatic examples of it.

IMPULSE is principally defined as "a wave of excitation transmitted to the tissues and, especially, nerve fibers and muscles that results in physiological activity; a sudden spontaneous inclination or incitement to some usually unpremeditated action."

What is not mentioned in definitions of this term is that such "excitation and spontaneity" is largely the function of the motor and pre-motor cortexes. Mull this over as we proceed.

With respect to the synonym AUTOMATIC, we will examine the definition of AUTONOMIC NERVOUS SYSTEM, given as: "the part of the vertebrate nervous system that supplies with nerves (innervates) the smooth and cardiac muscle and glandular tissues and governs involuntary action."

In this sense, the innervating autonomic nervous system is automatic, and, as well, can be referred to as a MECHANISM – defined as "a process or technique for achieving a result or goal."

*

If spontaneous super sensitivities don't arise because of or out of the perceptual conscious reason, then there are two systems

There has to be another perceptual system because of, and out of,

which the super sensitivities spontaneously arise and in ways that conscious reason neither perceives nor can account for.

So the autonomic nervous system does its own things – sometimes much to the alarm of whatever is passing for reason.

All of this having been said, it is now time to pose a very seminal question: Can the autonomic nervous system be trained – that same system that sometimes spontaneously produces hints and clues of naturally hardwired super sensitivities.

6. THE SITUATION OF WHETHER SUPER SENSITIVITY RUDIMENTS ARE INNATE IN THE HUMAN SPECIES?

SO! We have modicums of highly efficient super sensitive sleuths who have actually helped resolve crimes, and whose successes are increasingly being substantiated by law officials, and some examples of which are increasingly being documented on TV.

We also have voluminous spontaneous incidents of efficient and amazing premonitions, mostly documented after the fact, because few pay attention to premonitions until after they have been fulfilled. (The best source on this so far is the 1971 book PREMONITIONS: A LEAP INTO THE FUTURE, by Herbert B. Greenhouse.)

We also have a large incidence of transient, spontaneous super sensitivity events erupting in the populations in general.

Last, but not least, we also have animal superpowers that of late are acquiring not only popular, but also scientific attention. (See, for example, the article entitled "Animal Superpowers" in the December 24, 2005 – January 6, 2006 issue of NEW SCIENTIST.) Just about everyone knows that animals sense-perceive energies and stuff that humans usually don't unless they have a modicum of clairvoyance. In the case of animal superpowers, scientists are now busy trying to locate the relevant genetic hardwiring. They will eventually (if

they haven't already) get around to trying to locate such hardwiring in US, in THEMSELVES, etc.

*

Developing, enhancing, training something presupposes that the something already exists in rudimentary form.

RUDIMENT is defined as "raw, beginning; a beginning raw fundamental principle or element that can be enhanced, developed, or trained into a skill."

Before it became possible to map the entire genome (i.e., inherent-innate genetic structure) of a species, the existence of rudiments had to be guessed at, or tested by observation and experience.

During the last twenty or so years, it has become possible to identify the existence of such rudiments at the genetic level, even though they may have not been activated, turned on, energized, awakened, and thenceforth developed into some kind of lesser or greater skill-like efficiency.

It is also now understood quite well in the genetic research fields that Genetic Systems are usually quite busy turning off and turning on this or that rudiment, although the Why of this remains something of a mystery.

It is also somewhat well known that genetic systems INNATELY possess rudiments that are not used, but which anyway are passed along through their progeny.

Some now speculate that the human species has an overabundance of rudiments that are not used. Hence, these are not awakened, energized, developed, etc., but are anyway downloaded into successive generations.

So we have now tripped across that word INNATE – a depth diving term that goes hand-in-hand with the essential existence of raw rudiments.

*

The term INNATE is defined as "naturally existing in or

belonging to an individual from birth; inherent within; belonging to the essential nature of something."

These are perfectly good definitions. But before going on it should be pointed up that the term INNATE seems somewhat to have gone out of fashion, and is being replaced by the concept of HARDWIRED.

This is now a concept associated with computers whose hard drive capacities are, well, hardwired to perform those functions they do or can do – and if they are not hardwired, then they cannot perform such functions.

Bending this analogy a little, it could be said that a computer's hardwiring exists in and belongs to it from birth; its hardwiring is inherent within it, and belongs to the computer's essential nature.

However, computers operate on electricity, and so somewhere is a switch which, in its "on" position, is hardwired to permit the flow of the necessary "juice," or, in its "off" position, cuts the flow.

When a computer is switched off, its hardwired capacities are still inherent within its designed essential nature, and will perform those inherent functions when the contraption is again turned on and juiced up.

It could be said, roughly speaking anyway, that in its juiced-up state, the computer is once more "sensitive" to its inherently designed capacities AND the designed programs inserted into them.

It takes just one little glitch in all of this – well, everyone knows what THAT means.

*

SENSITIVE is defined as "subject to excitations by external agents; highly responsive or susceptible; capable of sensing and indicating gross and minute differences; also, the capacity of an organism to respond to stimulation by external and internal agents or sources."

As most realize, the human species and all of its individual specimens possess and experience many different kinds of sensitivities, so many in fact that no real attempt has ever been undertaken to itemize them.

These copious sensitivities have been thought of as consisting of two principal categories – physical sensitivities, and super-sensitivity capacities, designated here as such, in that they transcend the capacity limits of the physical sensitivities, and which, in some demonstrated cases, seem to have no really discernable limits at all.

*

It is generally accepted that the human organism is innately. i.e., "naturally," hardwired with respect to the physical sensitivities, largely because of their broadly shared functions in all specimens of our species.

But demonstrated emergences of this or that super sensitivity have always been thought of as erratic among individuals, and, as such, do not demonstrate broadly shared hardwired species functions.

So the super sensitivities have not been considered as innately hardwired in anyone, much less throughout the entire species.

Nevertheless, the super sensitivities have been "accounted for" in numerous ways, the principal one consisting of the erroneous idea that certain human specimens are somehow specially born with them, while the majority of those born are somehow deficit of them.

This idea does not really coincide with the widespread fluctuating manifestations of the super sensitivities, even though it seems "logical" enough – at least to those who are not too familiar with the actual history of what is involved.

*

The recently discovered existence of mirror (telepathic) neurons in premotor cortices implies they are innate, and thus have rudimentary potentials whether they are cognitively

activated or not – potentials having to do with discerning motives and intentions of others.

This must come as quite a shock to our present civilization in which people resent having their conversations overheard, or their telephones tapped. How does one get a search warrant with respect to mirror neuron tapping of another's motives and intentions - a warrant forbidding the use of one's own mirror neurons. Can you imagine?

In any event, mirror neurons genetically exist, and so it must be assumed they are super sensitive rudiments innate and universal to our species, and in all of its specimens whether cognitively inactive, or spontaneously active in the absence of conscious understanding of what's happening and why.

Spontaneous activity of various super sensitivities, or the existence of such, within our species has been reported perhaps from Day One. So even if they only occasionally activate does not at all mean that their rudiments don't permanently exist in some inactive form.

For extensive lists of what these innate "universals" are, do consult the Internet, and/or especially the entry for a List, compiled by Donald E. Brown, of "Human Universals" in THE MIT ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE COGNITIVE SCIENCES, Wilson & Keil, 1999. This List is also found as the Appendix of Steven Pinker's magnificent book entitled THE BLANK SLATE: THE MODERN DENIAL OF HUMAN NATURE (2002).

*

To remind, and hopefully for increasing clarity, the term UNIVERSAL is defined as "Including or covering a whole collectively or distributively without limit or exception; present or occurring everywhere; reference to everyone without exception in the class, category, or genus considered."

INNATE is again defined as "Inherent; existing in or belonging to an individual from birth, or inherent throughout a genus; originating naturally rather than from learned experience."

To sort out a possible confusion here, UNIVERSAL more or less

means that everyone DOES it; INNATE means that everyone HAS it whether they consciously know it or not, and if they don't innately have it then they can never do anything with it.

*

Now to momentarily return to the List of innate universals referred to above, it is therein pointed up that the innate items included in it consist primarily of "surface" universals of behavior and overt language noted by ethnographers, but that the List does not include "deeper universals of mental structure that are revealed by theory and experiments."

Are we therefore to think that the activities of our species consist only of "surface" universals that are unaccompanied by "deeper universals of mental structure."

Well, some of such deep-diving activities are quite well known and widely accepted – such as INSTINCT and premonitions, future-seeing episode phenomena, and INTUITIONS, none of which are included in the list.

Telepathy, the most socially hated super sensitivity, didn't make the List, either, and of course clairvoyance is at such a deep-diving depth that "mental structures" apparently need special depth-cognitive equipment that might enable even partial notice of that type of super sensitivity.

*

There are two grousing points being made here:
(1) Temporary intellectualisms come and go, and thus are characterized by impermanency;

(2) Even so, the innate capacities of instinct, intuitions, and etc., are interpreted THROUGH and BY such impermanent intellectualisms, many of which would rather that such capacities did not exist at all (for specific reasons that have earlier been discussed.)

There is also a third grousing point. As mentioned, super sensitivities spontaneously emerge all of the time among specimens of our species, this an historical FACT supported

by all sorts of unambiguous robust evidence – a FACT that many intellectualisms chose to ignore.

Explaining the HOW & WHY of things is, of course, a favorite preoccupation of various kinds of intellectualisms, and so if the how-why of something can't compatibly be explained within the reality boxes of given intellectualisms, then the "something" and its how-why is not thought of very favorably, its facts not withstanding.

*

So, are super sensitivities innate? If super sensitivities are innate in our species, then one has to consider why they manifest only occasionally and then mostly spontaneously.

There are numerous possible answers to this question, most of which rotate around either doubt about their innateness or denial of it altogether.

However, if the super sensitivities are innate, then historical evidence for them must exist in worldwide past cultures of lesser or greater antiquity.

Depth diving into past cultures of lesser or greater antiquity is a quite cumbersome activity, not as easy a matter as most historians make it sound.

As many have commented elsewhere, one of the difficulties involved is that historians usually only interpret past cultures via the assumed realities of their own times – and there is a general tendency to edit, distort, or omit past historical topics that are inconvenient to the contexts of their own principles, intellectualisms, and so forth.

But there is another difficulty, one seldom pointed up. If one takes the time to examine the English language, about 93 percent of it refers to external material objects, states, or facts, and so it is deplorably deficient in references of any other kind. Thus, states or facts that are not all that objective more or less have to be discussed within English that has a minimum of terms for them.

However, most languages of greater antiquity are at least

somewhat rich with concepts and terms that specifically refer to states and facts that are not based in gross material objectivity. For example and among others, Hawaiian Huna, early Chinese, Tibetan, and numerous Nordic and Amerindian ones, from which certain terms now and again leak into English usage.

Predominantly, however, these foreign references are quite hard to deeply incorporate – because modern English, in its overall philosophic-reality sense, does not itself possess relevant depth-contexts for them.

*

Since this essay focuses on possible training of super sensitivities, we would like to know if they have ever been identified as such in, let us say, antiquity, and if some kind of training has ever been associated with them.

Indeed, if rudiments of super sensitivities are innate and more or less universal, we would expect them to have been identified a long time ago. They have been, of course, since many languages formatted terms for them.

For reasons that will be self-explained ahead, this author has elected to discuss certain aspects of the Sanskrit language, a project he admits was, to say the least of it, quite challenging.

7. THE SITUATION OF WORDS, TERMS, CONCEPTS, AND THEORIES

BEFORE discussing Sanskrit materials, however, it is necessary to digress a bit into the Situation indicated just above. If we have a word for something, it is then thought of as identifying whatever the word refers to – after which we think we know what we are talking about.

If the words refer to objective things, such as things ranging from sub-quantum particles up to and including the visible matter cosmos, then such words are probably efficient enough for their purposes.

However, if the words refer to non-objective "things" having no exact or definite physicality, then their probable

efficiency tends to decrease, sometimes considerably so, although we still tend to think we know what we are talking about – because we HAVE words for what is involved.

Furthermore, words in this latter category are NOT actually based on objective things, but on intellectualizing concepts or theories which, in and of themselves, need words so as to be able to talk about them – as if we again know what we are talking about.

Concepts and theories are merely based on what is thought to be understood about whatever is involved. But such understandings can be quite wobbly, and they tend to come and go when new understandings emerge – and which might be replaced by other new understandings, ad infinitum.

*

Human experiencing of super sensitivities needs word-concepts in order to identify what has been experienced, and then to talk about such to others, hoping the others know what is being talked about.

In English, there are at least eighty-five or more words that refer to some kind of super sensitivity experiencing.

Such words, like all other words, have come into existence AFTER the fact of the experiencing, and the definitions of which have been contributed via intellectualizing concepts and theories based on whatever kind, type, or quality of understanding was at hand – all of this via intellects that might be slightly comatose in the first place.

*

This problematical situation doesn't stop with what has been discussed above – because intellects that are not too comatose sometimes seem to realize that non-objective kinds of experiencing do need, if not exact words, some kind of suitable words, even if slightly ambiguous ones.

Thus, in addition to ambiguous terms supposedly identifying this or that super sensitive experience, other ambiguous

terms such as "mind," "intelligence," "subconscious," "subjectivity," "the unconscious," "altered states," and even "Consciousness" itself (if and when that item is used in its largest "cosmic" scope).

*

So, here is a rough description of the Situation we end up with by considering the above brief discussions.

Super sensitivities are experienced.

AFTER the fact of being experienced, words are gotten up for them.

Concepts and theories are then generated that seem compatible with the words.

The concepts/theories hold water only as long as they do, and then new ones are originated, etc.

Since neither the super sensitivity experiences nor the resulting concepts/theories for them can be explained by depending on objective realities, they are perforce included in other concepts-plus-theories that likewise cannot be explained, as least in some total sense, in objective realities – such as subjectivity, the mind, the subconscious, altered states, etc.

These particular word items and their contexts are supposed, or posited, to exist. After which word items denoting experiencing NOT directly derived from objective contexts can be bundled into what is supposed or is posited to exist – for no other reason than having a basis for discussing them at in least quasi-objective ways.

As it more or less turns out, if the actual dynamics of super sensitivity experiencing cannot be explained via any relationship to objective experiencing, they also remain unexplained in the contexts of mind, subjectivity, the subconscious, altered states, etc. – as well as in the contexts of Consciousness which, itself, so far remains unexplained at least in the scientific sense.

*

So to briefly, and deliberately, to repeat:

Super sensitivity experiencing takes place if and when it does;

After the fact of the experiencing words are gotten up so as to be able to refer to the experiencing as such;

Since words are of little use if not accompanied by concept-definitions, these are then attached to the WORDS, but NOT to the experiencing itself.

The words are thus ONLY after-the-fact, superficial intellectualizing formats;

Whereas the experiencing takes place, at least in spontaneous super sensitivities events, before the intellectualizing words are gotten up, or before one can intellectually look them up in a dictionary.

It is appropriate here to mention that different languages have words for the same experiential phenomena, but in the other languages the definitions can differ quite a lot. When then transliterated into English words, the English definitions are utilized, but the English definitions may be far from the mark as expressed in the original other-language word.

Additionally, Sanskrit, for example, has certain terms for which there are no equivalent words, or concepts, in English. Over-energetic translators then search English for the next-best English term, but which almost nothing to do with the actual definitions of the Sanskrit one.

Got it?

*

THUS, if and when events come about that inspire interest in possible training of super sensitivities, WHAT is it that can be trained?

The intellectualizing words?

The intellectualized concept-definitions associated with them?

Intellectual variations of the concept-definitions (of which there have been many)?

The existing sum of intellectually accumulated knowledge about the super sensitivities? (Well, knowledge is not accumulated in the absence of words-plus-concept-definitions. If one does not comprehend this, let them try to accumulate knowledge without words to speak-tell or read-learn about what the knowledge consists of. And, by the way, the English and Western existing sum of accumulated knowledge about the super sensitivities is not very big to begin with, much less having achieved high degrees of refinement.)

The suggested bottom line here has to do with what comes first – in respect of which it could be posited that experiencing comes first, followed by intellectualizing word-concept-knowledge that may or not activate or even reinforce the experiencing.

*

It could be obvious by now that nothing can be trained in the absence of some kind of potential activity for it – activity that results in experiencing of the activity.

Since all sort of spontaneous super sensitivity events do innately occur throughout the human species (even to those many intellectually ill-prepared for them), it should be supposed that human sensing systems, known or unknown, are equipped with the necessary rudiments, rudiments that may or may not have become activated.

Has THIS situation been noticed before? Yes, it has.

8. THE SITUATION OF THE TWO GURU FUNCTIONS

THE LANGUAGE of modern science excludes terms that refer to super sensitivities, as does the "language" of mathematics that so far has not incorporated mathematical probabilities

for them.

But outside of these two exceptions, most other human languages (including English per se and some thousands of others) do incorporate some terms for and concepts about super sensitivities.

After all, words are needed for what peoples experience and become aware of – this somewhat based on the simple fact that if there is no experience-awareness of something, then no words are needed for it.

It is difficult to search through languages because the terms in question usually have been garbled via translation or transliteration into English – and sometimes, as in the case of Huna and American Indian languages, deliberately mistranslated or not translated at all.

Additionally, English often altogether lacks modern equivalents for contexts specified in other more ancient languages, so even transliteration into English is usually only approximate at best.

*

To help get into what follows, Sanskrit is said to belong to the Indic group of the Indo-Iranian subfamily of the Indo-European family of languages. Sanskrit is known to have been in existence at about 1500 B.C., most certainly with much earlier antecedents. Just what these antecedents actually were seems to be a matter of debate – with the possibility that no one really knows for sure where that Sanskrit was formatted, and when it was.

However, by about 1500 B.C. and later, Sanskrit seems especially used, in its classical form, as both a liturgical and as a standard court language, and therefore might have been inaccessible to subservient masses.

Sanskrit is commonly acknowledged by scholars to be "characterized by elegant and amazing perceptiveness." It is very rich with terms for states of Consciousness and for super sensitivities over and above its "gross material" words.

For reference, this author has largely depended on: (1) the second edition (1976) of Judith M. Tyberg's book THE LANGUAGE OF THE GODS: SANSKRIT KEYS TO INDIA'S WISDOM; (2) Arthur Anthony MacDonell's A PRACTICAL SANSKRIT DICTIONARY (2001); (3) discussion of Sanskrit terms with Sanskrit-fluent owners and employees of this author's local magazine and tobacco shop; and (4) various Internet Sanskrit resources. (Please note that in the following examinations of certain Sanskrit terms, we will march slowly and gently as possible.)

*

In our modern English, TEACHER is simply defined as "one that teaches; especially, one whose occupation is to instruct."

So far, so good, right? Well, there is a sometimes not so subtle complication involved having to do with what IS and IS NOT to be taught – in that most social groupings, large or small, have their own centralizing ideas of what is and is not to be taught-learned.

There are three general and quite identifiable results of this:
(1) Teachers transfer to their students only the information they are supposed to, while learners receive that information the best they can;
(2) Information that conflicts with what is taught and learned is discouraged and not taught;
(3) Innate potential capacities that might conflict with what is to be taught-learned are likewise discouraged, not taught, and not developed into actuality.

The principal result of (3) above is that no one really knows what or how many innate capacities actually dwell within the potentials of our species, such as hardwired capacities that exist in this or that state of latency with no real effort to trigger or develop them into actuality.

Furthermore, the modernist Western concept of teach-learn attempts to be based on reason, logic, facts, and supposed facts. This mix is usually all bound into what is assumed, at any given time, to be a seamless "educational" package of information, that, in most cases conforms to whatever is serving as social principles and standards.

*

In modern English, the Sanskrit term GURU is defined as "a venerable teacher, usually a personal religious teacher and spiritual guide." Thus, in English a Guru is basically thought of as a teacher.

However, in her book discussing various aspects of Sanskrit, Judith M. Tyberg does effort a larger description of GURU, to wit:

"One who has the capacity to pass on his realizations to those who seek him for wisdom." Also: "There may be the outer Guru, or Guide, who removes ignorance by the radiant light of his divine wisdom; or the inner Guru or Self (Atman) who is the Guide working through the intuitive part of Man."

There are some subtle complexities in this description of GURU that may not be noticed all that easily.

For example, "removing ignorance" is not quite the same as replacing or curing it by absorbing information packages via the teach-learn process that occasionally might result in installing a bit more ignorance than actual learning.

In any event, in Sanskrit, there are at least two different Guru functions, the first of which is to transfer information and realizations to students, but the second of which is to invoke wisdom by working through the intuitive part of Man.

Although this "invoke" part doesn't appear in Tyberg's descriptions of Guru, a little depth diving into the origin of the term is helpful.

The Sanskrit root word upon which GURU is formatted is GRI meaning "to invoke, to praise."

Now, don't just skate across this "to invoke" part, in that INVOKE is, in most languages, including English, principally defined as "to call forth."

Please try to bear in mind that calling forth something is somewhat different from the sometimes weary and unfruitful process of merely transferring an information package to a

student-learner.

So, in this sense, the second basic guru-function seems to consist of calling forth something in the student-learner – i.e., awakening, unfolding, and activating it, etc.

In this sense, it is possible to think that if something does not exist in the student-learner, it cannot be called forth.

If such exists, but is not somehow called forth, then it continues to exist in some kind of NOT-called-forth state or condition.

Here, then, is a significant distinction between (1) what seems to be the more profound guru-function, and (2) the Western modern teacher who merely transfers information packages, the learning of which, if such does take place, might not call forth much of anything else.

*

One of the specified guru-functions is "to remove ignorance."

In English, the term IGNORANCE is more defined by its synonyms than by its actual definition – synonyms such as ILLITERATE, UNLETTERED, UNTUTORED, UNLEARNED, all of these terms referring to "not having knowledge" – i.e., destitute of the sorts of intellectualized knowledge that can be transferred from teacher to learner.

However, the actual, and major, definition of IGNORANCE is simply given as "unawareness."

So. With respect to the Guru-functions, "removing ignorance" could refer to "removing unawareness" – this being a function that is obviously achieved, and probably only achieved, by INCREASING awareness by awakening and activating innate hardwiring latently existing in the student.

*

Judith Tyberg indicates that a Guru "removes ignorance by the radiant light of his divine wisdom."

The DIVINE part of this concept remains problematical – until

one consults a competent dictionary, wherein it can be found that the first definition is given as "to discover by intuition" – i.e., by calling forth, invoking, or activating the intuition in students.

Thus, Tyberg's effort to describe GURU could be somewhat rephrased as: One who has the capacity to pass on his intuitive realizations to those who seek him for guided intuitive awakening toward achieving wisdom.

To repeat: There may be the outer Guru that merely teaches information packages; or the inner Guru-Guide who removes unawareness via the radiant light of his intuitive wisdom by working through or with the intuitive part of Man, i.e., of human specimens in general.

This author has not been able to discover exactly how this is achieved – except to think that the "intuitive part" of individuals of our species is innately be hardwired but often unactivated – but which but can be lit up, so to speak, by the Guru-Guide who removes unawareness of such hardwiring. Got it?

In the above sketch, there are good grounds for thinking that "radiant light" might be replaced by "radiant energies" of some kind – such as, perhaps, telepathic osmosis, telepathic transfers of intuitive information, etc., etc.

In English, two of the first definitions of LIGHT are given as "something that makes vision possible; also inner light."

Of course, something depends on what is meant by "vision," and what "inner light" might actually consist of, especially if such "radiates."

*

Just ahead, we will have to begin depth-diving into a few other complex Sanskrit terms, principally to establish that some of the super sensitivities we have words for today actually had identifiable and better developed Sanskrit concepts in the distant past.

This implies that such super sensitivities were with our

species during Sanskrit times, and probably much earlier.

But first, there is the matter of a particular term that needs a little sorting out so as to help return us to its original and literal definition in the Sanskrit language.

The nature and contexts of the Sanskrit term YOGA are much discussed and debated within our modernist cultures. But nevertheless in English dictionaries the principal definitions are given as:
(1) A Hindu theistic philosophy teaching the suppression of all activity of body, mind, and will in order that self may realize its distinction from them and attain liberation; and
(2) A system of exercises for attaining bodily or mental control and well-being.

This author won't comment on these two somewhat decorated definitions, except to note that the term ATTAIN might be remembered, and that definitions (2) and (1) seem diametric opposites.

In any event, it seems that the literal definition of YOGA in Sanskrit basically refers to "skill in action," which seems quite close to one of the important nuances of our English term TRAINING – one of it's major definition being given as "to make prepared for a test of skill."

As will be discussed ahead, "a test of skill," if positively demonstrated, equates to an ATTAINMENT, a term referring to whatever is "come or arrived at by motion, growth, or effort."

9. SOME SANSKRIT TERMS FOR SUPER SENSITIVITIES, i.e., THE "SIDDHIS"

SIDDHI is sometimes translated into English as referring to "Occult powers." But this translation is more or less reckless because the term "occult" has been much demonized, often not in very good taste or style, and with a seeming lack of higher cognitive intellect.

So it is necessary to remind that OCCULT is originally taken into English from the Latin OCCULTARE meaning "The state of being hidden from view or lost to notice; hidden or concealed from sight," i.e., hidden, or outside the scope and limits

of the five physical senses, and outside the limits of objective logic.

Please especially notice the "lost to notice" part of these definitions.

*

Before going on, it is the better part of valor to do a little depth diving into two particular English words – ATTAIN and ATTAINMENT.

ATTAIN – "Achieve, accomplish; to come or arrive at by motion, growth, or effort."

ATTAINMENT – "The act of attaining; the condition of being attained; something attained; accomplishment."

The basic definition of the Sanskrit root word SIDH is "attain," while that of SIDDHI is "attainment" via processes almost exactly in the sense of the above English definitions, i.e., by motion, growth, or effort, accompanied, of course, by obviously specializing forms of learning and TRAINING.

However, there are two special stipulations involved here: That SIDDHI attainments refer (1) to attaining cognitive access to substantive qualities outside of, or beyond, the scope and limits of the five physical senses; and also (2) outside of, or beyond, objective material conditions and activities themselves.

*

One's "mental structures" might quiver at this prospect. So it is worth reminding that our depth diving efforts here are simply limited to discovering if any given ancient language did possess words and terms at least somewhat equivalent to our modern English terms denoting various types of super sensitivities.

This is an effort to establish that such super sensitivities have an antiquity that is suggestive of their being innate and present in our species, and therefore must be based in some kind of long-existing innate capacities.

*

The principle extant source describing the Siddhis is The YOGA SUTRAS OF PATANGALI, a volume that dates back to about the second century B.C. It is generally agreed that Patangali did not originate the Sutras, but rather compiled and systematized them from different sources, some of which might have been 5,000 years old or more.

SUTRA literally means "thread." But the Sanskrit connotation is accepted as referring to something like the slimmest or barest line of meaning or thought which a Guru can expand upon so as to awaken or stimulate, well, let's just put it, innate states or planes of consciousness that are in need of awakening and recovery.

Patangali's Sutras are 195 in number, divided into numerous sections that address different topics of yogic growth and development, but he devotes a large fifty-four Sutras to the Siddhis alone – this suggesting that he attached substantial importance to them.

The Sutras have been translated into English many times, but there is that small matter earlier referred to – that English is mostly focused on objective material contexts and is therefore deficient in concepts relevant to inner and non-physical planes of consciousness and their associated realities.

Thus, the various translations do differ, and perhaps the best thing is to study and compare several of them.

*

Since this translation problem does exist, there is long-standing difficulty in determining how many Siddhis Patangali is enumerating.

In her book already referred to, Judith Tyberg lists only eight of them. For our purposes in this essay, we will briefly depth-dive only four or five because we have approximate English terms and concepts for them.

TRIKALA-JNANI SIDDHI. The least complicated way of defining this Siddhi is given as "Attainment of knowledge-knowing of past, present, and future via diving deeply into an object, phenomenon, or idea." This Attainment is achieved by activating "deeper mental structures" rather than depending only on intellectual thinking resulting from reason, logic, and whatever is passing as rational.

Taken literally, TRI = three; KALA = escaping or transcending time; JNANI = knowledge-information thus achieved by doing so.

This Siddhi is achieved by the practices of:

DHARANA = concentration; the binding of deep conscious awareness to one place, object, or idea until all aspects are revealed.

DHYANA = a type of (non-objective?) meditation or contemplation.

SAMADHI = balanced state; to hold together completely; being one with - so as to attain unity of deep perceptions.

When these three tripartite "practices" are developed and combined together, the whole activates or attains a siddhi-like state or plane of direct inner perceiving (perceptual) consciousness referred to as SAMYAMA, which transcends the plane of consciousness directly focused on gross physical matter only.

So? Did you get all of that? If not, don't worry too much, because the whole of this Siddhi is much debated - not so much in its Sanskrit contexts, but with trying to translate those contexts into English which does not (yet) have similar concepts or equivalent terms.

*

Before moving robustly onward, in his book THE YOGA SUTRAS OF PATANGALI (2001 version), Sri Swami Satchidananda indicates that the modern science of physics has performed a type of SAMYAMA on Matter and its atoms by investigating deeper and deeper into their constituencies – and have thus

recently discovered that matter atoms are merely clusters of energies that are not completely or exactly material in their nature.

Some of these new discoveries have been discussed earlier, and will again be referred to ahead.

*

In any event, the Trikala-Jnani Siddhi deals with perceiving past, present, and future, this a Siddhi attained by activating deep-diving perceptions the potentials that obviously exist - otherwise they could neither be deep-dived into nor activated.

So it seems that the existence of such time transcending potentials and associated super sensitivities had already been identified some three to five thousand plus years ago - and were taken seriously enough in those ancient times to inspire a rather elegant and extraordinary research and developmental training of them.

But there is one question that goes unmentioned in Sanskrit texts having to do with how and why such deep diving perceptions were noticed in the first place.

Well, if it is possible to think that such deep-diving stuff is innate in our species, it is then possible to think that such stuff could spontaneously activate under certain circumstances – and do so just about everywhere in all cultures.

And that could explain why most languages (except that of modern scientism) develop words that identify them.

*

English contains one particular unscientific word that is assigned to a particular type of spontaneous manifestation that is completely in keeping with the Siddhi discussed above.

PREMONITION first appears in English at about 1456, defined as "The action of premonishing or forewarning; a forewarning of subsequent events; a forewarning."

During the later 1800s, however, a new definition was added: "Anticipation of an event without conscious reason."

Now, "anticipation without conscious reason" must occur spontaneously via ways and means that conscious reason alone cannot, or usually does not, have ways and means of accounting for.

If and when a premonition is "fulfilled," so to speak, and since it cannot be attributed to "conscious reason," then the implication is that deeper perceptual structures are somehow aware of what is being spontaneously forewarned against – while, it MUST be emphasized, conscious reason is out to lunch, especially if conscious reason supposes that a given present time cannot be transcended in past or future way.

Other English terms associated with premonition are INSTINCT and INTUITION that also spontaneously transcend the limited scopes of conscious reason.

So, hypothetically speaking at least, spontaneous premonitions, instincts, and intuitions are possible innate beginnings of Siddhi development accompanied by some kinds of training – and such is reported everywhere and throughout all time. So, as is now the discovered case with mirror telepathic neurons, deep hardwiring equipment must be latently universal, innate, or indwelling within our species.

*

Sutra 3.37 identifies a composite or collective kind of Siddhi, the activities of which awaken via Samyama, i.e., "spontaneous intuition" that functions without conscious reasoning.

In English, this Siddhi collective is expressed as "superphysical hearing, higher touch, seeing, higher tasting, and higher smelling," also collectively now referred to in English as Extra Sensory Perception (ESP).

In English, these superphysical activities are referred to as clairaudience, psychometry of various kinds, clairvoyance, and second sight or the sixth sense, while higher taste and

higher smelling have no English references.

Sutra 3.49 elaborates a little more about this by indicating that applying Samyama (spontaneous intuition) to the general power and qualities of perception, the intuitional senses actively re-attain to the ability to swiftly function without the aid of the physical sense organs.

So, what we refer to as ESP had achieved specific Sanskrit terms at least three to five thousands years ago, but the organized discovery of which in the modernist West took place just a little as a hundred years ago.

The acronym ESP dates only from the 1930s, although spontaneous ESP-like events have long taken place in all cultures, sometimes explained, if at all, as some kind of innate INSTINCT – which, by the way, IS accepted as both innate and universal.

*

Sutra 3.26 refers to attaining to the Samyama intuitional super sensitive Siddhis whereby "knowledge of the subtle, of the hidden, and of remote distances is obtained."

Super sensitive perception of the subtle and the hidden are usually grouped together in English as clairvoyance, but the "remote" stuff began (in later 1870s English) began to be referred to as "traveling clairvoyance," and later, during the 1970s, as "remote viewing."

The Sanskrit term for "remote" is VIPRAKRISHTA.

*

In Section Three of Patangali's book, Sutra 19 is devoted to a particular type of Siddhi, various aspects of which are attained by Samyama:

The Sanskrit is given as PRATYAYASYA PARACITTA JNANAM. This more or less translates as "Knowledge of others' mental images is obtained."

PARACITTA = others' mental images;

JNANAM = knowledge (of).

The exact meaning of PRATYAYASYA seems a little difficult as expressed in English, since the term is generally translated as "By Samyama on the distinguishing signs of others' bodies."

It is difficult to sort this out, except to note that Samyama involves deep intuitive acquisition of knowledge independently of the usual five physical senses, while SIGNS of others' bodies can more or less be achieved by the five physical senses.

In this sense, one doesn't quite understand the connection between (1) intuitive Samyama and (2) signs of others' bodies. Thus, (1) and (2) seem contradictory – UNLESS some kind of telepathy is involved.

In English, SIGN is applied in two ways: (1) to any indication perceived by the physical senses or by reason; (2) to any signal that transmits or conveys information beyond the range of direct physical perception or recognition – and probably eluding "the reason" altogether.

The second definition here could be applied to telepathy - IF individuals are producing "signals" that transmit or convey information.

Samyama, as direct intuition transcending "the physical senses and (usually) the reason", would not be too much needed to identify signs, but would be needed with respect to signals of other's mental images and the contents of their deeper mental structures.

This, of course, presumes that mental images and deeper mental structures produce signals, or, shall it be said, vibrations that emanate whatever they do.

Now, there is a long history behind the phrase "I can just see what others are thinking" – this from physical body cues, or from an intuitional type of perception first identified during the late 1800s as THROUGHT TRANSFERENCE and later in the early 1900s as, yes, perhaps you already got it! TELEPATHY via interacting mirror neuron activity – the

remarkable SCIENTIFIC discovery discussed earlier.

*

There is MORE to be discussed about all of the above, but in order to connect up the Siddhis with TRAINING, it is now necessary to enlarge a tiny bit on the second of the two Guru functions also pointed up earlier.

In Patanjali's discussions of the Siddhis (and elsewhere in the Sanskrit literature), it is indicated that four conditions must be present (more or less, anyway) in order to activate the Siddhi Attainments.

Very briefly put, (1) there must be interest in activating them, then (2) the intuitive function of a Guru Guide is needed as a Guide, then (3) development and stabilization of what is in process of being activated, and, finally, (4) a philosophy that incorporates the actual intuitive realities that are involved.

*

The principle English definition of GUIDE is given as "one who leads, shows, or directs another in his way." This definition almost certainly applies to the second function of a Guru Guide with special focus on attaining the Siddhi Attainments.

Now, it must firmly be stated that if there is no fundamental, raw rudimentary basis upon which an attainment can be built, so to speak, then it is really quite difficult to see how an Attainment can be attained.

Equally speaking, if there is no interest in attaining something, then it probably won't be attained, even though the raw potentials for it are latently existing. This is the case with just about all human activities, the activating and development of which depend on interest in them.

If interest in whatever does manifest, then most are at first dependent on others to show, lead, or direct that interest in some kind of structured way.

With respect to the Siddhi Attainments, interest may erupt spontaneously, or, if not, it can be "awaked" by a Guru Guide who already has experienced such awakening and been properly tutored with respect to how and why the awakening can be enhanced so as to attain structured and efficient performance.

In English, this is usually referred to as DEVELOPMENT, the first definition of which is "to set forth or make clear by degrees or in detail."

One can think of this as "education" via the teach-learn context. But it can also be thought of as training IF a raw potential is involved and capable of growth and unfolding from its raw state to a refined, perfected, efficient Skill-Attainment.

Finally, some kind of philosophical MODEL must be provided that profoundly strengthens cognitive awareness structures necessary for the actual growth, development, and actuality of Siddhi Attainments.

So, now THE question arises! WHAT philosophical model would we be talking about that is relative to attaining the Attainments?

In Sanskrit, this philosophical model is quite complex. But it contains one particular element that is quite surprising – the element that can roughly be referred to as "interpenetrating realities."

10. SANSKRIT "OTHER REALITIES"

AT FIRST SIGHT, what now follows in this somewhat challenging section might not seem relevant to the topic of super sensitivity training. But there remain the questions of what, why, and how such training might be possible.

So, in order to get into this, it might be repeated, once again, that the modernist philosophic and scientific arenas abjured the existence of super sensitivities on the grounds that they didn't really exist because there was no material explanation of them.

Thus, the idea of training them was irrelevant. As a first

Situational result, no modernist efforts were undertaken to build a philosophic or scientific model that incorporated them. As a second result, if super sensitivities do exist, then they must be thought of as capacities of consciousness, the fuller attributes of which admittedly remain unknown.

Yet, 3,000 or more years ago, such a model had been constructed, and copious evidence of it remains today in the Sanskrit language.

*

In English, the term MODEL has several definitions. The two being utilized here are given as: (1) a system of postulates, data, and inferences presented as a mathematical description of an entity or a state of affairs; and (2) a description or analogy used to help visualize or conceptualize something that cannot be directly or objectively perceived."

The basic modernist Western model of "reality" was that Matter was the Only Reality. Thus, all phenomena had to fit with and within that model.

So, in order to prepare for what is to come, it is first necessary to examine our English term MATTER – that same objective Stuff that has, during our modernism times, been assumed to constitute the Only Reality in the universe.

Taken from the Latin MATERIA, our term MATTER was in English at about 1340 with the early definition of "The substance, or substances collectively, out of which a physical object is made or of which it consists."

This definition was added to at about 1420: "Physical or corporeal substance in general, of which the chemical elements and their components are the separate kinds, contradistinguished from immaterial and incorporeal substance (spirit, soul, mind) and from qualities, actions, and conditions."

Modern English definitions, including scientific ones, have not moved much beyond these early ones. For example, most dictionaries define MATTER as "physical substance,' end of story, and one has to enter higher education in order to become

acquainted with modernist scientific details of it.

Back in the 1300-1400s, however, thinkers were not yet acquainted with such modernist details, and MATTER was thought to consist of four elements – Earth, Water, Fire, and Air – plus a fifth element referred to as Quintessence.

QUINTESSENCE was in English at about 1430, defined in the Oxford dictionary as "the 'fifth essence' of ancient and medieval philosophy, supposed to be the substance of which the heavenly bodies were composed, and to be actually latent in all things; the essential part of any substance."

The "supposed to be" phrase of this definition came about much later when modernist Materialism began (c. 1845) influencing mainstream philosophic and scientific thought with the Only Reality thing.

However, as scientific things stand this concept is being reintroduced because since the 1980s, when physicists began "weighing the universe, they discovered that there is too little visible matter to account for the observable behavior of galaxies, clusters and superclusters, etc., and that most of the missing mass is hidden.

As discussed earlier, that "missing" mass was eventually referred to as dark matter, dark energy, etc. (For those up to a longer discussion of this, see QUINTESSENCE: THE MYSTERY OF MISSING MASS IN THE UNIVERSE (revised edition of "The Fifth Essence") (2001) by Lawrence Krauss, Chairman of Physics at Case Western Reserve University.)

(Please also note that this same Situation is also anciently found discussed, in Sanskrit, in the Hymn of Creation, the RIG VEDA.)

*

To try to get into Sanskrit equivalents of our concepts of "matter," it seems appropriate to simply suggest that we cannot do so.

In other words, we cannot reverse engineer our English terms back into Sanskrit contexts, and then propose to think that

we understand the Sanskrit contexts.

To be sure, Sanskrit has its bulky share of terms that refer to matter, material things and situations, and to objective perceptions of it. But whereas modernist concepts are rather firmly rooted in matter-as-the-only-reality thing, ancient Sanskrit realities are not rooted in anything of the kind.

So the brief discussions that now follow might stretch cognitive capacities and overload at least some brain synapses. In other words, get ready for a headache. But do remember we are still hot on the trail of the super sensitivities.

*

In Sanskrit, there are numerous and diverse words that apply to what we think of as "matter," or as "material existence" – and, in modernist Materialism's terms, as the "Only Reality."

Now, we shall proceed very slowly, so take your time.

The larger majority of these Sanskrit "matter" terms are based on the root word BUHR having the general meaning of "earth, matter, material existence and experience, and Man's earth-world."

One of the several terms derived from this root word is BHUR-LOKA – defined as the "World of material becoming," and which is the lowest, most "gross" World of seven (and possibly more) LOKAS into which the "Universe is divided."

The term LOKA represents the "universal heavens, the Vast places of Light and becoming in them."

BUHR-LOKA therefore refers to "Becoming, arising, proceeding, or being produced from or within earth [matter] as a substance," and which is considered as the lowest, most gross form of all possible existences.

*

The next "becoming" situation, slightly above BHUR-LOKA, is

BHUVAR-LOKA, the "world of vitalistic manifestation-of-embodied life existence and becoming within emotion, passions, affectations of which desire is the pivot."

This is the vital or nervous "plane" just above our material earth "plane" through which "gods" come to commune with Man, but it is a confused wideness, and its paths are many, intricate and entangled. It is the mid-point "plane," or mid-world between Bhurloka and Svarloka.

Here, it becomes slightly obvious that what we refer to as (possibly confused?) "consciousness" seems to be the "pivot" that is being talked about.

*

Above this mid-point, or mid-world mess, is SVAR-LOKA, the "world" of light, pure (unentangled) thought and feeling, and becoming, within a pure psychic state" or "plane". Svarloka is described as becoming within the "clarity of high mental existence," but one wonders if the English term "mental" is all that much applicable here.

Although this author has not found it mentioned in the Sanskrit sources he has at hand, one also wonders if attaining Svarloka is a necessary precursor in order to awaken and attain efficient Siddhis, i.e., efficient super sensitivities that are not entangled with the Bhuvarloka mess.

Indeed, it would seem that if rudimentary Siddhis awaken, but remain entangled with the Bhuvarloka mess, then one attains little more than an entangled Siddhi mess. Some examples of such messes are available, but we are trying to remain constructive here.

*

Above the clarities of Svarloka is the "plane" of MAHAR-LOKA, described as the "world of vastness – beyond mind." This seems at least to suggest "consciousness" unentangled with mind, and thus becoming and operating, so to speak, in the Unobstructed Vast."

The Sanskrit root term MAHAS equals the English term VASTNESS. Other than that, English has few other supporting contexts – except, possibly, the innate vastness of consciousness itself.

There are three other, and even higher, Lokas, which will not be discussed here because of extreme language difficulties. It should also be mentioned that all of the above depends on which Guru-Yogin is involved, of which Judith Tyberg discusses a rather great number in her precious book. You see, various Guru-Yogins seem predisposed to argue about what's what with all of this.

*

The basic point being made in dragging (ever so briefly and perhaps inadequately) through the foregoing is that one of the most basic themes throughout the Sanskrit language has to do with "becoming, arising" within something, including numerous incorporeal states "above" the matter-earth-corporeal thing.

In contrast, the Matter-Is-The-Only-Reality thing clearly indicates that Matter is the only thing to become or arise in. End of story!

Additionally, the Sanskrit language is dripping with, as it might be put, scads of incorporeal terms that are not translatable into English because English has no comparable terms or contexts – excepting, of course, some of the Attainment Siddhis, but which terms are only relevant in parapsychology, etc., and forbidden in modernist versions of philosophy, science, and today's quantum physics.

*

Now for the really, really hard part which focuses on Sanskrit treatment of States of Existence in addition to, or above the Matter-Only thing.

In English, these "higher" States are referred to as identifiable PLANES, and all of which COULD have some kind of different separateness in the contexts of objective

realities where things are different and separate.

Why the English term PLANE should have been selected is something of a mystery – until it is discovered that, among its many other definitions, one of them refers to "A level of existence, consciousness, or development."

You see, a great portion of the Sanskrit language is devoted to words having relevance to levels of existence, levels of consciousness, and levels of development within the fundamental context of "arising-becoming" within them.

Which is to point up that a PLANE (in the particular Sanskrit context) is not individual to or with the individual, but rather exist as extra-material realities in their own right – and within which the individual can, with training (at least with an appropriate Guru-Guide) can undertake arising and becoming.

*

Basically speaking, in Sanskrit a PLANE refers to various hierarchical ranges of existence that "blend" with, into, and INTERPENETRATE all other planes. (So, finally, there is THAT word – in Sanskrit no less."

The physical matter world grades off and "upwards" into a "higher," more subtle ones, which in turn grades off into another more subtle, which in turn grades of into yet another higher, more subtle one, and etc., etc., etc., while the sum, or whole, of these grades interpenetrate, including interpenetration of the physical world.

In modernist materialistic mainstreams, there could not conceivably be a model for this kind of thing, and so it was thought of as a lot of hooey and occult nonsense.

However, a similar, if not exact, model for this is now in hand with the recent discoveries of dark, subtle, and exotic energies that interpenetrate, as well as interpenetrating multiple dimensions that are theorized as interpenetrated by same, including our matter-only reality – and including parallel universes.

So Stuff exists and interpenetrates – something the Sanskrit ancients were somehow aware of sufficiently enough so as to identify and create words AND a model for the apparently extensive "planes" of the interpenetrating Stuff.

It can now finally be pointed up that if Stuff interpenetrates, then it interpenetrates with whatever it interpenetrates. If, for example, so-called dark energies and multiple dimensions interpenetrate our Matter universe, then this interpenetrating includes not only physical bodies, nervous systems, and brains – but innate consciousness capacities, too.

So, in a certain sense, the recent Situations of interpenetrating discoveries are at least akin to similar interpenetrating Situations discussed in Sanskrit 3,000 or more years ago.

*

In English, INTERPENETRATE is defined as: "to penetrate between, within, or throughout; permeate; to penetrate mutually."

In English, PERVADE is defined as: "to become diffused throughout every part of; to go through, or mutually go through."

In English, PERMEATE is defined as: "to penetrate so as to diffuse through or throughout; to spread or diffuse through."

*

So, how did English come to have this precise definition? This a definition that harks back to Sanskrit times at least 3,000 years ago or more.

Well, it seems that this particular definition was, in its first instance, associated with the geometry of OPTICS, otherwise known as the scientific study of light, which got underway at about 1570, and which was combined with the 1811 discovery of polarization, often referred to as bi-polarization.

Now, under the scientific concept (c. 1865) of "Combinations and special collocations," PLANE-POLARIZATION was originally defined as "of light, so polarized that all the ethereal vibrations take place on one plane."

ETHERIAL vibrations?!!! Well, for goodness sakes.

ETHER has several English definitions, one of which is given as "A medium that in the undulatory theory of light permeates all space and transmits transverse waves."

ETHERIAL is also basically defined as "Immaterial, impalpable; marked by unusual delicacy and refinement."

11. THE SITUATION INCLUSIVE OF THE INFORMATION UNIVERSE AND SUPER SENSITIVITY INFORMATION TRANSFER WITHIN IT

IT IS GENERALLY understood that the physical senses detect information only within ranges of their objective, material physical limits. It is then understood that the detected information is transferred via the nervous systems to the brain – after which conscious awareness of what has been detected becomes involved one way or another. Thus, the transfer of information via the physical senses is more or less scientifically understood

However, the super sensitivity transfer of information is not likewise scientifically understood for at least two reasons: (1) the super sensitivities that detect information have not been scientifically detected; and (2) the information the super sensitivities detect not only notoriously transcends various objective aspects of matter, energy, space, and time, but also often "transcends" conscious awareness of whatever information is involved.

It is thus to be expected that confusions about the nature of the super sensitivities and their transfers of information should come about, and especially so for the following reasons – i.e., Science has not succeeded in attaining either a complete model or a science of consciousness, and it seems that Science has missed at least half the brain in the first place.

*

The modernist scientific failure to achieve such a model is quite embarrassing, so it is not generally emphasized or brought to public attention. It was very daring of Roger Penrose (Professor of Mathematics at the University of Oxford) to intimately discuss the details of this embarrassing failure in his book entitled SHADOWS OF THE MIND: A SEARCH FOR THE MISSING SCIENCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS (1969).

The details rendered in this book are somewhat challenging and will not be reviewed here, but it is recommended for those brave enough to struggle through it.

A review of science missing at least half the brain is found in SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN (April, 2004) under the heading HAS SCIENCE MISSED HALF THE BRAIN - which title should read "Science HAS missed Half The Brain." This is a fascinating read. A brief explanation: It seems that for every one cell neuron in the brain, there are nine Glial cells that were once thought merely as providing neurons with "nourishment."

Now it is being recognized that Glial cells "may be nearly as critical to thinking and learning as neurons are" i.e., NINE times more critical.

Exactly how Glial cells might be "critical" is not discussed all that much in the article, but they seem to involve implications to "thinking and learning," all be it what kind of such is not discussed in any detail.

Even so, "thinking and learning" (and training, too) involve some kind of INFORMATION and INFORMATION TRANSFERS – this being a particular aspect of super sensitivity activity that seems to have "gone missing" so far, along with the missing science of consciousness and missing than half the brain, too.

So here is yet another Situation that briefly needs to be dissected.

*

Early psychical and later parapsychology researchers set up a paradigm, or a basic model, within which various types of super sensitivity evidence were looked at as "phenomena" that

could

separately and objectively be categorized under given verbal identifiers – such as telepathy, premonition, clairvoyance, psychometry, precognition, ESP, etc.

By using such largely arbitrary verbal categories, one could intellectually know what one was talking about. Over time, this categorizing verbal model became so automatic that it was, and still is, difficult to suggest that it contained at least one important intellectual flaw.

The term PHENOMENON has several definitions, but the one being used in this context is given as "a rare or significant fact or event; an exceptional, unusual, or abnormal occurrence."

The subtle difficulty here is that such facts, events, or occurrences can be perceived only AFTER they have manifested, and if one perceives something only after it has happened then all one can perceive is that it happened – and one will be left much in the dark about the source, cause, about the why and how, it happened.

The term EPIPHENOMENON is defined as "a secondary phenomenon accompanied by another and caused by it."

The prefix EPI denotes "upon, near to, over, outer, before, anterior, after, besides, related to, coming before in time, preceding."

Therefore and in general, "epiphenomenon" refers to something that precedes something else, which caused and accompanies that something else, and which remains before AND after, as well as upon, near, over, beside, and related to that something else.

A bit boggling, isn't it, certainly with respect to the objective senses that perceive physical-material things as they SEEM, at any given point in TIME.

In any event, when super sensitivity activities are viewed only within the contexts of the objective-intellectual senses, those activities can be perceived (AFTER the fact of perceiving them) ONLY as exceptional, unusual, or abnormal

occurrences resulting in a rare or significant fact or event. That is, IF the information contents of such turn out as a demonstrable, verifiable reality.

*

TRANSFER is defined as "to convey or move from one person, place, or situation to another."

The Situation with respect to super sensitivities is that information is transferred from a situation OUTSIDE of sensing systems into a situation INSIDE the sensing systems, after which the sensing systems forward the information to something that can understand it as information – this particular "something" quite possibly being Consciousness, for which a science is missing.

No matter how super sensitivities are intellectually identified by words and concepts that enable placement in different kinds of categories, all of them share one factor in common. They transfer information from an outside situation into an inside one.

Telepathy transfers information.

Clairvoyance transfers information

Second Sight transfers information.

Precognition and premonitions transfer information.

Intuition transfers information.

Instinct transfers information.

The Sixth Sense transfers information.

Postcognition transfers information

Remote Viewing transfers information. Etc., Etc., Etc.

All of these (perhaps more yet undiscovered) transfer information, but then there are two problems yet involved: the problem of the something that understands

whatever information has been transferred, and the problem of from where it has been transferred.

*

As discussed earlier, it is increasingly being thought that whatever the universe consists of, it principally consists of information through and throughout – and whatever forms are within it are built upon the information they consist of. This universal state of affairs is being referred to as The Information Universe.

This is clearly mind-boggling, but there it is, and detractors of this must argue with the scientific cutting edges examining this state of universe affairs.

If this is the case, then information exists whether or not there exist information detecting systems for it.

Information detecting systems will think, quite obviously so, that the universe consists only of what they detect – since what is not detected will have no detectable reality.

So a double sort of confusing question arises as to what the information universe actually consists of that is or is not being detected by various kinds of information detecting systems.

As so far established by cutting edges of various sciences, the information universe consists of atomic matter and energies, and of Stuff so far labeled as dark matter, of dark energy, of subtle and exotic energies, of multiple dimensions, of parallel universes, of holographic potentials, of entropic Stuff having no specific form, of local and non-local situations, of time loops, etc – and whatever other Stuff remains undetected so far.

As so far understood, dark matter may or may not interpenetrate atomic matter, but all of the rest could, might, or do.

Within all of this Stuff, the percentage of atomic matter/energy Stuff has now bottomed out as having the lowly status of only about 4 percent to 7 percent of the actual

constitution of the Universe.

All of this is well and good - if a bit dizzying and confounding to certain types of reluctant reason and logic.

But there is an observation that could be made about all of this, one that is perhaps somewhat overdue.

This is that human Consciousness does not, even on average, ACT like it is totally confined within and to the 4-7 percent of matter.

In some cases, perhaps admittedly rare, it doesn't act like it is confined within anything at all – THIS having a certain similarity to the activities of super sensitivities.

Additionally, even though the five physical objective senses might seem as if they are confined to perceiving only physical objectivity, there is increasing scientific evidence that such is not ALL they detect even within their own categories as conventionalized in the past.

Each topic that has been discussed in this small section suggests particular future situations that are likely to be applied toward comprehending the actual nature of super sensitivities of Consciousness – sensitivities that clearly interpenetrate with information ranging from the mundane to, so to speak, the Cosmic – whatever the Cosmic is inclusive of.

It might actually be thought, in the sense of the Information Universe, anyway, that information interpenetrates everything.

*

Now, it is scientifically held that Matter incorporates the "laws" that result in matter being matter. It is also held that the Matter Universe doesn't disobey these "laws." Indeed, if matter disobeyed its own laws, then what would happen? If, so, matter would become something other than matter, and who knows where we would be?

Is this not at least somewhat logical?

As discussed earlier, it is thought that Stuff such as dark, subtle, and exotic energies and multiple dimensions interpenetrate everything, including our Matter, and if such interpenetrating Stuff followed the "laws" of Matter, then such Stuff would become Matter, too.

So it seems that such different Stuffs do not follow Matter "laws," making it possible to think that such Stuffs might have their own "laws" quite different from Matter "laws."

Furthermore, our Matter Universe is both built upon and is consistent with the Information it embodies.

Thus arises the question as to what kinds of Information these other interpenetrating Stuffs are built upon is consistent with the Information "laws" they embody?

In our Matter "reality," matter is identified as objects – from

galaxies down to and including subatomic and subquantum particles.

Space is measured by the distance between objects.

Energy is identified by whatever energy is input and output from, between, and into the objects and the space between them.

Time is measured by motions of objects relevant to each other.

The recently discovered Stuff that interpenetrates our local matter, energy, space, and time cannot be consistent with the law-like information that makes up any of these Matter phenomena – because if such Stuffs were consistent with the law-like information of Matter, the Stuffs could not interpenetrate and probably would tend toward becoming Matter.

Insofar as this author has been able to discover, there seems to be no great scientific revelation as to whether the different kinds of recently discovered interpenetrating Stuff contains, embodies, or carries their own kinds of Information – or how such Information is within the contexts of their interpenetrating.

However, in that the interpenetrating Stuffs interpenetrate the substance, information, and "laws" of our Matter realities, it might be presumed that the interpenetrating Stuffs have their own "laws" that transcend those of Matter and all of its substantive constituents.

*

Advancing Information Theory postulates that all Information in the interpenetrating Information Universe is everywhere available – even if detectors appropriate for detecting it are NOT available – or, put another way, even if appropriate sensing systems are not available. If information is not sensed-detected, then no one is the wiser that it exists in the Information Universe.

So it is possible, say, for given bio-consciousness organisms to have sense-detectors for certain kinds of information, but not for other kinds of it, after which the perceived "realities" of such organisms will correspond only to what is sensed-detected.

It must then follow that if the human species is innately possessed only of Matter sensing-detecting systems, perceived "realities" will then be confined to and correspond with Matter and its various phenomena, the "laws" of which do not transcend anything.

*

But the Situational problem involved with all of this is that the human species is apparently possessed of sensing-detecting systems other than the Matter detecting ones – sensing-detecting systems that interact with Information that transcends the limits of the Objective-Matter-Only "realities."

As already briefly discussed, in Sanskrit these transcending sensing-detecting systems are generically discussed as the "Intuitional Part of Man." This "Part" can and does interact with the infinitely interpenetrating "Intuitional Plane" in which all Information is available all of the time.

Among others, ancient Greek, Latin, Chinese, and (somewhat) Egyptian also had nomenclature equivalents for "Intuitional Plane," as do several American Indian languages.

However, these ancient nomenclature equivalents will not be reiterated here – because they are yet too scientifically sensitive, which is to say, too upsetting to basic scientific thought yet reeling from implications of the now discovered interpenetrating Stuffs.

In the discussions just above, it might not be noticeable that we have glided past a quite important Situational question – discussions of which will be undertaken just ahead.

12. A SITUATIONAL "MISSING LINK" IN COMPREHENDING THE REAL EXISTENCE OF SUPER SENSITIVITIES

THE IMPORTANT Situational question referred to above might be phrased as follows: How in any given time period do specimens of the human species begin to become aware of the existence of super sensitivities in addition to their physical, mundane, objective ones?

Having searched high and low for about five decades, this author has not been able to discover any source in which this significant question has been discussed or even mentioned.

So, in the absence of any supportive source, it seems the better part of valor is simply to TRY to initiate the required discussion - even if more or less hypothetically.

*

It seems that reasonably conscious people become aware of what they experience – in that if they don't become consciously aware then they can't claim to have experienced anything.

Of course, one can become intellectually aware of the existence of something without having actually experienced it. Thus, one can become intellectually aware of the existence of super sensitivities without actually having experienced any of them.

Thus, we might think in terms of prime actual

self-experiencing of the real thing, so to speak, and secondary intellectual experiencing via what one has been able to hear or read about. In other words, prime actual experiencing is not the same as secondary intellectual experiencing – and, for that matter, never has been and never will be.

In order to get the meat of this across, it is necessary to pick a particular poignant example of prime actual experiencing and discuss it in some detail – an example that has a tremendously long tradition even in antiquity, and examples of which are still happening today.

For example, one is contentedly walking along a narrow mountain path admiring the surrounding scenic wonders. One's physical body suddenly stops walking, the legs take a few steps backward. There has been no cognitive volitional decision to do this – one wonders why - if one has time to do so - because

Without any perceptible hint of forewarning, the path ahead immediately falls away in a thunderous landslide.

Legs now quivering, one cautiously creeps forward, and, with some elevated degree of mind-numbing amazement, peers over the edge and objectively views where one's mangled body would objectively have been.

Then, as soon as one can reach the mountain lodge, one consumes at least three martinis while breathing heavily.

Tales of this spontaneous, unpremeditated, unpredicted event are then incredulously told, retold, and often recorded, even including the involuntary stopping and the involuntary backward stepping that no one can understand the what, why, or how of.

Prime experiencing, right? And of a type that has a very long history, especially in situations when this type was useful and needed.

*

Let us now TRY to consider what was basically necessary for

this to happen.

First of all, one's volitional cognitive awareness factors seem clearly not to have been involved.

So it was, shall we say, some other sensing-detecting system perceived that the path, cliff, and mountainside were going to collapse a few seconds ahead in time.

To this other sensing-detecting system, the few seconds ahead in time represented calamitous DANGER.

This other sensing-detecting system perceived that there was not time to try to trigger even a slightly awareness premonition into the cognitive activities happily in charge of moving forward while enjoying the scenery.

So, this other sensing-detecting system simply commandeered the physical brain's motor cortex which then stopped the volitional walking and executed the involuntary backward stepping – all in a day's work, perhaps. After which the astonished volitional cognitive systems needed the three martinis, and perhaps six more.

*

Archaic peoples and the ancients that followed them probably did not know of the existence of the motor cortex.

But when it came to prime experiencing such things, they probably had the cognitive powers to recognize the difference between events like this and the more limited physical objective senses that do not transcend time even a few seconds ahead during which extreme dangers can come out of nowhere.

You see, this kind of prime experiencing saved lives, whereas the mere physical objective senses might not likewise be as dependable.

*

This author has met hundreds and hundreds of people who have experienced exactly something like this, and lived to talk about it.

Yet, no parapsychological term has been assigned to it. The only official documentation for it consists of interviewing those who have undergone different kinds of such prime experiencing.

When it is necessary to refer to it via a word, the term INSTINCT is usually seized upon.

But "instinct" has not officially been accepted as a super sensitivity parapsychology construct, because it is not seen as having any "Para" implications.

You see, INSTINCT is simply defined as "a complex and specific response of an organism to environmental stimuli that is largely hereditary and unalterable, does not involve reason, and has as its goal the removal of somatic tension" - such as, presumably, somatic tensions arising because of sensing danger present or ahead.

Sensing such most certainly will result in somatic tensions.

Well, who is to say that instincts do not involve their own kinds of reason? And who is to say that prime super sensitivity experiencing is NOT the result of some kind of reasoning, a kind of reasoning that can act independently of whatever is passing for mere intellectual reasoning?

And who is to say that the brain's motor cortex itself does not have its own versions of reason?

We thus arrive at considerations of the "missing link" which, it is thought, with respect to super sensitivities – i.e., the brain's motor cortexes are entirely responsible for any and all motions of the organism, even the motions of thought processes no matter what they consist of, including all information transfer systems.

13. THE DOUBLE SITUATION OF (1) SOCIAL DESENTIZING OF SUPER SENSITIVITY INFORMATION TRANSFERS, AND (2) THE ABSENCE OF AWARENESS 101

IN THAT INSTINCT "does not involve reason," it could not be thought of belonging to PSYCHOLOGY generally defined as "the

study of mind, mental or behavioral characteristics in general, and the study of mind and behavior associated with particular types of reason."

Even so, if instinct does not involve reason, it can be wondered how it could detect and reasonably recognize forthcoming danger a few moments into the future.

In the same sense, it is can easily be observed that psychological reason is somewhat infamous for failing to detect danger in the here and now, just ahead, or farther ahead into the future.

In any event, INSTINCT was not included in the lexicon of parapsychology studies because it was thought not to involve reason, while certain super sensitivities thought to involve psychological reason were included – such as telepathy, clairvoyance, premonitions, etc., which were assumed to consist of extraordinary reasoning functions of mind and its mental processes.

Do note that REASON is defined as: "mental computation; to calculate, to think; the power of comprehending or inferring especially in orderly rational ways; the sum of intellectual powers." Yes, indeed.

*

As earlier discussed in section 2 entitled "Some Old Situations," super sensitivities have a longish history of not being socially wanted or approved.

One basic reason for this is that most societal groups function on shared average, normal, or mundane sensitivities usually of the objective kind. Thus, it would be quite obvious that efficient super sensitivities might give numerous advantages in those types of social contexts within which access to such advantages are prized and jealously guarded.

After all, efficient mind reading and predictive foreseeing would obviously muck up any number of mundane or secretive goals, plans, plots, machinations, etc., while even halfway efficient instinct, gut-feelings, intuition, inspired

deduction, or even a smattering of wisdom would also be problematical.

It is thus that societies might become somewhat or even very intolerant of attempts to broadly enhance super sensitivity functioning, even though spontaneous eruptions of them occur among its general populations.

Since it is difficult to prevent such kinds of spontaneous eruptions, about the only general way of containing, so to speak, the issues involved is to envelope within social ways and means for discrediting, discouraging, and desensitizing awareness interest in them.

*

Nothing about the various kinds of super sensitivities is really real to individuals unless they first self-experience and attain awareness of their existence, the type of awareness that invokes experiencing that results in becoming conscious of whatever is involved.

This is to suggest that conscious experience of something is first preceded by some kind of subtle-to-stronger awareness, and also to suggest that if such awareness does not take place, then nothing happens, and no one is any the wiser – excepting the known fact that super sensitive phenomena often appear in dream, hypnotic, altered states, and spontaneous super sensitive events.

In most societal collectives and their systems, and according to their stabilizing and principles and other social control whatnots, one is encouraged to be aware of what one is SUPPOSED to be aware of, and furthermore, if social controls are to be and remain workable, one should not become aware of what one is NOT supposed to be aware of.

It is thus that most evolve and imprint not only somewhat precise mind maps containing what they are supposed to be aware of, but also evolve at least rough mind maps of what they are not supposed to be aware of.

This to say that most become SENSITIZED, via social reinforcement, to what they are supposed to be aware of, and

at least roughly discouraged and DESENSITIZED, via social intolerance, with respect to what they are not supposed to be aware of.

In conditions like this, the worst thing in the world is to ask people what they have actually become or are aware of, especially if smatterings of super sensitivities are involved.

It is not surprising, therefore, that studies of awareness and potential awareness are few and far between, and that what might be called Complete Awareness 101, or even mere Awareness 101, is absent just about everywhere. There is no encyclopedia itemizing either the scope of awareness magnitudes of our species or the innate capacities within consciousness that make such magnitudes possible.

*

It does turn out, however, that so-called "archaic" peoples, living and trying to obtain their life-support needs within the dangerous vicissitudes of Natural environments did tend to encourage enhancement of awareness, instincts, intuitions, etc., including various kinds of super sensitivities.

So-called "civilized" people don't need to do much of this kind of thing, because life-support elements are more easily at hand, and thus mere objective experiencing stands them in good stead, more or less anyway, depending on their social strata positions.

It is quite well known to anthropologists that peoples depending on Nature for their life-support needs encourage the development and enhancement of higher and more extensive levels of awareness, because Nature beautiful and wonderful is also fraught with serious dangers to life and limb.

Archaic (i.e., pre-civilized) peoples did not have our present vocabulary for super sensitivities. But what we refer to as developed instinct rated very highly, as did extensive awareness enhancement, up to and including their versions of telepathy over distance, certain pro-survival clairvoyant capacities, higher quality premonitions, and possibly enhancement of infrared and ultra violet sensing, and, of course, awareness of various kinds of other intuitions.

This suggests that archaic societies quite probably did have some kind of Awareness 101 tutoring in mind – or, as perhaps better said, Appreciation of Awareness Potentials 101.

AWARE is principally defined as "to be wary," but the "archaic" definition is given as "watchful." More modern definitions are given as "having or showing perception, realization, or knowledge."

Synonyms are given as COGNIZANT, CONSCIOUS OF, SENSIBLE, ALIVE, AWAKE.

As found in Webster's International dated 1966, in the contexts of being aware, AWAKE "implies that one has become alive to something and is on the alert." SENSIBLE "implies direct or intuitive perceiving, especially of intangibles or of emotional states or qualities." ALIVE "adds to SENSIBLE the implication of acute sensitivity of something."

However, Webster's 1966 does not point up that these SAME awareness definitions were being utilized and worked with in Sanskrit 3,000 or more years ago – Sanskrit Awareness 101?

14. THE RELATIONSHIP OF INNATE SUPER SENSITIVITES TO TEACH-LEARN-TRAIN SITUATIONS

SO, WE HAVE words denoting certain kinds or types of super sensitivities – such as telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, etc.

Because the words have been brought into existence, and because they have established definitions, it is generally assumed, by utilizing the words-plus-definitions, that it is understood what is being talked about.

Thus, for example, the definition of TELEPATHY is mind-to-mind "mind reading."

CLAIRVOYANCE – "the professed power of discerning objects not present to the physical senses."

PRECOGNITION – "having clairvoyant cognition relating to a future event or situation that has not yet occurred."

Additionally, these and other parapsychology terms are referred to as "abilities."

Thereafter, teach-learn-train procedures depend on or proceed from the intellectual frameworks established by such terms-definitions, and the whole of this seems to make perfect intellectual sense having no flaws because we do know what we are talking about.

*

Well, as with just about everything else that is more or less JUST intellectual, it follows that teach-learn procedures can and do emulate such intellectualized frameworks, and so the intellectualized information transferred from teach to learn can be perfectly understood, again with the idea we know what we are talking about.

But subtle problems begin to be recognizable when it comes to TRAINING of the alleged "abilities."

For starters, it can be thought that IF the intellectualized frameworks were, say, ENTIRELY workable, then efficient and vigorous activation of super sensitivity training would have manifested some time ago – producing thousands of all kinds of efficient super sensitivity experts and workers.

It must clearly be pointed out that the above musing is not at all intended to demean any attempts to enhance super sensitivity processes, because ANY attempts to do so are seriously better than none at all. After all, it is the super sensitivity heritage of our species that is involved, and any attempts at such enhancing should be properly appreciated in this specific sense.

So with respect to any attempts of such kind, it can be said that what works does work, to the degree such can be seen to work. And in this sense, we can learn as much from failed attempts as successful ones.

However, the point under discussion here is not (in any criticizing manner) directed at real or alleged super sensitivity training attempts. Instead the point is

directed to the possibility that mere intellectualized understanding is quite different from more profound experiential understanding.

In this sense, in all fields of human activity it is easily demonstrated that "book" or "armchair" learning is quite different from direct experiential learning – i.e., direct experiencing in the open field of experiencing.

So, two questions can now be posed, the first of which is: Does efficient super sensitivity training mostly emerge from "book" and "armchair" learning, or would such training more emerge from direct experiencing of super sensitivities themselves?

The second question might ask if the word-definitions of the various super sensitivities actually and accurately reflect the intimate processes involved, and some of which remain decidedly unidentified?

There are partial answers to these two questions, and all of such answers depend on WHAT is trainable. E.g., would one be training words-plus-definitions-plus-intellectualizing concepts; or, would one be training direct super sensitivity experiencing?

After all, the relationship of our super sensitivities to the teach-learn-train thing DOES NOT so much depend on what can be taught-learning, but on WHAT in general CAN be trained.

There is a subtle Situational problem involved here – in that it is generally assumed that learning and training equate to the same thing.

However, learning consists only of learning, but training consists of applied learning plus direct experiencing – APPLY being defined as "to put to use, especially for some practical purpose."

If, however, super sensitivity learning is not meant to be applied, then training efforts are not applicable, right?

*

It is always useful to clarify the definitions of terms when attempting to write about them, especially in the contexts of super sensitivity discussions. Such is the case with the words to TEACH, to LEARN, and to TRAIN, the more precise functions of which often become confused with each other.

TEACH is taken from the Medieval English TECHEN meaning "to show," but the modern definitions are "to cause to know a subject; to cause to know; to impart the knowledge of; to instruct by precept, example, or experience."

LEARN is defined as "to gain knowledge or understanding or skill in by study, instruction or experience; to come to be able to; to come to realize."

TRAIN is defined as "to direct growth of; to form by instruction, discipline or drill; to teach so as to be fitted, qualified, or proficient; to make prepared for a test or performance of a skill."

*

It is obvious that the contexts of these three terms are interactive, but subtle differences between them do exist.

The central context of TEACH is simply to instruct.

The central context of LEARN is simply to be instructed whether by others or by oneself.

The central context of TRAIN is to make proficiently prepared by directing (via instruction, discipline, and drill) the GROWTH or UNFOLDMENT of potential activity."

Aside from the definition of "a stage in the process of growing, the central context of GROWTH is "progressive development as in emergence, evolution, increase, or expansion."

*

The teacher-learner relationship is wonderful, of course, especially if teacher is proficient and learner is interested, so there is much to be said of that relationship. But there

is always the matter of what is being taught and what is being learned.

It can be mentioned, as many have done, that just about anything can be taught and learned – including, as it must be said, misconceptions, "facts" not based on facts, suppositions, speculations, assumptions, all sorts of falsities, and etc.

Such can be taught without either teacher or learner being the wiser, and sometimes not having any recognition that what is taught and what is learned do not produce the phenomena of any kind of "growth."

In other words, such teachings as these have their own contexts and always yield those same contexts – until it is recognized that they are, as it is said, "the mothers of all fuck-ups."

There are, of course, teachings that result in better and more knowing, showings, and learnings – some such teachings perhaps not resulting in too much growth of anything, but rather resulting in rote application of the learned knowing with little growth beyond what has been learned.

For example, a mere unfounded opinion can be taught and learned; a theory (which at first is also mere opinion based on supposition, etc.) can be taught after which both teacher and learner might tend to think of themselves as learned; an idea, whether fruitful or not, can be taught; a falsity, whether recognized as such or not, can be taught; prejudices can be taught/learned; etc, and ad infinitum.

*

The teacher-learner relationship seems to be a dynamic factor innate in our species, and when that important relationship does work and bear positive fruit it is absolutely terrific.

It is possible to think that in the absence of the innate teacher-learner function, everyone would have to figure out everything for themselves – perhaps including toilet training. As it is, however, the teacher-learner relationship automatically commences everywhere our species

is found.

But this statement must be slightly qualified, in that this teach-learn-train concept usually automatically commences in relationship to becoming conscious of physically objective realities, based on the physical senses and, as has been discussed, modernist concepts of consciousness do exclusively relate it to perception of physical objects.

This is to say that consciousness is based on awareness-cum-perception of material objects - i.e., Matter-Only things and stuff.

However, super sensitivity types of consciousness involve other kinds of awareness-perceptions that imply the existence of consciousness without an object.

(NOTE: This author has discovered only one extensive modern philosophic treatment of this in THE PHILOSOPHY OF CONSCIOUSNESS WITHOUT AN OBJECT by Franklin Merrell-Wolff, first published in 1923, reissued by Julian Press in 1973.)

So the now probable existence of awareness-consciousness not based on objects opens a door onto the subtle, but significant, vista of all kinds of super sensitivities not exactly explainable in Matter-Only terms – not only involving super sensitive awareness of ghosts which can't quite be considered or explained as Matter-Only – but which subtle super sensitivities, if enhanced, might be inconvenient to awareness-consciousness based on Matter-Only objects.

In any event, teach-learn-train processes are quite identifiable with respect to objective matter realities, largely because it is usually understood WHAT can be trained – such as intelligence experientially operating within the contexts of this or that kind of physical matter.

However, when it comes to super sensitivities that transcend objective matter realities, teach-learn can intellectually convey what has been learned, or thought to be learned, about them.

But the TRAINING aspect is not understood (in general that is), because whatever is involved has long been assumed to

involve intelligence experientially operating within contexts other than those of objective physical matter.

So, is that assumption entirely correct?

15. THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACH-LEARN-TRAIN TO THE BRAIN'S INNATE MOTOR CORTEX

LEARNING ABOUT the motor cortex of the brain is probably not very high on everyone's reading agenda. So something resembling a suggestive reason to take interest in the matter needs to be established.

We will begin by referring back to the incident of walking along a mountain path, body stopping, legs moving backward, cliff collapsing in a tremendous avalanche, life saved – all of which took place WITHOUT volitional conscious reason or explanation. Thousands of similar events exist in various literatures.

These events are understood as having occurred via non-conscious intuition, non-conscious gut-feeling, non-conscious instinct, etc.

The events are, after the fact, intellectually quite appreciated as such, as some kind of extraordinary events.

But one important factor is seldom, if ever, discussed – why the body was stopped without a trace of volitional reason, why the legs stepped backward, also without conscious reason. Indeed, none of the several factors operational in various kinds of similar of events were accompanied by conscious reason.

In other words, this entire event was totally involuntary, taking place beneath, above, or outside of conscious perceptions and reason – and none of which is explainable, except particular one factor.

No biophysical motion, whether voluntary or involuntary, takes place without motor cortex activity.

*

In the biological sense, MOTOR is basically defined as "Something that causes or imparts motion;

of, or relating to, or being a nerve fiber that passes from the central nervous system or a ganglion to a muscle and conducts an impulse that causes movement;
also, a motorneuron, a nerve cell with its processes;
a muscle designed to move a particular part of the animal frame;
a nerve whose function is to excite muscular activity in a particular part of the animal body."

Prior to about 1800, it was generally thought that the muscles themselves supplied their own "muscular energy" so as to result in their motions.

At about 1808, it was being held that "In every motion, there must always be a number of muscles employed, some as motors, some as directors, some as moderators."

However, by about 1899, motor-motion seems to have taken on, shall we say, a "mental" aspect – for example, "If we think of a ball, this idea must comprise the images of these muscular sensations, as it comprises the images of sight and touch.

"Such is the motor image. Also, by making reading and writing proceed together, the two memories, visual and motor, are constrained to associate and to aid one another."

In 1900, it was announced (in AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY, April, XI, 210) that "Motor phenomena are now regarded as necessary in all mental processes."

In 1903, the THE AMERICAN NATURALIST (March, XXXVII, 207) indicated that "To whatever sense the stimulus is given, the impulse has to go to the motor-image centers, and then to the muscles."

At some point this author has not yet been able accurately to determine, but probably about 1924, it was either discovered or decided that the "motor-image centers" resided in what then became termed as the "motor cortex."

Also during the 1920s, a general Map of the Brain was produced by "a French woman" (whose name has not yet been discovered

by this author).

This Map seems to have endured – until quite recently.

In any event, the physical placement of the motor cortex is situated at the top of the brain. The motor cortical areas are now typically divided into three regions that have different functional roles: The Primary Motor Cortex (M1); the Premotor Areas (PMA); and the Supplementary Motor Area (SMA).

The purpose of M1 is to connect the brain to the lower motor neurons via the spinal cord in order to tell them which particular muscles need to contract. These M1 upper motor neurons are found in layer 5 of the motor cortex and contain some of the largest cells in the brain. (If one is interested, Map diagrams of the physical brain are easily available.)

It has, however, proven difficult to locate anything like an elegant definition of the motor cortex composed of 200 words or less.

It is usually pointed up as "The region that is mainly involved with motor functions," after which discussions descend into describing its internal physical details and minutia for which physical evidence is identifiable.

The entire brain is also described along such physical lines, i.e., how areas of the brain physically act or react to objective information fed into it via the five objective physical senses.

This is completely in accord with the Matter-Only thing, and so activities associated with super sensitivities that seem to transcend matter, space, energy, and time have not scientifically been looked for.

NOTE: Excepting, of course, the recent and now ongoing discoveries of premotor cortex involvement with mind-to-mind sensing of others' intentions and motives – in that intentions and motives hardly fall into any completely neurophysical category.

*

This Map Situation, however, is undergoing change – because it seems that cutting edge research of the brain is rendering the old map/model of the brain more or less obsolete.

For example, the physical brain was once the exclusive territory of neurobiologists.

These must now move over a bit so as to include what are being called "3D brain mappers and cartographers" who scan brains via all sorts of imaging devices, and are thus busy attempting to create the most detailed and sophisticated computer brain-atlas ever assembled.

In December 2001, BBC News interviewed Arthur Toga, director of the Laboratory of Neuro Imaging at the University of California (UCLA), who complained (here somewhat paraphrased): That the old brain-map that has served as a model for the billions of brains on the planet has been inappropriate in terms of representing the entire human population;

That the old brain-map was mostly an physical anatomical one, so the fuller scope of its functions have not been mapped in any comprehensive way;

That brains may be anatomically similar in general, but individually their functions vary in accord with genetic inheritance and other factors;

And that no one yet has been able to identify what a "normal" brain should look like.

*

Troubles with the old brain-map have also arisen elsewhere in other types of research.

For example, it was once thought that since the brain is divided according to its anatomical "regions," that each of such parts and activities had a separate identifiable function.

MRI and Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scanning have

recently indicated that when the brain is in this or that kind of activity, not just parts but ALL of its regions light up more or less like fireworks in the night sky, as if scads of "information messages" were being exchanged among the regions with great velocity. (See the article entitled SPREADING CONSCIOUSNESS: AWARENESS GOES GLOBAL IN THE BRAIN, by Bruce Bower in SCIENCE NEWS, October 19, 2002.)

The September 29, 2001 issue of SCIENCE NEWS featured an article (by Bruce Bower) entitled JOINED AT THE SENSES: PERCEPTION MAY FEAST ON A SENSORY STEW, NOT A FIVE-SENSE BUFFET. This article basically discusses evidence that helps explain one of the fundamental mysteries of the brain – i.e., how it unites separate sensations into multifaceted experiences.

So, on-going research of these kinds seem to imply that progress is being made with respect to identifying all sorts of functions of the brain. And indeed is seems that progress is being made in discovering what has NOT been known about it.

As already mention, in its April 2004 issue, the venerable SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN featured a lead article (by R. Douglas Fields) entitled HAS SCIENCE MISSED HALF OF THE BRAIN? NEGLECTED CELLS HOLD KEYS TO THOUGHT AND LEARNING.

This article discusses the topic of "Mounting evidence suggesting that Glial cells, overlooked for half a century, may be nearly as critical to thinking and learning as neurons are." In the past, Glial cells, even though out-numbering neural cells nine to one, were thought to have only a maintenance role, such as bringing nutrients to neurons, maintaining a healthy balance of ions in the brain, and so forth.

It has now been discovered that Glia influence the formation of synapses and help to determine which neural connections get stronger or weaker over time, such changes being essential to learning and to storing long-term memories.

Research along these lines has begun to show that Glial cells also communicate among themselves in a separate but parallel network to the neural network – which is tantamount to being

ANOTHER brain inside the neural network one.

So, although yet cautious, neuroscientists are excited by the prospect that more than half the brain that has gone largely unexplored may contain a trove of information about how the entire brain actually works.

To remind AGAIN, interlocked within all of the above advancing discoveries, were also the discoveries of mirror "telepathic" neurons in the premotor cortex.

Meanwhile, while all of the above discoveries developed, certain neuro scientists have recently embellished on the discovery of "The OTHER Brain, the One With Butterflies."

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES (23August2005), this is "the brain in your gut." So, the human body has two brains, "the one at the top of the spinal cord and the hidden but powerful brain in the gut known as the enteric nervous system." This article includes, in glorious color, a cut-away anatomical diagram of the gut.

The TIMES article more or less focuses on physical (and some psychological) situations and difficulties that might occur between the two brains. But in the contexts of this Situational paper, it can be noted that the rather famous "gut-feelings" involving premonitions, instincts, and presentiments, etc., have a long human history.

Most of the advancing research efforts briefly discussed above are still quite locked into focusing only on anatomical physical phenomena, and don't seem quite ready to include experiential super sensory
functioning. So "more-than-half" of human experiencing functions are still being missed, i.e., those functionable aspects relative to information that transcends mere physical, objective perceptions.

But it is somewhat obvious that many of the old realities about brains are in process of being turned upside down.

However, most of the old concepts about the motor cortex are still holding water, and especially two of them as already mentioned.

*

Returning to the motor cortex, as a brain part, it is located at the very top of the brain and, deeply embedded downward within it, is the region mainly involved with motor functions in which precise muscle-moving signals originate.

Just in front of this primary cortex is the premotor cortex, the primary "receiving" area for detected incoming signals, and for initiating and sequencing movements - and which is also associated with "higher intellectual functions," especially those associated with "planning and intention." (This is the principal area in which the apparently innate mirror (telepathic) neurons have recently been discovered.)

It is generally appreciated that the importance of the motor cortexes cannot be over estimated, in that if they don't work, then nothing else does either - even though elsewhere in the general nervous systems neural detectors-receptors are busy enough initiating "waves of excitation" that remain undetected by the two cortexes.

Likewise, it seems that although the motor cortexes might have different kinds of innate capacities, some of these kinds might not become awakened or activated – which is the same as saying that they are not working. And even if awakened or activated, they might not have pierced through the veil of cognitive unawareness.

*

The motor cortexes are definitely innately and diversely hardwired to deal with the enormous varieties of stimuli and resulting waves of excitation provided by the five physical sensing organs. The "kingdom" of these five is, of course, the objective physical material universe, but only insofar as the detecting limits of the five permit.

It is thus that tremendously strong general and special perceptual responsive learning "programs" are developed within the motor cortexes, programs based exclusively on physical stimuli (whatever these consist of in different

environments.)

E.g., learning to walk, talk in different languages, skillfully and automatically managing computer keyboards with all ten fingers, riding bicycles without thinking about it, etc., all of which require at least the equivalent of some kind motor-skill training - but most of which might not require all that much intelligence, because after all everyone can perceive and interpret the Here & Now physicality in more or less equal playing field ways, and which perceiving does not require the introduction of all that much super sensitivity.

So, it is possible to end up with very strong motor cortex perceptions and interpretations of OBJECTIVE PHYSICALITY via the famous five sensory organs – and not much else, even though the motor cortexes might also be innately hardwired for dealing with other kinds of perceiving, say, super sensitivity perceiving.

So, properly outfitted with matter-only perceptions, one can be walking along and just about to cross a bridge or something of the kind, and suddenly experiences a compelling premonition to stop walking. One stops walking without conscious reasons for doing so.

During this involuntary stop walking pause, the bridge, or whatever, then collapses – even though there was no consciously perceived apparent physical, objective, Here & Now reason for it to do so.

*

So, the situational question here has to do with what DID perceive the collapse of the bridge (or mountain side) BEFORE it did collapse, and after pulling off this non-conscious bit of wonderment, what involuntarily MOVED the body backward.

It certainly seems that "something" was perceiving ahead in time, perceived the forthcoming danger, put two and two together via some kind of non-conscious thinking, and galvanized the processes of the motor cortex systems to move somewhere outside the perceived, forthcoming danger zone.

As already elaborated, there are multitudes of historical examples of this kind of spontaneous event, and so it is almost an equal bit of wonderment as to why involuntary movement that takes the objective body out of harm's way has not been researched, and especially so in parapsychology.

About the only clue to all of this is found in the following two early statements about the motor cortex:

MOTOR PHENOMENA ARE REGARDED AS NECESSARY IN ALL MENTAL PROCESSES.

WHATEVER SENSE THE STIMULUS IS GIVEN, THE IMPULSE HAS TO GO TO THE MOTOR-IMAGE CENTERS.

At the time these two motor cortex provisos were formulated, they obviously referred to objective physical stimuli that transferred objective information to the motor cortex that forwarded such to the brain's associative areas, and then into the conscious cognitive areas of the brain.

But if these two motor cortex provisos can be interpreted as including super sensitivity stimuli-impulses resulting in super sensitivity information transfers, then the two provisos equally apply to objective and super sensitivity information transfers.

Which is again to say that without motor cortex involvement and participation, nothing can be perceived consciously or otherwise to happen, and therefore nothing can be experienced, nothing can be taught, learned, or trained.

16. THE SITUATIONAL QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT THE INNATE MOTOR CORTEX CAN DIRECTLY AND "MENTALLY" INTERACT WITH SUPER SENSITIVITY INFORMATION

IN CLOSING this Situational Paper, it is now necessary to TRY to discuss the "mental" aspects of the brain's rather complicated motor cortexes. Basic information about those cortexes can rather massively be found by consulting appropriate neurological textbooks and in Internet sources.

In order to TRY to get into this situational question, there is the question of what is meant by the term MENTAL.

For about 200 years, perhaps a bit more, that term has, in English, almost exclusively come to refer to whatever is psychological and outside the scale of given situations characterized, it is thought, by (get this!) "normality."

In turn, NORMAL is defined as "according to, constituting, or not deviating from a norm, rule, or principle."

NORM refers to "a pattern or trait taken to be typical in the behavior of a social group; an authoritative standard."

However, MENTAL is principally defined as "occurring or experienced in the mind" – such as THINKING in the awake conscious state of doing so.

THINK has a number of definitions that describe different kinds of thought-experiencing that go on in the mind.

The scope of most of these THINK definitions are reflected in a sort of confused and intellectually messy grab bag containing the term's given synonyms - such as CONCEIVE, IMAGINE, FANCY, REALIZE, ENVISAGE, COGITATE, REFLECT, REASON, DELIBERATE, SPECULATE, FANTASIZE, THEORIZE, SPECULATE, etc.

However, the most basic definition of THINK has to do with "attainment of clear ideas or conclusions," and in the light of this definition most of the given synonyms might not actually qualify as "think." But the synonyms do suggest much "think" that needs to be desensitized in order to achieve this or that condition of "typical mental behavior of a normalized social group."

*

If the capacity potentials for super sensitivities are innate, such may spontaneously be experienced only in the contexts of special real circumstances, especially the spontaneous kinds that result in saving lives.

However, the term THINK is not applied to such cases, probably because such spontaneous experiencing is commonly understood as not being based on thinking that is understood mostly to take place via cognitive processes of the awake mind – which,

if not out to lunch altogether, is busily at work trying to apply reason to whatever is being thought about.

Even so, when one is spontaneously saved from avalanches, collapsing bridges, or mine fields in war, "something" outside of conscious reason has gained the necessary "attainment of clear ideas or conclusions" that activated the otherwise unexplainable saving sequence.

*

In any event, why and how "attainment of clear ideas or conclusions" is achieved is hardly ever discussed with reference to verifiable super sensitivity activities.

But it doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that it is achieved via processing of information either in the non-conscious parts of the brain, or in non-conscious capacities of Consciousness itself, or at least somewhere in human neurological systems (discovered or yet undiscovered) that can pull off the necessary "attainment," even if conscious reasoning is not conscious of such.

Now, nothing can do anything unless it has capacities to do so – this being the case both with (1) creating artificial intelligence mechanisms into which information-processing capacities have been hardwired, and (2) as well as with any biological organism that has, hopefully, modicums of hardwired capacities to do so.

With respect to information acquired via super sensitivity processes, the ever-so-important bottom line points to hardwired capacities for processing information, in the absence of which such information would not get processed – with the logical fallout that no one is the wiser about such unprocessed information, but might be dead in an avalanche, etc.

*

A rather laborious effort has been made in this document to substantiate that specimens of the human species often EXPERIENCE various kinds of spontaneous super sensitivity events, generically referred to as premonitions, intuitions,

or instincts that are experienced even though the THINK mechanisms of conscious reason has not been involved.

The why and how of these experiencing events cannot be explained by depending on the physical senses or by objective reason-logic based on them.

So when the why and how of the super sensitivity event ultimately proves correct, there is no real way to explain anything.

We shall now begin modifying the above sentence so as to state it in a slightly different ways.

When the information of the super sensitivity event ultimately proves correct, about the only explanation possible is that there exist capacities for sensing information that is not sensed by our objective physical senses or by reason-logic based on them.

There are three specific factors to be considered here:
(1) When the physical motor systems of the body involuntarily move the body out of harm's way before it is consciously realized that such has actually taken place, it should be obvious -
(2) That sensing systems transcending the physical ones have processed relevant information and "attained clear ideas and conclusions" about it, and -
(3) Then DONE something about it, including preempting the brain's central motor systems (even though this usually leaves one's "mind" in an astonished and confused flutter.)

In other words, the conscious "mind" is not the only aspect of human capacities that processes information, in that it seems quite clear that the motor cortex is involved in interacting with information the conscious "mind" is not processing.

*

So in the contexts of verifiable super sensitivity experiencing and activity, there must exist –

Capacities (largely unidentified) that process information

in ways that transcend (or transgress) the known "laws" of matter, energy, space, and time as objectively seen in the material realms;

Capacities of awareness that undercut objective, conscious awareness of those material realms – but which capacities can nonetheless interact with the brain via its motor cortex and associative systems, or perhaps the entire autonomic nervous system altogether.

*

To reiterate, the term CAPACITY has several materialistic definitions. It also refers to (1) the ability to hold, receive, store, and accommodate information; and (2) the POWER to grasp and analyze ideas and cope with problems, situations, and experience.

The term POWER also has some materialistic definitions, and, of course, several social ones. But that term also applies to human faculties of ability capacities, to personal or species capacities, to natural aptitude capacities, the term NATURAL referring to capacities innate.

Although the use of the term POWER in these contexts has been unfashionable for several decades, it is nevertheless derived from POTENT simply defined as "to be powerful" in the context of POTENTIALITY defined as "capable of development into actuality."

*

In these contexts, then, it seems that natural-innate super sensitivity capacities exist that are capable of development into actuality, but might not be developed into activity.

However, if verifiable and efficient spontaneous super sensitivity events take place, it would seem that the capacities involved simply blossom into activity all by themselves, and do so without consciously struggling to "develop" them within whatever is passing for normal reasoning.

Two of the useful definitions of DEVELOP are "to set forth

or make clear by degrees or in detail; also, to make active."

Thus, in order to develop undeveloped capacities, it is necessary to be taught so as to learn something about them in terms of clear degrees and details.

However, it is commonly understood that to render a developing capacity into an active state, not only is learning required, but also TRAINING – defined as "to form by instruction, discipline, or drill, so as to become prepared for a test of skill."

*

It is, of course, completely recognized, in the materialistic sense, that humans have both innate and acquired capacities for objectively interacting, via the physical senses, with material objectivity.

It is also accepted that increasing the potentials for this interacting can be achieved via all kinds of teach-learn-train processes, and that such processes can be applied even if intimate details of brain activity are not known.

For example, although it is thought that one "learns" to ride a bicycle, such is not accomplished by the learning, but by training into the motor cortex an experiential program that eventually works automatically on its own.

The same applies to anything else that requires motor cortex participation, such attaining efficiency in sports, various of the martial arts, ballet dancing, vocal training, utilizing a computer keyboard with all ten fingers, language training, recognition of super sensitivity information aspects such as "psyching out" land mines in a jungle, sensing intentions and motives of others, etc. ad infinitum.

*

It is worth reminding that brain activity, much less details of it, were NOT historically known until, roughly, the beginning of the nineteenth century A.D., and which details are not YET fully known as this document is being constructed.

Today, however, it is fully recognized that the associative and motor cortexes are fully involved in the teach-learn-train processes, and with the memory components, too.

MEMORY reflects an obvious and a powerful innate capacity, the existence of which could not have gone unnoticed even in ancient times (although in today's sciences, the location in the brain of the Seat of Memory is a mystery still to be solved, along with the Seat of the Mind, and the Seat of Consciousness itself.)

*

So, an important issue-question arises, one that has not been even minimally addressed in our modernist, materialistic, scientific times.

Before the modern discovery of brain details, it is quite obvious that the teach-learn-train thing had been recognized throughout human history.

But teach-learn-train procedures need to be based against perceptible evidence indicating the existence of something can benefit from teach-learn-train efforts.

We will slip into this important issue somewhat sidewise. If something is NOT experienced, then whatever is involved doesn't exist as such, and there can be no concept of applying teach-learn-train procedures to it.

But if experiencing, especially various kinds of super sensitivity pro-survival experiencing, IS experienced, then there might arise interest in evolving teach-learn-train procedures so as to enhance whatever experiential dynamics are involved.

This applies more or less equally to experiencing the objective via enhancing the dynamics of physical sensitivities, as well as to experiencing super sensitivities via, as it might simply be put, enhancing the dynamics of super sensitivity.

*

Of course, those who have not experienced spontaneous eruptions of what we today refer to as instincts, premonitions, or intuitions, might be at sea here.

But in the past, in rough and tough environments (including human nature environments), the potential advantages of experiencing instinct, intuition, and premonition could not possibly have gone unnoticed – in that all of these super sensitivities demonstrate various kinds of FOREWARNINGS not directly available via the objective physical senses alone.

Forewarnings are GOOD – at least relative to environments and topics where they are useful.

*

As already discussed, no one can experience anything for which rudimentary capacities don't exist. Such capacities might exist in a latent, or inactive unawakened condition – such as is the general case not only for super sensitivity capacities, but also for mere objective sensitivity the larger experiencing scope of which is often found in desensitized (or not enhanced) conditions.

But that capacities for super sensitivities do exist is vouched for via all human languages (even so-called "archaic" ones) that contain many terms reflecting many different kinds and types of them.

In fact, the few modern terms we have used for them probably represent only the tip of the VAST super sensitivity iceberg – VAST here referring back to the discussions about Sanskrit multiple realities.

*

As also earlier discussed, the modern, materialist Objection to super sensitivities was that no physical source or physical processes could be discovered for them – and so they could not be considered either as innate or acquired capacities.

This Objection was more probably based on social intolerance

of super sensitivities rather than on real scientific observation and research.

In any event, after about 200 some odd years of the supposed legitimacy of this Objection, mirror "telepathic" neurons were discovered to be innate in the premotor cortex not only in monkeys, but in humans also – apparently much alive and working in monkeys, apparently less alive and working in humans.

Mind reading (also a component of forewarning) represents one of the most socially sensitive issues imaginable. However, enhanced instinct, intuition, and premonition are probably as socially sensitive as telepathy – IF any or all of these might respond to the teach-learn-training thing designed so as to involve motor cortex participation.

*

So, can such super sensitivities be trained?

As discussed in the Sanskrit sections earlier, probably NOT unless at least a modicum of experiencing capacity can be awakened, that is, be coaxed up from a latent to a somewhat active state.

After that, as is quite well understood today, the brain's motor cortexes are certainly involved, and that anything involving the motor and associative cortexes almost certainly can be taught-learned-trained.

Because, you see, motor responses CAN be trained, as well as can anything involving information transfers if they become recognizable as such.

This is entirely in keeping with the known fact that incoming information is first processed via the motor cortex, then forwarded to and processed by the associative systems.

*

As we now near the close of this Situational report, there are two very subtle Situations involved that have not been identified as such.

The modernist scientific Objection to the super sensitivities held (1) that they could not be explained or accounted for by Matter-Only sources or processes; and (2) that since Matter was the only reality, there was no other reality that might account for them and or provide ways and means for their processes.

Thus, the super sensitivities were dubbed as EXTRA-SENSIBLE, defined as "beyond the each of sensuous perception" – meaning beyond the limited scopes of the five objective physical senses, and beyond the reach of objective-matter-only sciences, too.

The term EXTRA-SENSIBLE was converted to EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION by the J. B. Rhine, whose famous book of the same title was published in 1934, and which term "denoted awareness apparently received through channels other than the usual [physical] senses."

One of the principal results of this was that the super sensitivities, and evidence of them, became detached from any physical contexts, after which it was assumed that there was nothing that connected them to physicality. Thus, there was no logical reason to look for such connections either in parapsychology or in the Matter-Only brain.

This Situation remained in place until about 1996 when mirror "telepathic" neurons were discovered in, of all places, the physical premotor cortex of the physical brain – and which discovery came as a "surprising" shock to matter-only scientists and numerous parapsychologists, too.

This implied that TELEPATHY, ambiguously defined as "mind-to-mind" can now be rendered more precisely as "premotor cortex to premotor cortex," although this conceptual shift has not actually occurred yet.

Meanwhile, the ongoing cutting edges of physics and astrophysics had determined that the Matter-Only universe was not a matter-only one – in that the Universe was also occupied not only by dark interpenetrating energies, but equally interpenetrating subtle and exotic energies, as well as multiple interpenetrating dimensions and interpenetrating

realities, etc.

It might be presumed that these other realities "carry" or "manifest" various kinds of information that are not governed by the objective "laws" of Matter but apparently by yet unknown "laws" of their own.

So, it seems that there exist interpenetrating "laws" as well as "interpenetrating" information – concepts that somewhat resemble concepts and terms found in the Sanskrit (and many other) languages.

*

Thus, we are obliged to reexamine the general definition of EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION once given as a term that "denoted awareness apparently received through channels other than the usual [physical] senses."

We might, for example, begin this reexamination by asking "awareness" of What?

If AWARNESS is to be defined as "having or showing realization, perception, or knowledge," then it is quite proper think in terms of perception of What, realization of What, knowledge of What.

You see, although it might be too simplistic to say so, if there is nothing to become aware of, there will not be any awareness of it.

In other words, awareness occurs AFTER the fact of the existence or presence of something that can stimulate awareness of it.

To repeat so as to GRIND this in, if there is not something to become aware of, then awareness does not ensue, take place, or manifest.

So, awareness itself cannot be "received," but information might be received through channels that might provoke, awaken, or stimulate awareness of whatever such information consists of – and which information is thus converted into perception of it, realization of it, and knowledge about it.

It is now reasonable to ask where, why, and how such information is thusly converted within innate Consciousness perspectives and capacities – in that, again, if Consciousness does not exist then utter universes of information might exist with nothing to "receive" it.

So it could be thought that Information exists; Consciousness exists; Within Consciousness are capacities to detect Information; It seems that the physical Brain has something to do with "recognizing" different types of Information; Thus the Brain must have different kinds of neural (and other) information recognition detectors and which commence the processing of Information as different kinds of information; Such information may refer to physical objective information, and to super sensitivity information acquired by other "channels than the usual physical senses"

After all of this, conscious-of Awareness may or may not take place; But nonetheless, there is one Brain Part that seems to recognize information whether conscious-of-Awareness takes place; So far as is understood, this Brain Part seems principally to consist of the Motor Cortex and its closely affiliated sub-parts; One of which is designated as the premotor cortex; Which is the physical Brain Part in which mirror telepathic neurons have been discovered and which apparently possesses innate "channels" that deal with detecting information (such as intentions and motives) in others; And which particular motor cortex capacities probably represent only the tip of the super sensitivity iceberg.

17. THE SHIFTING SUM OF THE SITUATIONS

WITH THE exception of the Situations forming up because of the new scientific discoveries, the contexts of most of the other Situations probably would have continued to endure.

As discussed, the most apparent principal reason for this projection probably has to do with social antagonism toward super sensitivities that might interfere with the protection of confidentiality and secrecy upon which many human activities depend.

Early psychical and later parapsychological research

certainly suffered from such antagonism, although both research objectives were energetically pursued at their startups.

Both of those research objectives essentially focused on identifying super sensitivity phenomena – psychical research focusing on general experiential phenomena in the presence of suitable witnesses, while parapsychological research focused more narrowly on theoretical statistical phenomena gained in laboratory settings.

Neither research objectives undertook examination of how to enhance or train super sensitivities - principally because it was thought that super sensitivities were special "gifts" or "abilities" of individuals often of very different psychological types, but altogether consisting of a census of only 7 percent or less in given populations. So their "gifts" or "abilities" were more or less considered as psychological flukes occurring by inconsistent unidentifiable chance.

Many popular books were early available that presented evidence of individuals spontaneously experiencing some kind of super sensitivity event, especially of the premonition, intuitive, and future-seeing kinds.

These sources of indicated that such spontaneous experiencing took place quite more frequently than expected, and did so among individuals in whom special "gifts" and "abilities" did not manifest as such. This quite large body of evidence was more or less dismissed as merely anecdotal – meaning questionable and possibly fictitious.

The concept that rudimentary super sensitivities might be species-innate achieved only extremely minimal discussion in closets, and, at any rate, was never connected up with anecdotal body of spontaneous evidence, with the exception of certain "occult" studies ostracized from psychical and parapsychological research, as well as from modernist philosophic and scientific endeavors.

This mix of Situations was so cemented in place that even when advancing quantum studies began revealing phenomena of non-locality and non-Matter realities that might have

implications for Consciousness, such phenomena were only very tacitly connected up with super sensitivity probabilities or potentials.

In this author's thirty some odd years in super sensitivity research, no one, including himself, could imagine anything of sufficient magnitude that might shift this complex Situational cement to any significant degree.

Then, voila! Mirror "telepathic" neurons are discovered in premotor cortexes of brains – in which, albeit yet undiscovered, are supposed to be the Seats of Consciousness, Seats of Minds, Seats of Memory, as well as other possible Seats yet undiscovered or imagined. So, how about Seats of Super Sensitivities? This, of course, is just a vague question here.

In the PHYSICAL brain, no less – hence a Situation scientific, albeit a New one, unexpected, but implying all sorts of ramifications, including biogenetic ones, innateness, Gosh, probably more, such as a new Sum or all Fears – efficient mind-reading if it proves trainable.

And where there is one brain-confirmed super sensitivity critter roaming about, it there is likely to be others – as the old saying somewhat goes. And so some Situational shifts along such lines might be anticipated.

Perhaps the biggest Situational shift has to do with the failure of the Matter-Is-The-Only-Reality thing. Of course Matter itself is not going to shift. But the implications of Stuff interpenetrating Matter, such as multiple dimensions realities, etc., would result in new types of science in addition to the material sciences.

Thus, a shift from one exclusive type of science to multiple types of it - such as is happening already, albeit in a sort of infant stage of development.

Those living exclusively within and fixated by the contexts of gross, objective material realities would not be affected by such scientific shifts – unless it turns out that interpenetrating multiple Stuffs and dimensions have interacting informational exchange potentials that, as it

might be put, LEAK into and out of each other.

It may be possible that such interpenetrating information leakage might have something like subtle energetic holographic forms that might be detected by certain innate super sensitivities innately designed to do so.

In this case, such might give evidence, say, as to how future information leaks into consciousness in holographic forms, even if only in dreams, visions, intuitions, gut-feelings, etc., and sometimes on a quite large scale.

NOTE: One of the best surveys of this kind of leakage is found in PREMONITIONS: A LEAP INTO THE FUTURE by Herbert B. Greenhouse (1971) - which might be studied in connection with THE HOLOGRAPHIC UNIVERSE by Michael Talbot (1991).

In the sense of all of this, it might turn out that approaches to super sensitivity training might focus on holographic leakage phenomena, but do so in ways that are consistent with the signal-to-noise ratio embodied in Information Theory – accompanied, of course, by the distinct probability that innate Consciousness is innately possessed of super sensitivity capacities that detect and interact with such leakages.

**

SUGGESTED SOURCES THAT DOCUMENT EXPERIENTIAL SUPER SENSITIVITIES COMPILED EVIDENCE OF SUPER SENSITIVITY LEAKAGES:

THE STORY OF PROPHECY by Henry James Forman (1940). (Rather amazing if not mind-blowing! Also an excellent and gripping read.)

THEY FORESAW THE FUTURE: THE FACINATING STORY OF 6000 YEARS OF FULFILLED PROPHECY by Justine Glass (1969).

COMPILED EVIDENCE OF EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN EXPERIENCE:

EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN EXPERIENCE: STUDIES IN THE PSYCHIC, SPONTANEOUS, IMAGINAL compiled and edited by Rhea A. White, published between 1994-2001 by Exceptional Human Experience

Network, 414 Rockledge Road, New Bern, NC 28562, in seventeen volumes consisting of two issues each. Contact routes: ehe.org. Also 252-636-8734. (Extremely professional, abstracts, etc., an extensive encyclopedia of super sensitivity experiencing, the only one in existence so far.)

AN EXPLORATION OF THE "INNER" AND "OUTER" SPACES OF THE SUPERCONSCIOUS STATE:

BREAKTHROUGH TO CREATIVITY: YOUR HIGHER SENSE PERCEPTION by Shafica Karagulla, M.D. (1967). (A down-to-earth, easy to read, clinical narration of super sensitivity dynamics – absolutely terrific.)

Can't help mentioning that the motor cortex is located at top of the brain, the location of the famous Crown Chakra. Google It.