

Compliment to:

Entire Ingo Swann Database - 1372pg.

This volume contains a Total of Pages of work Post 2002 (Any that I could find.)

Page 2

08.08.05 [Telepathy - The Opening Up Of \(Part 1 of 3\)](#)

Page 31

06.01.06 [The Coming Importance of the Question: Can the Superpowers Be Trained?](#)

Page 136

06.12.06 [A Preliminary Bibliography of Scientific and Other Sources Containing Significant Clues For Research and Development of Remote Viewing at Stanford Research Institute 1972-1985](#)

TELEPATHY - THE OPENING UP OF

Part One of Three

Ingo Swann (08Aug05)

TOPICS DISCUSSED IN PART ONE:

- 1. INTRODUCTORY**
- 2. CAN IT BE TRAINED?**
- 3. THE NEW SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT**
- 4. WORD TRAPS**
- 5. THE CONVENTIONAL TERM “TELEPATHY” DISSECTED AND EXAMINED**
- 6. MOVING TELEPATHY BEYOND ITS OLD CONCEPTS**
- 7. MIND?**
- 8. THOUGHT – THE NATURE OF?**
- 9. THE CONCEPT OF TELE – PATHY ENLARGED**
- 10. THE TELEPATHIC-EMPATHIC “BOBO” EVENT**
- 11. INTELLECTUAL vs ORGANIC TELEPATHY**

1. INTRODUCTORY

The bulk of this essay was in draft form during 1999, at which time I hesitated to introduce it into this Website.

There were three or four reasons for this hesitation back then – one of which was that there had been no significant advance or development about telepathy in more than sixty years.

In the absence of such advances anyone might make suggestions this way or that. But without some new development that might give new meaning or importance, one might only be talking in circles based in old, outworn concepts.

*

However, a major scientific development has recently taken place, a development that already has triggered renewed interest in the bigger picture possibilities of, shall we say, applied telepathy.

Before discussing that particular development, however, it needs to be established that telepathy has had a bigger picture all along, one that is, if nothing else, quite amusing.

Almost everyone is at least somewhat familiar with popularized concepts of telepathy, and perhaps also knowledgeable about very many parapsychological experiments conducted here and there to see if telepathy actually exists, and if so, to what degree it does.

Evidence garnered from such decades long experiments more or less confirms that telepathy does exist, but does not robustly manifest itself too well in formal laboratory test conditions and situations.

Instead, the best examples of its robust existence come from informal real-life situations, and

then usually reported (if at all) in anecdotal form.

So the mixture of formal experiments and anecdotal reports have long represented the scenario with respect to what is known and not known about telepathy – well, let us say instead, the scenario that is publicly available.

*

But there is ANOTHER element at work within this scenario, an element that became clear piece by piece during this author's long participation in remote viewing research at Stanford Research Institute – research sponsored and funded for about twenty years by our nation's most important intelligence agencies.

To briefly and bluntly sum up this element, it is generally understood that if too much efficient telepathy would be developed, then SECRECY of all kinds would be extremely difficult to maintain.

Large sectors of human activity depend on the functional value of secrecy, and no one wants the minds of those who design and maintain it to be accessible via telepathy.

There are many types of secrecy, of course: military, diplomatic, governmental, industrial, economic, social, and criminal - down to and including individual shysters, scammers, liars, misleaders, scumbags, hoodwinkers, and fakers who would rather not have their thoughts and intentions easily “read” by telepathic means.

So, from times biblical onward, THIS reluctance has constituted the bigger picture of what we call telepathy – a.k.a. mind reading.

*

While telepathy may engage mere research interests, and serve as inspiration for science fictions, it is possible to think that actual and potentially efficient telepathy is feared, detested, hated in the real world of human activities, and must not be allowed to be developed as such.

One might like to have telepathy for oneself, but would rather OTHERS not similarly have it.

For clarity, one might like to read the minds of others; but one might not like to have one's own mind equally available to others. Right? Right!

*

Of course, authorities cannot squash telepathy when it spontaneously manifests among Earth's populations. But organized activities designed to research and possibly develop various forms of its functioning CAN be squashed via various subtle ways and intrigues – and, to this author's knowledge, ARE squashed.

With its sporadic and often minimal funding, parapsychology research included various kinds of so-called “paranormal” phenomena that sometimes included telepathy.

But behind the scenes of such research were narrowed eyes always alert on behalf of ensuring that telepathy research did not, in any long-term sense, benefit from funding, including funding from private sources.

Behind these already covert scenes, such narrow eyes also covertly and carefully scrutinized ALL literature about telepathy, having, if nothing else, access to media means to debunk and ridicule whatever and whoever was involved.

Secrecy MUST be maintainable – even in the face of the fact that some developed forms of it might be HELPFUL in detecting, preventing, and defeating certain dismal and egregious activities.

*

About the only instances in which telepathy is minimally tolerated involve “psychic detectives” some of whom DO assist in helping police to solve crimes, often in astonishing ways.

To avoid the telepathic issues involved, the psychic detectives are referred to merely as “psychics,” “seers,” or “clairvoyants,” even though such clairvoyants often detect the thoughts, intentions, and motives of the criminals involved.

You see, clairvoyants are supposed to “see” things, as contrasted to “reading thoughts, intentions, and motives,” these four words constituting the official parapsychological definition of TELEPATHY

*

As mentioned above, important developments with respect to telepathy have recently taken place.

After so many decades during which telepathy was socio-scientifically homeless, these developments more than suggest that telepathic research is now here to stay, albeit most probably in highly secret circumstances.

For a bit of necessary background, a full part of scientific objections to telepathy was (1) that there were no mind-brain mechanisms that could account for direct, mental mind-to-mind exchanges of information, especially of the long-distance kind; and (2) that no known medium existed through which the mental information could directly be transmitted.

Doubly damned in this way, it was thus scientifically held that telepathy was impossible, even though early psychical and parapsychological researchers had provided carefully controlled cumulative evidence that it was not impossible.

However, it WAS possible for the materialist sciences to dismiss such evidence, because science dismissed the whole of psychical and parapsychological research anyway.

*

There things stood (as they had stood for many decades), backed up by the official conviction - plus more than a little bit of desperate hope, that such mechanisms would never be discovered. For clarity, minds should not be able directly to “read” each other especially concerning secrets. And (as this author was sometimes asked) if one could not be confident of such then what COULD one be confident of. The secrecy games would never be the same.

2. CAN “IT” BE TRAINED?

Through the years this author listened to people expressing the usual conventional objections to telepathy as the ruination of secrecy, one was quite surprised that numbers of them wondered, with worried eyes and in lowered voices, if “IT” could ever be trained.

Almost everyone of course assumed that IT could not be trained, on the evidence that IT never

had demonstrated itself amenable to training.

But there was (and still is) the worrisome possibility that someone (another nation, for example) would somehow engineer such a breakthrough – placing other non-telepathic nations at some serious disadvantage.

“IT” was always referred to as an “it,” mostly, it seems, because few dared verbally to link telepathy with training, this possibility a greater horror than the mere existence of telepathy itself.

In the sense of this wonderment, “training” implied elevating IT to a higher predictable functional workability than what was visible as a result of carefully controlled experiments whose results did NOT imply much of anything along such lines.

*

It is of course possible to assume that one can’t train IT if one doesn’t know what IT is, and which assumption is a great relief when it comes to imagining what might happen if IT was somehow amenable to training.

Such assumptions are even eager to overlook (ignore) how ANYTHING gets trained.

Briefly speaking, anything that involves perceptions and motor cortex responses is trainable because the associated perceptions and motor cortex responses CAN be trained (i.e., developed, activated, enhanced, expanded, etc.).

After all, perceptions and motor cortex responses ARE known to support various kinds of ITs – sports, piano playing, etc., and if such are expanded via training then the IT-thing has more to work with, so to speak.

Indeed, even natural “gifts” benefit from the training of their associated perceptions and motor responsiveness.

In other words, one does not directly train an IT itself, but whatever perceptions and motor responses are involved can undergo training.

*

It might be necessary, of course, to find out WHAT perceptions and motor responses are ACTUALLY involved – and there is usually a great deal of confusion in this respect.

One source of such confusions is that most tend to like the IDEAS about something they have managed to come in possession of – and when an idea IS liked, there is usually some reluctance to discover, for example, that it is not entirely workable, or is not consistent with certain facts. Generally speaking, ideas are liked much more than are facts, and many ideas can get along quite well without them, thank you very much.

So what usually happens along these lines is that people try to train their IDEAS about something – especially when the IT involved remains, as it is often said, “elusive.”

And telepathy is among the most elusive of the elusive – so much so that even whatever perceptions and motor responses are involved are also elusive.

*

However, it has recently turned out that the IT is now not as elusive as it has been, because hard scientific evidence for the actual existence of IT is now in hand, more or less anyway.

3. THE NEW SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

In an effort to try to keep up with what is going on in science, this author subscribes to a few science magazines that review and synopsise new scientific activities and events.

One of these sources is SCIENCE NEWS: THE WEEKLY NEWSMAGAZINE OF SCIENCE. In its April 30, 2005 issue (Vol. 167, No. 18) appeared an article entitled “Goal-Oriented Brain Cells – Neurons may track action as a prelude to empathy.”

The first paragraph reads: “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.”

This author’s eyes bugged out upon scanning this first paragraph – because “sensing the thoughts and intentions of others” is the formal definition not of EMPATHY but of TELEPATHY.

*

Back in 1996 or thereabouts, some neuroscientists inadvertently came across a curious cluster of cells while examining the premotor cortex of one or more Macaque monkeys. Said premotor cortex is thought to be the brain area involved with “planning movements.”

It was observed that the cluster of cells fired not only when the monkey performed an action, but also fired when the monkey merely saw another monkey perform the same action.

The cells were named MIRROR NEURONS because they “reflect” the actions that monkeys observe in other monkeys.

The Italian scientists built on this earlier work “by examining how certain mirror cells respond to the intention behind the action.”

The SCIENCE NEWS article closed with “Whether people have the same kinds of mirror neurons as monkeys do ... remains unknown.”

Even so, humans and monkeys are closely related genetically. Some say that humans descended from them, or at least point up that such are our “cousins” not yet come down from trees.

*

It’s worth pointing up here that no one seems to know exactly what kinds of neurons the human brain actually has. For example, on the cover of the April 2004 issue of America’s premier science journal, the venerable SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, drew attention to that issue’s lead write-up by asking: “HAS SCIENCE MISSED HALF THE BRAIN? NEGLECTED CELLS HOLD KEYS TO THOUGHT AND LEARNING.”

“Neglected brain cells?” It would seem that no cells of the brain, as important as it is, should be “neglected.” Presumably, possibly, certainly, human mirror neurons are (were) among the neglected cells – cells that were not looked for because science had thought, even boasted, that telepathy was impossible? (Do remember, as earlier noted, that macaque mirror neurons were discovered by some incidental chance.)

Anyhow, we don’t know what half of our brains do, but the neglected half might hold some surprises when it ceases to be neglected.

*

As a brief aside, during his twenty-plus years in parapsychology and etc., this author discovered, with some few exceptions, that most parapsychologists and etc. were not interested in brains, much less their cells.

They WERE interested in “paranormal” phenomena, but only if such phenomena were amenable to experiment-testing of the kinds that yielded statistical evidence.

For example, testing for telepathy by transmitting intellectual “targets” composed of graphic images, colors, numbers, Zener card images, kooky surrealistic assemblages, etc.

The same intellectual targets were also used to test for clairvoyance, so if a given subject was successful it could not conclusively be stated whether success occurred via telepathy or clairvoyance, both conveyances usually yielding low statistical averages anyhow.

*

It could have been wondered if one’s telepathic neurons or faculties, powers or whatever, were interested in Zener card images, or colors, or target assemblages that were worse than the worst surrealistic art, so much so that they didn’t make sense.

It could have been noticed that dynamic telepathic occurrences among the raw public mostly involved something IMPORTANT, something that transcended mere intellectual targets, something often consisting of life or death events.

This was sometimes acknowledged in some parapsychology labs. But no one knew how to introduce a real life or death situation into experimental testing.

It might not be too much to think (hypothetically, of course) that dynamic telepathy, when it spontaneously occurs amongst the raw public, might belong to, well, something like a life force – rather than to intellectualizing reality boxes whose mental workings might be somewhat questionable.

In any event, it seems that telepathy is not interested in Zener cards, etc.

So, if the modern sciences have missed 50 percent of the brain, parapsychology might have missed 95 percent of telepathy.

*

Returning to mirror neurons, from other earlier not entirely dependable sources involving research elsewhere, it seems that scientists (other than the Italian ones) have discovered that the cells in the premotor cortex fired up not only with respect to actions in others, but, as a “great surprise,” also duplicated “sensations and emotions.”

Paraphrasing a little, it was soon said (by a neuroscientist at the University of California) that via the special premotor cortex neurons we are “practically in another person’s mind.”

As already mentioned, these special premotor cortex cells are now referred to as MIRROR NEURONS, because they seem to “reflect” not only physical actions, but also less tangible stuff such as sensations, emotions, and thoughts.

But there remains one outstanding, unresolved issue.

It seems that one’s mirror neurons are doing their thing all of the time, whether one is conscious of it or not. On average, most people are not consciously aware of what is going on in their mirror neurons.

So, outstanding is the issue of where, when, if, and how conscious awareness “kicks in.” Be pleased to remember this “kicks in” thing, because it seems to play a major role with respect to all forms of consciousness.

If one wants to examine more information about this topic, the Google search engine is carrying some thousands references under the heading of MIRROR NEURONS.

*

The familiar term TELEPATHY is of course totally forbidden in science and even mostly so in academia.

But this new mirror neuron scientific discovery opens up new potentials that are at least the equivalent of telepathy.

Even so, naming the premotor neurons as MIRROR NEURONS is perhaps not a bad idea - because, as will be elaborated ahead, the term TELEPATHY is almost totally useless anyway.

*

In any event, one can wonder if various kinds of research are already underway with respect to discovering more of the capacities of mirror neurons, and perhaps developing knowledge and enhancement of them.

One might bet one’s bottom dollar on this – because it is conceivable that at least eight known intelligence agencies throughout the world would like (away from public awareness) to possess these capacities for their own use - to say nothing of economic and industrial concerns, various (secret or otherwise) organizations, clubs, cults, cells, and numerous other Machiavellian whatnots.

*

There is a very specific reason for this anticipation, one that might not be understood unless it is pointed up.

With the increasing scientific discovery of various kinds of mirror neurons, telepathy has, as it were, “gone” scientific – and is thus now elevated from its former ignominious non-scientific status.

Once something has gone scientific, various worries appear with respect to who is going to develop its possible developments, and who is going competitively to use them for what?

So WE better look into this before someone else does – and gets ahead of us, to our disadvantage.

To be clear, no one is now going to treat telepathy as “unproven” and “hopefully, impossible.” IT is here to stay. So, under the concept of mirror neurons, telepathy is finally opened up – because science itself can no longer ignore it. So-called “skeptics,” dwelling in the idea that telepathy is impossible, must be slightly red-faced in the light of this development.

4. WORD TRAPS

Basically speaking, the discovery so far of mirror neurons tells us only two things – that telepathy IS possible, because specific neural receptors in the premotor cortex provide a physical

“explanation” for it.

However, mere physical evidence of something doesn't tell us all that much about how it works, or about what is further involved beyond or in addition to its physical-ness.

*

Stuff and things must of course be assigned some sort of a name-identity.

So a word for that identity comes into existence, more or less quickly followed by a definition(s) for it.

The word + definitions thus convey the IDEA of the identity so named and defined.

Thereafter, when the word is utilized we feel we have a grip on the idea – and thus assume we know what we are talking about.

If the idea-word-definitions fall into popular appeal, they thus become cast in intellectualizing cement.

*

This is all well and good, even sometimes exciting – because when, via words + definitions, one feels that one is participating in and sharing ideas, one might experience a sense of certainty about whatever is involved.

On average, specimens of the human species like a sense of certainty more than they do uncertainty.

So it sometimes doesn't matter if the IDEA was, shall we say, founded on something less than facts, but more on a nomenclature selection that seemed fashionably exciting at the time the idea first got underway.

*

There is, of course, always the bothersome problem of new facts that don't quite fit into the assumed certainty of the original idea – problems bothersome because they chip away at the assumed certainty involved.

Everyone probably has at least a little familiarity with what is done with such bothersome problems.

The assumed certainty of an idea-word-definition tends intellectually to be “protected,” if only by virtue of being cast in socio-intellectual cement, because if not, there is always the threat of inundations of uncertainty.

Once a word has achieved the status of vast socio-intellectual consensus “reality,” any challenges to its assumed authenticity are simply sidelined.

Via all of this sometimes palpable nonsense, many words become unknowing intellectual traps – in that if we do not use such and such an idea + definitions + word, it then might seem that we do not know what we are talking about.

One such word-trap is the term TELEPATHY - the idea + definitions + word of which will now be dissected.

5. THE CONCEPT-WORD “TELEPATHY” DISSECTED AND EXAMINED

One of the early reasons (in 1999) for postponing this essay on telepathy was the absence of mainstream scientifically accepted evidence for it.

Against this absence, just about anything written about telepathy could be considered as just so much vaporous hoey, at least in those “minds” wanting to consider themselves as being scientifically proper.

*

But coupled to the absence of some kind of scientific evidence, there was also a second reason. As some few researchers had noted as early as sixty years ago, any in-depth research and consideration of the assumed basic concepts upon which ideas of telepathy are founded reveals that neither the concepts nor the ideas actually fit together.

In that people, on average, do not like to have their assumptions and ideas eroded or popped by the introduction of something contrary to them, it seemed (as of 1999) that dragging through the misfitted “telepathy” situation was more or less like pissing into the wind.

*

However, “telepathy” IS a word, and words are attached to conceptual ideas, and it is via words that we think and exchange information about those concepts.

In a certain sense, words connected to words are something like a road map via which places and things are connected together so that one can both find one’s way and arrive at a specific place or location.

If the road map is incorrect, one might end up who knows where.

If words stimulate ideas and concepts, and if the ideas and concepts are not precise, or are somewhat fictitious, who knows what one’s thinking will end up as.

Well, if one is in possession of even slightly non-applicable assumptions and concepts about “telepathy,” one might end up NOT manifesting too much of it.

In other words, “telepathy” is a word, but it is ONLY a word, while the ideas and concepts upon which the word is based may be slightly or even mostly non-applicable to the phenomenon itself.

The word is only a term intellectually assigned to the phenomenon, but is NOT the thing itself.

Furthermore, the assigned term only reflects the versions of the ideas and concepts (i.e., the different realities) that the definitions identify in print and in dictionaries.

When the definitions become socially concretized, and because they are found in dictionaries, we then feel we know what we are talking about.

The only remaining problem, usually invisible, is that ALL of the facts about something are seldom known.

*

In any event, once a word has become socially concretized, it then governs the way the thing or phenomenon is intellectually to be thought about.

In other words, how the term is intellectually to be thought about is packaged in a certain way, and so people don't like to think about it in another way.

In the face of this certitude, anyone suggesting that understanding of "telepathy," for example, might benefit by moving in the direction of "a road less traveled" is likely to be confronted by a lot of blank stares, rolling eyeballs, and snide commentary about one's position just around the bend, heading in the direction of Loony Town.

*

The term TELEPATHY belongs to a collection of other words that are likewise used with the general conviction that we know what we are talking about.

Although this may be the case in a general superficial sense, words like "telepathy" have some rather tattered and incomplete conceptual packaging.

The following six examples are taken from the Oxford Dictionary of the English Language that traces words from their earliest usages in English, with definitions that at least approximate the original meanings involved.

Most words undergo evolutions of meanings. As will be seen, however, the original definitions of the following six terms have not changed all that much and are almost the same as our modernist definitions.

At about 1626, SECOND SIGHT is found in English having the definition of "A supposed power by which occurrences in the future or things at a distance are perceived as though they were actually present."

Some 300 years later, at about 1837 - SIXTH SENSE came into English usage, defined as "A supposed faculty by which a person or creature perceives facts and regulates action without the direct use of any of the five senses." (Please bear in mind this particular definition.)

1847 - CLAIRVOYANCE came into English usage taken directly from French. But in French the term was used in the context of "Keeness of mental perception, clearness of insight; insight into things beyond the range of ordinary perception." This French definition seems more or less hinged to the basic concept of wisdom.

However, in English usage, the term was given the definition of "A supposed faculty attributed to certain persons, or to persons under certain mesmeric conditions [i.e., trance conditions] consisting in the mental perception of objects at a distance or concealed from sight."

1855 - THOUGHT READING came into English usage, while THOUGHT TRANSFERENCE had appeared a bit earlier in 1822. Both concepts had the definition of "The reading of another person's thoughts; direct perception by one mind of what is passing in another, independent of ordinary means of expression or communication."

1882 - TELEPATHY came into English usage, definitions of which will be discussed just below.

*

Before doing so, however, it is worth noting that the six terms indicated above supposedly identify six DIFFERENT "supposed" powers or faculties, the supposition of which generated about a hundred years of research and experimentation attempting to discover the why and how of the supposed differences.

The general idea behind this was that if the facts of the differences could be established, then

each of the supposed powers or faculties might be cultivated into more efficiency. Well, when this writer entered as a subject into parapsychology labs in 1970, parapsychologists still could not be certain if a successful experiment was a case of telepathy, clairvoyance, sixth-sense, second-sight, or, possibly, out-of-body perception. As a partial explanation for this, it is quite easy to ascertain that people, including parapsychologists, love differences more than they do samenesses, possibly because differences are more amenable to gossip, arguments, diatribes, combats, philosophical conflicts, and other odd human whatnots.

*

One of the results of this Search for Supposed Differences was that it went completely unnoticed that the definitions of the six terms above reveal that all of them have at least one thing in common – acquisition of INFORMATION by means, faculties, or powers UNKNOWN. Such powers or faculties were not too much unknown because they were so notably known that they had at least acquired names for themselves. In fact, it should be noted that each of the six terms discussed above have numerous synonyms. It is interesting to note that some of the synonyms for each of the terms are interactive among all of the six terms discussed above – as if one synonym can stand in for others of them.

*

The principle and standard idea of TELEPATHY consists of conceptualizing it in terms of “mind-to-mind,” or, somewhat redundantly, as “mental telepathy.” So when one sees a graphic illustration of it, one is usually looking at a visual-aid set-up of two heads separated by a distance whose “minds” are supposed to be in process of interacting in unknown ways that transfer information from one to the other. The mind sending the information is usually described as the “sender,” the one receiving the information is the “receiver.” Quite imaginative, don’t you think?

*

In any event, in experiments designed to demonstrate telepathy, the two subjects involved are asked to use their “mental telepathy,” the general idea being that the sender’s mind is supposed to try sending something to the receiver whose mind is to try receiving what is being sent. With some few exceptions during the last 100 or so years, this ostensible methodology has not worked very well, if at all, but it is still the on-going standard parapsychological research concept and model. The bottom line here is that we use the concept-term TELEPATHY defined as mind-to-mind, and thereby assume we know what we are talking about. But what if telepathy was not exactly mind-to-mind, but rather consisted of stuff and things we don’t know about?

6. MOVING TELEPATHY BEYOND THE OLD MEANINGS OF THE WORD “TELEPATHY”

Most of the following discussions will depart from the rather simplistic and fruitless “mind-to-mind” rationale, so basic reasons for doing so need to be established.

This author was born in the southern part of the High Rocky Mountains in a small mining town that was left over from what at one time had been a big mining town basically with respect to discovering loads of gold and silver.

Left in impecunious circumstances after the early death of her husband, one of my grandmothers had converted her home so as to give, sometimes advancing credit, room-and-board to itinerant miners of all sorts who came to work in the left-over mine processing metals of lesser values - or independent prospectors still hoping to find golden motherloads somewhere among the local high mountain peaks.

*

This Granma had been born into extreme poverty, but nonetheless had matured into rather tough and sturdy rolling stock characteristic of most early mountaineering women who could express their declamations in both genteel and/or hard-boiled, straight-forward ways.

Physically and in manner, Granma somewhat resembled the once famous actress Marie Dressler (1869-1934) who was toughly featured in the movies “Tugboat Annie” (1932) and, a little more, but not quite, genteely in the famous “Dinner at Eight” (1933).

Granma also had a large portion of the legendary Green-Thumb thing, and a fair share of future-seeing especially when danger was forthcoming.

*

When this author was about seven or eight, two ostensible miners knocked at the door seeking room and board.

Granma took one look at them and said that the house was full up. The two retreated looking a little forlorn.

These two resembled most other mining itinerants who came and went, and the house did have beds available. So this author inquired of Granma why she had sent them on their way.

“Honey,” she replied, “types like those try to act as if they are big shits on silver platters, but they are only small turds on tin plates. They always cheat and make trouble, and always disappear before paying up what is owed.”

“But how do you know that in advance?” I asked.

“You can feel it crawling on your skin, and smell it in your nose – it’s not a smell-smell, of course, but it’s a smell anyway.”

This author has remembered this small but rather stunning discussion ever since.

About a month or so, the town’s sheriff escorted the two guys out of town for running up bills of credit. Delicious town gossip that that certain Red Light Ladies had been advancing their services on credit and the two guys could not pay up. THIS, apparently, was too much, for it was alleged that the sheriff got a kick-back from these affairs.

*

Did Granma’s perception consist of “telepathy,” a term coined in 1882, but which had not yet wended its way up into the high peaks and deep valleys of the High Rocky Mountains during this

author's childhood. Neither had the term "intuition."

"Gut-feeling" yes, perhaps with a smattering of "second sight."

This author never heard the term "telepathy" until sometime after World War II, and then only in the context of "psychological impossibility."

*

So, WAS it telepathy? Was it the "mind-to-mind" thing?

During the course of the 1960s and 1970s, an astonishing array of bio-receptors were scientifically discovered in various laboratories here and there.

All of these receptors were somewhat akin to those being called "mirror neurons" lodged in the premotor cortex.

Two enterprising authors (Robert Rivlin and Karen Gravelle) pulled together all of this receptor research, and, supported by a stunning bibliography of scientific papers, melded them in an organized fashion in their book entitled DECIPHERING THE SENSES; THE EXPANDING WORLD OF HUMAN PERCEPTION (1984).

Among the scads of receptors discussed are those lodged in the skin described as "receptors that feel the temperament of others; receptors that feel bonding or antagonism; receptors that trigger alarm and apprehension before their sources are directly sensed."

Does not this resemble the creepy-crawly skin thing, that vast numbers of human specimens sometimes experience?

Lodged in the nose are receptors that detect "pheromones, sexual receptivity, fear, love, admiration, pain in others" that "trigger sensations/perceptions of intentions, motives, and thoughts."

Is this not the smell thing, which is not a smell-smell, but a smell anyway - an affect that many also experience, although they know not how, why, or wherefrom?

*

"Telepathic experiences" are discussed on pages 196 and 211 of DECIPHERING THE SENSES, but elements of such litter almost the entire book.

However, telepathy is exclusively thought of as the "mind-to-mind" thing, against which skin-to-mind and nose-to-mind seem to have no relevance - at any rate, relevance as to how whatever is involved might be drawing information from.

Additionally, as with the outstanding problem relating to mirror neuron receptors, something depends on when, or if, "consciousness kicks in."

In other words, various kinds of one's receptors might be firing away all of the time, or at least quite often.

But if the so-called consciousness of the so-called mind-thing doesn't kick in, then one is no wiser about what receptors are firing away at than if the firing up did not take place at all.

*

As a depressing postlude to the DECIPHERING THE SENSES book, the astonishing information in it seems to have resulted in an absence of astonishing impact. The book came and went without too much ado.

One reason for this lack of popular appeal is that the book's title seems inappropriate and even boring - because what are discussed in the book are OUR SEVENTEEN SENSES - senses additional to our ordinary famous five.

But some additional small part of the reason for the book's disappearance might be that neuroscientists are primarily interested in brains, not skin or noses, while parapsychologists (who might collectively have benefited something from the book) are not even too much interested in brains, much less noses and skins.

You see, parapsychologists tend to be psychologists, or, lately, some kind of physicists – most of whom don't know what brains are doing or are up to. With some marvelous exceptions, generally speaking, brains are outside of their fields – hence outside their reality boxes, too.

Also to be noted is that many proclaimed “psychics” feel that whatever is going on doesn't even have a physical explanation. After all, if psychic perceptions are derived from some other affair transcending material physicality, then why should anyone be interested in physical factors.

(As will be commented upon later in the forthcoming Parts Two or Three, it should be granted, however, that there IS that possibility to be considered – i.e., that there are factors involved in addition to physical ones.)

*

In any event, mirror neuron receptors have now been discovered in brains - perhaps to the delight of the brain people -but perhaps not so much to those fomenting and guarding SECRETS that could now be vulnerable via mirroring thoughts, intentions, and motives of others.

So one of the first essential problems about telepathy has now been at least partially answered – i.e., that the actual existence of “telepathy” has actually been confirmed in more than just argumentative theory – as well as scads of other bio-receptors distributed throughout the ORGANIC electro-chemical physical body.

See that term ORGANIC? Be pleased, if possible, to retain it in it your memory banks.

*

Now, it is necessary to dissect the past definitions of TELEPATHY.

The EOP, i.e., THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF OCCULTISM AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY (1978), has a quite long essay under the heading of TELEPATHY – from which certain sections will now be quoted below and ahead.

“ Of the various branches of psychic phenomena there is none which engages more serious attention at the present day [i.e, at about 1900] than telepathy or thought transference.

“ The idea of intercommunication between BRAIN AND BRAIN [emphasis added], by other means other than the ordinary sense channels, is a theory deserving of the most careful consideration, not only in its simple aspect as a claimant for recognition as an important scientific fact, but also because there is practically no department of psychic phenomena on which it does not have bearing.”

*

This definition is somewhat of an embellishment over what seems to be the original one proposed by Frederick William Henry Myers (1843-1901), one of the principal founders (in

1882) of the Psychical Research Society in London, His definition reads: “The communication of impressions of any kind FROM ONE MIND TO ANOTHER [emphasis again added] independently of recognized [the five physical] channels of sense.”

Via these two definitions of TELEPATHY, we can perceive that mind-to-mind and brain-to-brain began to be linked at some point between 1882 and 1900, and are still so linked today.

7. MIND?

To proceed further, it is important to somewhat comprehend what is meant by MIND, and seeking to achieve that comprehension is something of a challenge. One can read numerous books on psychology, of course, but all one will end up with is more understanding about psychology within whose contexts “mind” is not very well understood as such.

So it is more interesting simply to trace the dictionary definitions of MIND.

To begin with, the Oxford Dictionary presents some twenty-eight definitions of the term, each definition being accompanied by three to five distinctive nuances – more or less making up a total of eighty-four plus definitions or partial ones.

MYND (probably taken from some early Indo-European source) is found in English at about 1000 at which time it principally referred to “memory, remembrance, recollection, commemoration, commemorative.”

In a lesser, secondary sense, it also referred to “The state or action of thinking about something, as in thought of an object; to have in mind, to give heed to.” For obscure reasons, this early definition was declared Obsolete.

At about 1200, however, MIND was being referred to as “The cognitive or intellectual powers, as distinguished from will and emotions.”

1297 – “Purpose or intention; desire or wish.” Also declared Obsolete for reasons unstated.

1340 – “Mental or psychical being, or faculties thereof.”

1400 – “That which a person thinks about any subject or question; one’s view, judgment, or opinion.”

*

With one principal exception, combinations of these early definitions, including the Obsolete ones, still mostly constitute the gist of how MIND is defined today.

The exception has to do with the introduction of the term CONSCIOUSNESS into the mix, a term that was not in English much before 1681, and then with the principal definition of “the recognition by the thinking subject of its own acts or affections; the faculty of being conscious, as a condition and concomitant of all thought, feeling, and volition.”

The reference to “being conscious” refers, in general, to being conscious OF whatever one is in the awake state or condition, possibly including being conscious OF dreams, etc., while in the sleep or in a trance condition. So, the correct appellation here would not refer to consciousness per se, but of conscious-of-ness in the awake condition.

*

The reason for this slight correction is that the “State of Consciousness” was proposed and generally accepted after about 1805 - after which the State of Consciousness was increasingly described as the whole, innate existence of consciousness within which many separate forms based on conscious-of-ness can arise, disappear, shift, change, modulate, etc., and do so whether one is awake or not.

As many observed, “we know not” what the innate State of Consciousness is. Such is more or less STILL being said of it as this essay is being composed now in 2005. (See, for example: SHADOWS OF THE MIND: A SEARCH FOR THE MISSING SCIENCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS (1994), by Roger Penrose.) Back in 1866, the then renowned British biologist Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895) also pointed up “that what consciousness is, we know not; and how it is that anything so remarkable as a state of consciousness comes about as the result of irritating nervous tissue, is just as unaccountable as the appearance of the Djinn when Aladdin rubbed his lamp, or as is any other ultimate fact of nature.”

Going back a few years earlier than Huxley, the still famous British economist John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) had noted (in his A SYSTEM OF LOGIC (1843), that “Mind is the mysterious something that thinks and feels.”

Between Huxley’s and Mill’s comments, we today really don’t know much more about consciousness and mind, excepting a few transient details the importance of which is vague – although a great deal is now known about the brain and sensory receptors.

*

In any event, at some point after the term “consciousness” had become present in English, the Oxford offered up the following definitions of MIND.

- (1) The Seat of a person’s consciousness;
 - (2) Memory;
 - (3) Thoughts, volitions, and feelings;
 - (4) The system of cognitive and emotional phenomena and powers that constitutes the subjective being of a person;
 - (5) Also, the incorporeal subject of the psychical faculties,
 - (6) The spiritual part of a human being; the soul as distinguished from the body.
- To these definitions (or descriptions) it would now be necessary to add:
- (7) The discovered existence of thousands of kinds of cellular receptors, now including mirror neurons lodged in the premotor cortex;
 - (8) The subliminal systems constituting the subconscious;
 - (9) The superliminal systems constituting the lesser known superconscious;
 - (10) And a selection among the historical eighty plus definitions of MIND, including those that imply transcendental elements.

If these ten brief definitions do partially establish what MIND consists of, the next question is how, or whether, the ten elements work harmoniously together to produce what is fondly referred to as “mental clarity” – which is something one would like to have possession of when telepathically attempting to connect up to thoughts and intentions of others.

There are occasions when some few of the specimens of the human species cannot even telepathically connect up to their own thoughts and intentions. This is at least one basis for considering, hypothetically of course, that MIND might not have mental clarity all of the time, but could at least partially exist as a confusion of rather entangled neural networks.

*

Now, to get back to TELEPATHY itself, defined as mind-to-mind thought transference. Well, it does take two minds or two brains to “interact” so as to communicate “impressions of any kind from or between one mind to another independently of recognized [the five physical] channels of sense.”

So, in this sense we have TWO interacting minds, let us say Mind A and Mind B, both being thought of as independent of each other.

Might we not think that Mind A is in possession of its versions of the ten elements laboriously listed above?

Might we not think that Mind B is in possession of its own versions of same?

If so, might we not dare to think that the Mind A and the Mind B versions might be different, differently arranged, ordered, or disordered, differently constituted, differently founded upon different intellectual and awareness thresholds, and other such whatnots?

One doesn't want to consider that these A and B versions of minds might be quite messy, because such is often all too obvious anyway.

And, as earlier mentioned, there is the issue of whether or not consciousness “kicks in” relevant to any telepathic interaction – meaning that although the brains involved might interact with this or that telepathic thing, mind-consciousness itself might not “kick in” – this in turn implying that brains and their associated receptors might be doing their thing, but consciousness is out to lunch.

In general, it CAN sometimes be observed that lots of consciousnesses are out to lunch most of the time – including those consciousnesses that opined that telepathy is solely, exclusively, and specifically a mind-to-mind affair.

8. THOUGHT - THE NATURE OF?

Although few take note of it, the concept of TELEPATHY as the mind-to-mind thing carries within it the earlier concept of thought transference - in that it is thought that thoughts are manufactured in the mind-thing.

This is taken so much for granted that any other ideas about it can seem alien. and welcome doormats for such ideas might be replaced by no trespassing advisories.

*

In any event, discussions about the nature of THOUGHT are almost totally absent in the parapsychological literature about telepathy.

So the EOD does not have a special entry for it, although there are entries for Thought-Reading, Thought-Transference, Thought Vibrations - Theory of, Thoughtforms, and Thoughtography otherwise known as Psychic Photographs.

*

The term THOUGHT was in Old English very early at about 839, and, according to the Oxford dictionary, carried the various definitions of:

“ The action or process of thinking;

“ Mental action or activity in general, especially that of the intellect;;
“ Exercise of the mental faculty;
“ Formation or arrangement of ideas in the mind.”

Twentieth-century definitions of the noun were briefly given as:

- (1) The action or process of thinking - cogitation;
- (2) Serious consideration;
- (3) Recollection;
- (4) Reasoning power;
- (5) The power to imagine, conceptualize;
- (6) Something that is thought;
- (7) An individual act or product of thinking;
- (8) Intention, plan;
- (9) Opinion, belief;
- (10) The intellectual product or the organized views and principles of a period, place, group, or individual;
- (11) A slight amount of.

Only one synonym is given: IDEA

*

The early 839 and the later twentieth-century definitions more or less resemble each other, although the modern definition is slightly more detailed – with the result that both sets of definitions give the idea that one knows what one is talking about, right?

The New Columbia Encyclopedia (1975) has apparently not found it necessary or useful to have an entry for THOUGHT, although it does have one for THOUGHT READING whereby one is directed to SEE TELEPATHY – which is briefly defined as “apparent communication [of information] between two persons without recourse to the [physical] senses.”

“ Two persons?” Presumably this refers to two persons each having MIND and THOUGHT without which the persons probably would not be enabled to thought-recognize themselves, much less others.

*

Anyhow, referring back to the eleven modernist definitions of THOUGHT, the contexts of the mind-to-mind thing presuppose that thoughts, such as intentions, in one’s MIND are

- (1) pristine and crystal clear enough that they
- (2) can be transferred to
- (3) another mind and
- (4) arrive in such other mind in a condition pristine and crystal clear
- (5) which other mind itself must be in a condition of pristine and crystal clarity
- (6) in order for this whole thing to be conducted in circumstances that are pristine and crystal clear from the start-up.

This seems to be asking for a whole lot, in that at least some minds are not, in the first place, characterized by too much pristine and crystal clarity of thoughts - even to the thinker who is thinking them in what passes for such thinker’s mind morass.

*

Most modern dictionaries give about twenty-one distinct qualitative definitions for THINK. If one reads through them, it becomes possible to wonder how thoughts of one kind can be distinguished from other kinds – except thoughts concerning the most mundane matters, such as disposing of the garbage – which some few are not very good at, anyway. In any event, it seems that certain kinds of thinking result in “forms” in the mind; other kinds result in mental image pictures; yet other kinds result in reflecting, in TRYING to center one’s thoughts; other kinds result in devising opinions, judgments, ideas, plans via deduction, inference, and imagination. Thus, if one chances to telepathically recognize a thought-intention, there remains the difficulty of determining whether it merely consists of an opinion, judgment, idea, plan, deduction, inference, or imagination. Is this not a mess?

9. TELE – PATHY EXAMINED

After sort of summarizing the mind-to-mind, thought-to-thought comedy (or fiasco?), it is finally appropriate to mention that the term “telepathy” CANNOT be translated into any language as “mind-to-mind.”

Whether Frederick Myers understood this or not when he coined the term back about 1882 cannot be determined now.

But in constructing the term he certainly knew he was loosely attaching together two Greek words – TELE meaning “distance; at a distance; over a distance,” and SYM-PATHY.

*

Back in 1882, there may have been a slightly socio-scientific context involved, in that the phenomena under discussion had for a longish time been known as “thought-transference over distance,” during which “thought” had been assumed to be the principal activity of the mind morass.

Behind this socio-scientific context, Alexander Graham Bell’s version of the telephone had been patented and demonstrated in 1876.

The term “telephone” is drawn from the term PHONIC defined as “of, or related to, or producing sound; of, or relating to, the sounds of speech.”

So TELE-PHONE was defined as “an instrument for reproducing sounds (speech) at a distance.” In this sense, TELE was entirely scientific, and so it quickly became a sort of scientific rage that inspired quite a number of TELE-prefixed words.

*

In the sense that TELEPATHY was first used, TELE was prefixed to another Greek term, PATHY, itself drawn from the Greek PASCHEIN that translates into English as PATHOS, and refers to “undergoing experiencing, to undergo suffering emotions and feeling.”

In this context, however, “undergo” did not, in the negative sense, exclusively refer to “suffering,” but instead “to partake of; “to pass through experiencing” of something.

The negative contexts of PATHY are drawn from another Greek term, PATHES, which DOES refer to suffering as painfully suffering.

*

The English term SYMPATHY was derived from the Greek SYMPATHEIA and the later Latin SYMPATHIA, both derived from SYN + PATHOS.

SYN- (or SYM-) is the GREEK prefix for “with, together with,” which, in English, refers to “with; along with; together with; at the same time with; to bring or experience together with.”

In English, however, SYMPATHY seems mostly to have been thought of as something vocalized or expressed at funerals or wakes, even if only sent via mail in the form of somber greeting cards.

But even this English connotation does have an earlier, and more informative, history.

*

SYMPATHY entered English at about 1579 and which had the rather remarkable definition of “A (real or supposed) affinity between certain things, by virtue of which they are similarly or correspondingly affected by the same influence or affect, or influence each other (especially in some occult way), or attract or tend toward each other.”

By 1596, another definition has formed up: “Conformity of feelings, inclinations, or temperament which makes persons agreeable to each other; community of feeling; harmony of disposition.”

This seems to reflect “birds of a similar feather flock together.”

It was not until about 1600 that the term took on the familiar definition of “The quality or state of being affected by the sorrow or suffering of another.”

*

However, at about 1662, SYMPATHY was defined as “The quality or state of being affected by the condition of another with a feeling similar or corresponding to that of the other; the fact or capacity of entering into or sharing the feelings of another or others. Also, a feeling or frame of mind evoked by and responsive to some external influence.”

As of about the 1980s, modern definitions for SYMPATHY were being given as:

- (1) Feelings, emotions, experience – more at PATHOS.
- (2) An affinity, association, or relationship between persons or things wherein whatever affects one similarly affects the other;
- (3) Mutual or parallel susceptibility or condition brought about by it;
- (4) Unity or harmony in action or effect;
- (5) Inclination to think or feel alike – intellectual or emotional accord;
- (6) The act or capacity of entering into or sharing the feelings or interests of another – the feeling or mental state brought about by such sensitivity;
- (7) The correlation existing between two bodies capable of communicating their VIBRATIONAL ENERGY [emphasis added] to one another through some medium.

*

Before dissecting and examining the above, we should take the time to note the following dictionary (not occult) definitions for:

SYMPATHETIC VIBRATIONS: A vibration produced in one body by the vibrations of exactly the same period in a neighboring body.

SYMPATHETIC NERVOUS SYSTEM: Autonomic nervous system; a part of the vertebrate nervous system that governs involuntary actions.

AUTONOMIC: Acting independently of volition.

*

Please now redirect your attention to the seventh modernist definition of SYMPATHY noted above, i.e., “The correlation existing between two bodies capable of communicating their vibrational energy to one another through some medium.”

In this respect it might be pointed out, if only hypothetically, that if capacities for such kind of “communicating” did not innately exist in the human species, then such communicating would never be experienced in any way, and thus would never become a topic of wonderment or debate, much less one of direct experiencing.

The EOP does not have an entry for SYMPATHY. Neither do the following major sources summing up parapsychological research:

PARAPSYCHOLOGY: SOURCES OF INFORMATION (1973), Compiled under the auspices of the American Society for Psychical Research (1973).

ESP RESEARCH TODAY: A STUDY OF DEVELOPMENTS IN PARAPSYCHOLOGY SINCE 1960, by J. Gaither Pratt. (1973).

PARAPSYCHOLOGY: NEW SOURCES OF INFORMATION, 1973-1989, compiled by Rhea A. White (1990).

It therefore seems that sympathy, apparently a major ingredient in all kinds of sensitivities (certainly telepathic sensitivities), has not been considered very deeply in psychical or parapsychological research.

*

The sixth definition of SYMPATHY quoted above is given as “The act or capacity of entering into or sharing the feelings or interests of another – the feeling or mental state brought about by such sensitivity.”

*

The term EMPATHY entered English via German after it was coined, in German, in 1912, EINFUHLUNG (in + FUHLUNG) - (which literally translates into English as “in + feeling”) – the German term defined as “The power of entering into the feeling-experiences of or understanding of objects or emotions outside ourselves.”

A German by the name of Lipps leaned on this definition to describe “The theory that the appreciation of a work of art depends upon the capacity of the spectator to project his personality into it.”

*

As already mentioned, it is interesting to note that the EOP, and other parapsychology sources, does NOT have an entry for EMPATHY.

EOP likewise does NOT have an entry for FEELING – although it does have an entry for SENSITIVE, but only in relation to MEDIUMS, some of which, as is admitted in psychical and parapsychological research, have been quite good at TELEPATHY.

If, in desperation, one consults the authoritative NEW COLUMBIA ENCYCLOPEDIA (1975), one's desperation will remain desperate – for there is no entry for EMPATHY therein.

*

can drive one to consult little known and unpopular sources (even among parapsychologists), among which is HANDBOOK OF PARA-PSYCHOLOGY (1977), edited by Benjamin B. Wolman.

Therein, on page 875, we can finally find an entry for EMPATHY, described as:

“The ability to perceive the mood and feelings of another person and the understanding of the feelings, sufferings, and situation of another person without those feelings being communicated by words.

“Moreover, empathy encompasses communication across large distances: thus it borders on and often transgresses the borders of ESP.”

On page 878 appears the added comment that “Both empathy and telepathy are instances of TRANSFER of psychological elements such as emotional states, perceptions, thoughts and so on, but such a transfer is facilitated by the particular somatopsychic or psychosomatic nature of the individual concerned.”

*

SOMATO-SOMATIC CELL refers to “one of the cells of the body that compose the tissues, organs, nervous system, neural networks, and parts of the individual other than the germ cells.” As earlier discussed, mirror neurons have been discovered in the premotor cortex, which is just one of the organs, or parts, of the individual other than germ cells. Unless other reasons are to be discovered, it is fair to speculate that mirror neurons respond via some kind of empathic contact with others.

So also, it seems, do skin cell receptors, nose receptors, and quite a number of receptor cells throughout the whole body discussed in DECIPHERING THE SENSES referred to earlier.

Alas! No one knows what empathy is or consists of, at least insofar as discovering its technological mechanisms, much less why consciousness sometimes does or does not “kick in” about it.

However, those who sense vibrations, better known as “vibes,” probably do realize that they are in something like a condition or state of IN + FUHLUNG with what they are sensing.

In English, this “something” might be defined as IN + WITH + PARTICIPATION with what they are sensing.

*

This may be one reason as to why empathy is not too popular – because some vibes as well as some minds can be quite yucky, etc., and so forth.

Simply put, people don't like to experience those empathic-feelings that they don't like – which might bring about a lot of closure with respect to empathic experiencing.

The only exceptions seem to be those stalwart types (most often women) who successfully become empathic-clairvoyant-ESP-telepathic-time-traveling psychic detectives - which they of course could not become if they wilted at the first skin-crawl of the usually ugly events they are invited to empathically inspect and sort out.

(NOTE: As this essay was finally being sorted out during 2005, there was a short-lived production about psychic detectives recently at work with police detectives – on cable, but five amazing episodes were on prime time. Utterly fascinating, and worth tracking down if possible. During the 1970s, the very impressive Dorothy Allison gained much media attention for helping police solve difficult cases, and, as well, the remarkable Robyn Jameison, Jeanne Borgen, and Joe Morgan who did likewise. Among others, more recent PSI detectives are the astonishing Nancy Myers and Noreen Renier. Check the Internet for these names; also See: *A MIND FOR MURDER: THE REAL-LIFE FILES OF A PSYCHIC INVESTIGATOR* by Noreen Renier (Berkeley Books, 2005). The deeper empathic-telepathic implications of this PSI detective situation will be considered more deeply in Parts Two and Three.)

*

Meanwhile, there is no entry for EMPATHY in the official 1987 DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS (DSM-III-R) published by the American Psychiatric Association, and no entry for TELEPATHY either.

But there is an entry for EMPATHY in the PSYCHIATRIC DICTIONARY (Fifth Edition, 1981), edited by Robert J. Campbell, M.D.

“EMPATHY: Putting oneself into the psychological frame of reference of another, so that the other person's thinking, feeling, and acting are understood and, to some extent, predictable.”

Also, “the ability to accompany another to wherever the other person's feelings lead him, no matter how strong, deep, destructive, or abnormal they may seem.”

There is also a brief reference to EMPATHIC – “the organism's primary feeling-motivation and response.” (Please note that here we finally encounter FEELING + MOTIVATION, this latter term appearing, along with “thinking,” in association with the definition of telepathy – i.e., thoughts, motivation.”

10. THE TELEPATHIC-EMPATHIC “BOBO” EVENT

In the context of empathy, reference is now made to “strong, deep, destructive, or abnormal” in connection with “empathic participation.”

To get into this rather yucky type of thing, it can be told that back in the mid-1970s this author was acquainted with a quite wealthy Wall Street type whose wonderful wife was deeply into parapsychology stuff.

They entertained lavishly, and among their numerous dinner guests were writers, scientists, politicians, etc., including various police commissioners and noted detectives with whom the use of “psychics” to help solve crimes was often discussed.

*

At the time there was a certain individual who seemed to have tested well in some simple, even silly, clairvoyant experiments, and it had somehow been decided to see if he might be able to give clairvoyant tips about crimes.

Because by then I knew a lot about how experiments should be designed and conducted, I was called upon to witness (and oversee) a few meetings between three police detectives and the individual who had tested well in the clairvoyance experiments.

The whole affair was to be strictly off the records, and, in any event, the clairvoyant individual involved refuses to have his name mentioned, so we will give him the alias of BoBo.

I would not narrate the following because it is anecdotal and there are no records to support it. But what is narrated is quite consistent with what most other psychic detectives report experiencing, and which reports today do have police verification.

*

The drill with BoBo was this: The detectives (identified by fake names) were interested in gaining information about unsolved or difficult crimes.

It was agreed that the detectives should bring photographs (only five) of possible suspects, present them face down on a table, whereupon BoBo the clairvoyant, without touching the photos, would say whatever he would say.

BoBo would be given no other information, and the detectives were to be seated, told to not move, and to keep their mouths shut in case they inadvertently gave some kind of clue.

Of course, BoBo understood that some kind of crime was at issue, or the detectives would not be interested.

*

In the first session, the cops carefully laid out five photos face down, then sat and kept their mouths shut.

BoBo was seated in a chair placed at a distance from the photos so that he could not touch them, or wave his hands over them. He did not close his eyes, and almost immediately indicated that “Crime is somehow involved here, but there is no crime, so what are you’al doing here?”

The five photos were of five cops, including one commissioner, none of whom seemed covertly involved in any kind of crime.

This, of course, was an unscheduled test, one that had not been agreed upon. BoBo was a little pissed, but the detectives seemed pleased.

*

At the next session, some days later, the same detectives again put five face-down photos on the table.

BoBo surveyed them from the same distance, but this time took a little longer before he commented.

Then: “Well, the thoughts here are complicated . . . “ A few moments passed. Then: “But this involves a bank robbery in broad daylight where someone withdrew a large amount of money that was handed to him in a paper bag, went outside, took a taxi to Brooklyn where the cab was held up while waiting at a red light. The only thing taken was the paper bag with the money in

it.”

Everyone looked quite bewildered, including myself. The whole story in practically one or two breaths!

BoBo continued: “The photos are not of the robbers involved, nor of the man who was robbed. The fourth photo from the left is of one of the bank’s employees, a male, who arranged the job, so it was basically an inside piece of work.”

*

This time, the detectives, their faces rather flushed, didn’t seem too pleased, and one of them complained that “Because of the amount of money involved, we have checked out all of the bank’s employees.”

BoBo didn’t wilt, merely saying “Well, you better check again.”

We never learned the outcome of this, but the detectives did come back for more. They wouldn’t have done so if they had thought BoBo was delivering nonsense.

*

So, about two or three weeks later, the detectives were back again, this time with six face-down photos.

BoBo sat and began his scrutiny with his usual calm indifference, but took a little longer before he said anything, sort of shifting this way and that in his chair.

“ This is about a missing person, the second card from the right (pause). Can I see him?”

So he was shown – but still did not touch the card. “Yes,” BoBo said, “that’s him. He seems to have been an important police informant about some important investigation underway.”

One of the detectives: “...seems to HAVE BEEN?”

“ Oh, yes, he’s already dead, about a week or ten days ago, I’d say. . . . it was over in New Jersey, outside of Trenton to the north a little.

“ They beat the shit out of him, but he wouldn’t talk, they took a hacksaw and sawed off his left foot. He fainted.

“ They then strangled him with a piece of narrow wire that cut through.

“ His face turned blue.

“ They threw him and his severed foot in the trunk of an old green car and drove him away.”

Silence.

Then: “Where did they go?”

“ Oh, that,” BoBo responded with tears in his eyes. “The green car is left abandoned in the parking lot of (deleted) raceway.

It’ll be discovered soon, because the body has already begun to stink.”

About a week later, we were told that the stinking car had been found, and that the detectives, now thoroughly impressed, had another “task.”

*

BoBo, however, was a somewhat hysterical wreck. “I can’t get the bloody brutal thoughts of the killers and pictures out of my head - especially the sawing off part, the smell of the bone, blood, the agony of the guy, my skin again and again crawls with his fear and pain. God Damn! I can

hardly sleep, every time I close my eyes there's that FOOT dangling. Even drink doesn't help. I've had to get pills."

About two weeks later, "Well, I'm a bit better now, but let the cops train their own clairvoyants, and let them be forensic specialists who are used to this kind of shit."

So, that was the end of BoBo's clairvoyant detecting – after only three tries at it.

*

Clairvoyance? Or was it telepathic, or, perhaps empathic? Whatever it was, it was clearly WITH IT + PARTICIPATORY – completely in keeping with, to paraphrase a little, "Putting oneself into an empathic-telepathic-somatic-psychological frame of reference so as to participate in (i.e., "mirror") another person's feelings, no matter how strong, deep, destructive, or abnormal they may be."

*

Poor BoBo. At the time, neither he nor I knew that his empathic-clairvoyance was "wide open." Myself, I had to find out about this kind of thing some years later, albeit in an entirely different way.

But this led to the understanding that telepathic-empathic connectivity can be closed, can be partially open, be lukewarm, or openly "hot" upon special occasions – especially in the contexts of sensing threatening dangers whether their sources are consciously perceived or not perceived. If one reads enough of the literature about experienced instinct, gut-feeling, intuition, and insight, it might dawn that these phenomena are mostly characterized by some kind of vibrational empathy, more so than by conscious intellectual deduction – which is not a bad thing if it correctly accompanies the vibrational empathy.

But most experiencers of instinct, gut-feeling, intuition, and insight usually say that they have no intellectual idea of what is involved, or how any of this comes about.

So the presence of conscious intellectual deduction usually does not accompany those forms of vibrational empathy.

*

This is perhaps why such real experiences have been excluded from versions of telepathy focused only in the mind-to-mind scenario in which thoughts, intentions, and motives ARE considered as intellectually conscious constructions formatted within the contexts of the swampy mind-thing, and within whatever a given mind-thing is utilizing as its reality box.

In any event, mind-to-mind telepathy can also be closed, or be lukewarm, or, on some occasions, be "hot."

The lukewarm versions of telepathy are what usually show up under parapsychological testing, usually with lukewarm results that measure in the 0.5 to 1.5 percent ratio.

These have been, and still are, interpreted as "suggestive" of telepathy, not as complete evidence of it – much to the relief of those having minimal or major secrets to conceal.

11. INTELLECTUAL VS ORGANIC TELEPATHY

As already tiresomely emphasized, TELEPATHY is a term intellectually and vividly associated with “mind-to-mind thought-transference” – and that is the beginning and end of that concept. The “mind-thought” thing has long been established as a conscious intellectual affair that emanated from the elusive Seat of intelligence located somewhere in the brain-mind thing, (although no one seems to have located that Seat for sure).

It is additionally thought that INTELLECT produces thinking, meaning that if Intellect were absent in our species, there would be no thinking of thoughts.

It is from INTELLECT that the term INTELLECTUAL is derived, one of the definitions of which is given as “Developed or chiefly guided by the intellect rather than by EMOTION or EXPERIENCE.” (Emphasis added.)

Thus, intellectual thinking and affairs can take place in the absence of emotions or experience, so many vistas of this and that can be intellectually-mind-established that are completely out of touch with experience that might significantly modify those non-experienced vistas.

Furthermore, the intellectualized vista of TELEPATHY incorporates only four, largely superficial, basic factors, i.e., the two thought-minds involved, the intervening distance between them, and the transference of thoughts over or through that distance.

Thus, if something transmitted across the intervening distance cannot be recognized as a mind-thought thing, it is then not thought of as telepathy.

This is not to say that such cannot occur, because it sometimes (rarely, it seems) does.

*

As a shift in conceptual venue, EMOTION is defined as “Feeling – the affective aspect of consciousness; a psychic and physical reaction subjectively experienced as a strong feeling and physiologically involving changes that prepare the body for immediate vigorous action.”

As indicated in the definition of INTELLECTUAL, intellectual affairs can proceed in the absence of experience or EMOTION, the implication being that intellectuality doesn't particularly need to feel anything or have a basis of experiential understanding.

Thus, intellectual telepathy is expected to proceed without experiential and emotional stuff mucking up the process. The transmission of thought alone will do – IF the sender and receiver are up to snuff in recognizing thoughts coming and going from one mind morass to another.

*

As will extensively be discussed in Part Two forthcoming (one of these days), it is quite well understood (in the advancing brain studies area) that unless something is somehow FELT, it will not register in consciousness or in the so-called mind.

But meanwhile, attention is drawn to that part of the definition that refers to “changes that prepare the BODY for immediate vigorous action.”

The principle definition of BODY is given as “The organized physical substance of an animal or plant whether living or dead; the living or dead organism.”

ORGANISM is defined as “A complex structure of interdependent and subordinate elements whose relations and properties are largely determined by their function in the whole; an individual constituted to carry on the activities of life by means of organs separate in function but mutually interdependent.”

The term ORGANIC refers to anything “of, relating to, or arising in a bodily organ.”

It is now to be noted that an organic bodily organ cannot feel anything unless it is somehow organically stimulated to do so – and in order to be organically stimulated it has to possess some kind of organic “equipment” that organically recognizes, responds, or reacts to such organic stimulating.

This “organic equipment” has historically been referred to as the physical senses, which were thought to consist of five, and only five.

But with the increasing discovery of vast numbers of cellular receptors throughout the human bio-body, it is more apparent than ever that we have more organic senses than just the obvious physical five.

This can be phrased in a different way. We have more organic MICRO-senses than just the traditional MACRO-five, and it has become clear that various micro-senses detect kinds of information that the macro-five do not.

It is also somewhat understood that information, acquired via the macro-five, more or less feed directly into appropriate parts of the brain organs - at least when one is in a clearly awake, hopefully conscious, condition, during which what is perceived via the macro-five can intellectually be thought about.

This is all more or less straightforward and understandable. But it is also apparent that if our organic systems had to wait until something could intellectually be thought about in the awake condition, then the organic systems would be much stressed – or, perhaps, wouldn't work at all.

*

The foregoing is probably difficult to grasp – unless it is put into some kind of order, even if only hypothetically so.

1. Organic systems exist;
2. Organic systems continue to exist only because they are systems whose elements work together to form the whole of them;
3. To exist, organic systems must have numerous sensory receptors that are stimulated by various kinds of information;
4. To continue to exist, organic systems must have organic ways and means of processing information incoming from a possibly wide variety of its sensory receptors;
5. The most natural, and logical, basis for this is development of a central nervous systems that collects receptor information and forwards it to what passes as its brain;
6. The developed brain is usually sectioned into various groups of synapses and neurons each of which are dedicated to dealing with certain categories or types of information;
7. The whole of the foregoing so far must work automatically, so central nervous systems must have functioning counterparts we refer to as non-conscious, non-volitional autonomic response systems.

*

AUTONOMIC is defined as “Acting independently of volition, i.e., reflexive; acting spontaneously without depending on volitional thought.”

VOLITION is defined as “The [conscious] act of making a choice or decision; the power of choosing or determining.”

Volitional activity requires some kind of conscious thinking, and which is the putative chief

function of mind, those two morasses that have laboriously been detailed earlier.

The way one's life is intellectually lived might depend on volitional activity based on whatever is being filtered through what passes for efficiency within the two morasses.

But one's very physical existence depends on the efficiency of one's organic autonomic nervous system, that very system that does whatever it does "independently of volition" - which is to say, in the absence of being volitionally conscious of it intellectually..

It is usually assumed that it is the intellectual thinking mind that telepathically detects thoughts, emotions, and intentions of others. It is quite possible that the mind sometimes actually succeeds in doing this, but the average hit rate is also acknowledged as being quite low.

On the other hand, as but two examples, the organ referred to as the skin has receptors that organically feel emotions and intentions of others; the organic nose has organic receptors that smell emotions and intentions of others.

But this is neither acknowledged nor referred to as telepathy, and won't ever be - unless the existence of intellectual telepathy AND organic telepathy is acknowledged.

It seems that the only two real differences between the two are:

(1) that organic telepathy that is somatically felt via the impulses of the autonomic nervous system is more likely to "kick in;"

(2) while intellectual telepathy is less involved with autonomic impulses, but more involved with what is being mentally calculated within the mind-morass.

More simply put, here is the important distinction between "felt" and "thought."

In the larger picture of all things, it is quite well known that specimens of the human species can undergo various kinds of mental calculations without feeling too much of anything.

Based upon a lot of evidence voiced by numerous telepathic experiencers, "Mental calculation alone does not a telepath make.

"TO BE CONTINUED AS PART TWO UNDER THE
GENERAL HEADING OF
" THE PROBLEM OF CONSCIOUSNESS KICKING-IN"

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 FOREWORD

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 which 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."

EXPERIENTIAL 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 or 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) (1) That their reality existence within our species has been noted in all cultures from time immemorial; and
- (2) (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 or 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) (1) to any sensitivities that cannot be attributed to the five physical senses;
- (2) (2) to any sensitivities that transcend whatever is passing for conscious reason and logic based only on the restrictions of material objectivity;
- (3) (3) to any sensitivities that transcend the materialistic understanding of matter, energy, space, and time; and
- (4) (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 or 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) (1) There were no brain-mind mechanisms that could account for direct, mental mind-to-mind exchanges of information especially of the long-distance kind; and
- (2) (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. **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 or distant 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) (1) Temporary intellectualisms come and go, and thus are characterized by impermanency;
- (2) (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 notwithstanding.

*

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) (1) Teachers transfer to their students only the information they are supposed to, while learners receive that information the best they can;
- (2) (2) Information that conflicts with what is taught and learned is discouraged and not taught;
- (3) (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) (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) (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 THOUGHT 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 Bhuvanloka mess.

Indeed, it would seem that if rudimentary Siddhis awaken, but remain entangled with the Bhuvanloka 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 off 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 hoey 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 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 SENSITIVITIES 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 motoneuron, 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 it seems that progress is being made in discovering what has NOT been known about it.

As already mentioned, 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, modicum 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) (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) (2) That sensing systems transcending the physical ones have processed relevant information and "attained clear ideas and conclusions" about it, and -
- (3) (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 as 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 AWARENESS 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.

(Superpowers of the Human Biomind)

A PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

OF SCIENTIFIC AND OTHER SOURCES

CONTAINING

SIGNIFICANT CLUES FOR RESEARCH

AND DEVELOPMENT OF REMOTE VIEWING

AT STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE 1972-1985

Ingo Swann

DURING the period between 1972-1985, remote-viewing research and testing was aided by numerous researchers, consultants and thousands of experiments conducted under the auspices of ever-present oversight committees of various kinds.

But there is a tendency to forget that the research was also aided by hundreds of published scientific and other documents that enabled fresh insights and approaches to the complicated phenomena involved, as well as aiding in discovery of factors for which there was no historical precedent.

Important sources continued to emerge after 1985, and a significant sample of these will ultimately be included as time marches on (as it decidedly insists on doing). As more sources are recovered from various archives, they will be included in undated versions of this beginning one.

1880

Dessoir, Max: EXPERIMENTS IN MUSCLE-READING AND THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE.
Proc. S.P.R., Vol. 4, 1886.

Richet, Charles: FURTHER EXPERIMENTS IN HYPNOTIC LUCIDITY OR
CLAIRVOYANCE. Proc. S.P.R., Vol. 6, 1889.

Schmoll, Anton: EXPERIMENTS IN THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE. Proc. S.P.R., Vol. 4,
1887.

Schmoll, Anton and J.E. Mabire: EXPERIMENTS IN THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE. Proc.
S.P.R., Vol. 5, 1888.

1890

Rawson, Henry G.: EXPERIMENTS IN THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE. Proc. S.P.R., Vol.
11, 1895.

1900

Perky, Cheves West: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF IMAGINATION. From the Psychological Laboratory of Cornell University, 1904

1910

Freud, Anna: THE UNCONSCIOUS, Coll. Papers, IV., 1915b.

Peterson, Frederick, assisted by Miss L.H. Rainey: THE BEGINNINGS OF MIND IN THE NEW BORN. Bulletin of the Lying-in Hospital, Vol. 7, 1910.

1920

Sidgwick, Mrs. Henry: REPORT ON FURTHER EXPERIMENTS IN THOUGHT-TRANSFERANCE CARRIED OUT BY PROFESSOR GILBERT MURRAY. Proc. S.P.R., Vol. 34, 1924.

Thurstone, L.L.: THE NATURE OF INTELLIGENCE. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924.

Vasil'yev, L.L.: THOUGHT TRANSMISSION OVER A DISTANCE. Vestnik znaniya, No. 7, 458-468, 1926.

1930

Beitel, R.J.: SPATIAL SUMMATION OF SUBLIMINAL STIMULI IN THE RETINA OF THE HUMAN EYE. J. Gen. Psychol., 10, 311-27, 1934.

Broad, C.D.: THE PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF FOREKNOWLEDGE. Aristotelian Society Supplemental, Vol. 16, pp. 177-209 and 229-245, 1937.

Chase, Wilton P.: COLOR VISION IN INFANTS. Journal of Experimental Psychology, Vol. 20, No. 3, March, 1937.

Crumbaugh, James C.: A QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE ATTITUDES OF PSYCHOLOGISTS TOWARD THE FIELD OF EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION. J. of Parapsychology, Vol.2, No.4, December 1938.

Ellis, Willis D., ed: A SOURCE BOOK OF GETALT PSYCHOLOGY. New York, 1939.

Eng, Helga: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHILDREN'S DRAWINGS. New York, 1931.

Hornbostel, Erich Maria von: THE UNITY OF THE SENSES. A source book of gestalt psychology (104) pp. 210-216, New York, 1939.

Irwin, O.C.: INFANT RESPONSES TO VERTICAL MOVEMENTS. Child Development, Vol. 3, 1932.

Lewin, Bertram D.: SOME OBSERVATIONS ON KNOWLEDGE, BELIEF AND THE IMPULSE TO KNOW. Int. Jnl. Psa., XX, 1939.

Miller, J.G.: DISCIMINATION WITHOUT AWARENESS. Amer. J. Psychol., 52, 562-78, 1939.

Pratt, J.G. and Margaret M. Price: THE EXPERIMENTER-SUBJECT RELATIONSHIP IN TESTS FOR ESP. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 2, No. 2, June 1938.

Sells, S.B.: THE ATMOSPHERE EFFECT: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF REASONING. Arch. Psychol., p.200, 1936.

Sinclair, Upton: MENTAL RADIO. Monrovia, California, Upton Sinclair, 1930.

Warcollier, Rene: EXPERIMENTAL TELEPATHY. Boston: Boston Society for Psychic Research, 1938.

Williams, A.: PERCEPTION OF SUBLIMINAL VISUAL STIMULI. J. Psychol., 6, 187-99, 1938.

1940

Adrian, E.D.: THE PHYSICAL BACKGROUND OF PERCEPTION. Oxford, 1947.

Alajouanine, T.: APHASIA AND ARTISTIC REALIZATION. Brain, Vol. 71, Part 3, September, 1948.

Bevan, J.M.: THE RELATION OF ATTITUDE TO SUCCESS IN ESP SCORING. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. II, No. 4, pp 296-309, December 1947.

Boring, Edwin G.: SENSATION AND PERCEPTION IN THE HISTORY OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY. New York, 1942.

Broad, C.D.: THE EXPERIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENT OF TELEPATHIC PRECOGNITION. Philosophy, Vol. 74, pp 261-275, 1944.

--PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF PRECOGNITION. The Listener, pp 709-710, May 8, 1947.

Carrington, W.: EXPERIMENTS ON THE PARANORMAL COGNITION OF DRAWINGS, III. Proc. Amer. Soc. For Psych. Res., 24, 1-107, 1944.

Harlow, Harry F. and Margaret Kuenne Harlow: LEARNING TO THINK. Scientific American, Vol. 181(2), August, 1949.

Hartmann, Heinz: ON RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL ACTION. Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences, Vol. 1 (Roheim, Geza, Editor), New York, International Universities Press, 1947.

Hartmann, Heinz and Ernest Kris, Rudolph M. Lowenstein: SOME COMMENTS ON THE FORMATION OF PSYCHIC STRUCTURE. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, Vol. II, New York, International Universities Press, 1947.

Heider, F.: SOCIAL PERCEPTION AND PHENOMENAL CAUSALITY. Psychol. Rev., 51, 358-374, 1944.

- Helson, Harry: ADAPTATION-LEVEL AS FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR PREDICTION, etc. Amer. Journal Psych. Vol. 60, pp. 1-29, 1947.
- Humphrey, Betty M.: A FURTHER STUDY OF ESP AND INTELLIGENCE. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 12, No. 3, September 1948.
- THE RELATION OF ESP TO MODE OF DRAWING. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 13, No. 1, March 1949.
- Koestler, Arthur: THE YOGI AND THE COMMISSAR AND OTHER ESSAYS. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1945.
- Kravkov, S.W.: COLOUR VISION AND THE AUTONOMIC NERVOUS SYSTEM. J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 31, 335-7, 1941.
- Kriss, Ernst: ON INSPIRATION. Int. J. Psa., XX, 1940.
- Miller, J.G.: THE ROLE OF MOTIVATION IN LEARNING WITHOUT AWARENESS. Amer. J. Psychol., 53, 229-39, 1940.
- Miller, N.E., and J. Dollard: SOCIAL LEARNING AND IMITATION. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.
- Murphy, Gardner: REMOVAL OF IMPEDIMENTS TO THE PARANORMAL. Journal A.S.P.R., Vol. 38, January, 1944.
- Postman, L. and W.O. Jenkins, D.L. Postman: AN EXPERIMENTAL COMPARISON OF ACTIVE RECALL AND RECOGNITION. The Amer. J. of Psychology, LXI, 1948.
- Pratt, J., and J.B. Rhine, B. Smith, C. Stuart, J. Greenwood: EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION AFTER SIXTY YEARS. New York: Henry Holt, 1940.
- Price, Margaret M. and J.B. Rhine: THE SUBJECT-EXPERIMENTER RELATION IN THE PK TEST. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 8, No. 3, September 1944.
- Riesen, A.H.: THE DEVELOPMENT OF VISUAL PERCEPTION IN MAN AND CHIMPANZEE. Science 106:107-108, 1947.
- Rudel, R.: THE FUNCTION OF THE DAYDREAM. Master's thesis (directed by M. Scheerer) at the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, New York School for Social Research, New York, 1949.
- Sadger, J.: PRELIMINARY STUDY OF THE PSYCHIC LIFE OF THE FETUS AND THE PRIMARY GERM. Psychoanalytical Review, Vol. 28, 1941.
- Scherer, Wallace B.: SPONTANEITY AS A FACTOR IN ESP. J. Parapsychology, 12, 1948.
- Schmeidler, G.R.: PREDICTING GOOD AND BAD SCORES IN A CLAIRVOYANCE EXPERIMENT: A PRELIMINARY REPORT. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 37, pp. 103-110, July 1943.

--PREDICTING GOOD AND BAD SCORES IN A CLAIRVOYANCE EXPERIMENT: A FINAL REPORT. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 37, pp. 210-221, October, 1943.

--SEPARATING THE SHEEP FROM THE GOATS. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 39, 1945.

--PROGRESS REPORT ON FURTHER SHEEP-GOAT SERIES. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 40, 1946.

--PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF ESP AS SHOWN BY RORSCHACH STUDIES. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 13, No. 1, March 1949.

Schmeidler, G.R., and R.A. McConnell: ESP AND PERSONALITY PATTERNS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Smith, Burke M. and Edmond P. Gibson: CONDITIONS AFFECTING ESP PERFORMANCE. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1941.

Smith, Burke M. and Betty M. Humphrey: SOME PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO ESP PERFORMANCES. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 10, No. 4, December 1946.

Smith, Burke M. and E.P. Gibson: CONDITIONS AFFECTING ESP PERFORMANCE. J. Parapsychology, 5, pp.58-86, 1941.

Stewart, C.E., Betty M. Humphrey, Burke M. Smith and Elizabeth McMahan: PERSONALITY MEASUREMENTS AND ESP TESTS WITH CARDS AND DRAWINGS. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 11, NO. 2, June 1947.

Taves, Ernest and L.A. Dale: THE MIDAS TOUCH IN PSHYCHICAL RESEARCH. Journal A.S.P.R., Vol. 37, pp. 57-83, April, 1943.

Taves, Ernest and L.A. Dale, Gardner Murphy: A FURTHER REPORT ON THE MIDAS TOUCH. Journal A.S.P.R., 1943.

Thouless, R.H. and B.P. Weisner: PSI PROCESSES IN NORMAL AND "PARANORMAL" PSYCHOLOGY. Proc. Soc. Psych. Res., London, 48, pp. 177-96, 1947.

Watkins, C.Law: THE LANGUAGE OF DESIGN. Phillips Memorial Gallery, Washington, D.C., pp. 10-13, 1943.

Wertheimer, M.: PRODUCTIVE THINKING. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1945.

Woodruff, J.L., and Gardner Murphy: EFFECT OF INCENTIVES ON ESP VISUAL PERCEPTION. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 7, No. 3, September 1943.

1950

Adams, J.K.: LABORATORY STUDIES OF BEHAVIOR WITHOUT AWARENESS. Psych. Bull. 54:383-405, 1957.

Arieti, S.: PRIMITIVE INTELLECTUAL MECHANISMS IN PSYCHOPATHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS: STUDY OF THE ARCHAIC EGO. American J. Psychother., 4:4-15, 1950.

Baker, K.E. and H. Feldman: THRESHOLD-LUMINANCE FOR RECOGNITION IN RELATION TO FREQUENCY OF PRIOR EXPOSTURE. Amer. J. Psychology, 69, 278-80, 1956.

Baron F.: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF IMAGINATION. Scientific American, 199, 150-56, 1958.

Bexton, W.H., Heron.W., and Scott, T.H.: EFFECTS OF DECREASED VARIATION IN THE SENSORY ENVIRONMENT. The Canadian Journal of Psychology, 8 (2) (1954).

Blackwell, H.R.: PSYCHOLPHYSICAL THRESHOLDS: EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES OF METHODS OF MEASUREMENT. Engineering Res. Institute Bull. Univ. of Michigan, No. 36, 1953.

Brown, D.R.: STIMULUS SIMILARITY AND THE ANCHORING OF SUBJECTIVE SCALES. Amer. J. Psychol., 66, 199-214, 1953.

Bruner, J.S.: GOING BEYOND THE INFORMATION GIVEN IN CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO COGNITION. Symposium, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1957.

Bruner, J.S. and J.J. Goodnow, G.A. Austin: A STUDY OF THINKING. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956.

Capek, Milic: THE DEVELOPMENT OF REICHENBACH'S EPISTEMOLOGY. Review of Metaphysics, 11(1), pp 42-67, 1957.

Casper, George W.: EFFECT OF THE RECEIVER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SENDER IN ESP TESTS. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 16, No. 3, September 1952.

Chang, H.T.: INTERACTION OF EVOKED CORTICAL POTENTIALS. J. Neurophysiol., 16, 133-44, 1953.

Dixon, N.F.: SYMBOLIC ASSOCIATIONS FOLLOWING SUBLIMINAL STIMULATION. Int. J. Psycho-anal., 37 (23), 159-70, 1956.

--THE EFFECT OF SUBLIMINAL STIMULATION UPON AUTONOMIC AND VERBAL BEHAVIOR. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 57 (1), 29-36, 1958a.

--APPARENT CHANGES IN THE VISUAL THRESHOLD AS A FUNCTION OF SUBLIMINAL STIMULATION. A PRELIMINARY REPORT. Quart. J. Exp. Psychol., 10, 211-19, 1958b.

Eilbert, Leo and G.R. Schmeidler: A STUDY OF CERTAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS IN RELATION TO ESP PERFORMANCE. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 14, No. 1, March 1950.

Ferguson, G.A.: ON LEARNING AND HUMAN ABILITY. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 8, 95-112, 1954.

- Fisher, C.: A STUDY OF THE PRELIMINARY STAGES OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF DREAMS AND IMAGES. J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn., 5, 5-60, 1957.
- Fisher, C. and I.H. Paul: THE EFFECT OF SUBLIMINAL VISUAL STIMULATION ON IMAGERY AND DREAMS: A VALIDATION STUDY. J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assoc., 7:35-83, 1959.
- Gibson, James. J.: THE PERCEPTION OF THE VISUAL WORLD, Boston, 1950.
- Gilbert, L, and G.R. Schmeidler: A STUDY OF CERTAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS IN RELATION TO ESP PERFORMANCE. J. Parapsychology, 14, pp. 53-74, 1950.
- Goldiamond, I.: INDICATORS OF PERCEPTION: I. SUBLIMINAL PERCEPTION, SUBCEPTION, UNCONSCIOUS PERCEPTION: AN ANALYSIS IN TERMS OF PSYCHOPHYSICAL INDICATOR METHODOLOGY. Psychol. Bull., 55:373-411, 1958.
- Gomulicki, B.R.: RECALL AS AN ABSTRACTIVE PROCESS, Ph.D. Thesis, Oxford University, 1952.
- Granit, R.: RECEPTORS AND SENSORY PERCEPTION. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1955c.
- Hess, D.O.: THE ROLE OF NEUROLOGICAL IDEAS IN PSYCHOLOGY. Journal of Personality, 20, 39-55, 1951.
- DRIVES AND THE CNS (CONCEPTUAL NERVOUS SYSTEM). Psychological Review, 62, 243-253, 1955.
- Humphrey, Betty M.: A NEW SCALE FOR SEPARATING HIGH- AND LOW-SCORING SUBJECTS. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 14, No. 1, March 1950.
- ESP AND INTELLIGENCE. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 14, No. 1, March 1950.
- ESP SCORE LEVEL PREDICTED BY A COMBINATION OF MEASURES OF PERSONALITY. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 14, No. 3, September 1950.
- INTROVERSION-EXTROVERSION RATINGS IN RELATION TO SCORES IN ESP TESTS. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 15, No. 4, December 1951.
- INTROVERSION-EXTROVERSION RATINGS IN RELATION TO SCORES IN ESP TESTS. J. of Parapsychology, 18, pp 252-62, 1951.
- Humphrey, Betty M. and J. Fraser Nicol: THE FEELING OF SUCCESS IN ESP. Journal A.S.P.R., Vol 49, January, 1955.
- Humphrey, G.: THINKING. London: Methuen, 1951.
- Klein, G.S.: ON SUBLIMINAL ACTIVATION. J. Nerv. Ment. Dis., 128:293-301, 1959.
- Klein, G. and D.P. Spence, R.R. Holt, S. Gourevitch: PRECONSCIOUS INFLUENCES UPON CONSCIOUS COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR. Paper read at Annual Meeting, American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1955.

- Kriss, Ernst: ON PRECONSCIOUS MENTAL PROCESSES. Psycholanal. Quarterly, 19, 1950.
- Lazarus, R.S. and R.A. McCleary: AUTONOMIC DISCRIMINATION WITHOUT AWARENESS: A STUDY OF SUBCEPTION. Psychol. Rev., 48, 113-122, 1951.
- Linn, Louis: THE DISCRIMINATING FUNCTION OF THE EGO. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 23 (1954).
- Livingston, R.B.: CENTRAL CONTROL OF RECEPTORS AND SENSORY TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS. In J.Field, H.W. Magoun, and V.E. Hall (eds.) Handbook of Physiology. Section 1: Neurophysiology. Vol. 1 Pp. 741-60. American Physiological Society, Washington, D.C., 1959.
- Maslow, Abraham H.: MOTIVATION AND PERSONALITY. New York: Harper, 1954.
- ALFRED KORZYBSKI MEMORIAL LECTURE: TWO KINDS OF COGNITION AND THEIR INTEGRATION. General Semantics Bulletin, Numbers 20 & 21, 1957.
- CREATIVITY IN SELF-ACTUALIZING PEOPLE. General Semantics Bulletin, Numbers 24 & 25, 1959.
- Newell, A., and J.C. Shaw, H.A. Simon: THE PROCESS OF CREATIVE THINKING. University of Colorado 1958 symposium on cognition. Rand Corp. Rep., No. P-1320 (b), 1958.
- Osgood, C.E.: A BEHAVIORISTIC ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTION AND LANGUAGES TO COGNITION. Symposium, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Penfield, W., and R. Rasmussen: THE CEREBRAL CORTEX OF MAN. New York: MacMillan, 1952.
- Pratt, Carroll C.: THE ROLE OF PAST EXPERIENCE IN VISUAL PERCEPTION. Journal Psych., Vol. 30, pp 85-107, 1950.
- Pribram, K.H.: ON THE NEUROLOGY OF THINKING. Behav. Sci., 4, 265-287, 1959.
- Rapaport, D.: TOWARD A THEORY OF THINKING IN ORGANIZATION AND PATHOLOGY OF THOUGHT. Edited by D. Rapaport, New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Rhine, J.B.: THE PROBLEM OF PSI MISSING. Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 16, June, 1952.
- Rivers, Olivia B.: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE MENTAL HEALTH AND INTELLIGENCE OF ESP SUBJECTS. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 14, No. 4, December 1950.
- Schmeidler, G.P.: RORSCHACH AND ESP SCORES OF PATIENTS SUFFERING FROM CEREBRAL CONCUSSION. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 16, No. 2, June 1952.

--PICTURE-FRUSTRATION RATINGS AND ESP SCORES FOR SUBJECTS WHO SHOWED MODERATE ANNOYANCE AT THE ESP TASK. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 18, No. 3, September 1954.

--AGENT-PERCIPIENT RELATIONSHIPS. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 52, No. 2, April 1958.

Shevrin, Howard and Lester Luborsky: THE MEASUREMENT OF PRECONSCIOUS PERCEPTION IN DREAM AND IMAGES: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE POETZL PHENOMENON. J. Abnormal Social Pshychol., 56, 1958.

Silberer, H.: SYMBOL-FORMATION. Republished in Rapaport, D. (Ed.) loc. cit.

Smith, G.J.W. and M. Henriksson: THE EFFECT ON AN ESTABLISHED PERCEPT OF A PERCEPTUAL PROCESS BEYOND AWARENESS. Acta Psychol., II (2), 346-355, 1955.

Soal, S. and F. Bateman: MODERN EXPERIMENT IN TELEPATHY. London: Faber & Faber, 1954.

Swann, W.F.G.: THE KNOWN AND THE UNKNOWN. Journal of the Franklin Institute, Vol. 259, No. 5, May 1955.

Taylor, J.S.: MEANING, FREQUENCY AND VISUAL DURATION THRESHOLD. J. Exp. Psychol. 55, 329-34, 1958.

Thouless, R.H.: PROBLEMS OF DESIGN IN PARAPSYCHOLOGICAL EXPERIMENTS. Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, Volume 37, No. 680 May-June 1954.

Vinacke, W.E.: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THINKING. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

Wallace, Anthony F.C.: ACCULTURATION: REVITALIZATION MOVEMENTS. American Anthropologist, April 1956, pp 264-281.

Werner, Heinz: MICROGENESIS AND APHASIA. Journal of Psychology, June 1955.

--MICROGENESIS AND APHASIA. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 52:347-353, 1956.

Werner, H. and B. Kaplan: THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO COGNITION: ITS RELEVANCE TO THE PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ETHNOLINGUISTIC DATA. Amer. Anthropologist 58:866-880, 1956.

Werner, M.A. and B.T. Engel, T.L. Clemens: STUDIES OF AUTONOMIC RESPONSES PATTERNS: RATIONALE AND METHODS. Behav. Sci., 2:216, 1957.

Wertheimer, Michael: HEBB AND SENDON ON THE ROLE OF LEARNING IN PERCEPTION. American Journal of Psychology, Vol. 64, pp 133-137, 1951.

- Allison, J.: COGNITIVE STRUCTURE AND RECEPTIVITY TO LOW INTENSITY STIMULATION. J. Abnorm. And Soc. Psychol., 67 (2), 132-8, 1963.
- Anderson, M.L.: THE RELATIONS OF PSI TO CREATIVITY. Journal of Parapsychology, 26, 277-92, 1962.
- Antrobus, J.S.: INFORMATION THEORY AND STIMULUS-INDEPENDENT THOUGHT. British Journal Psychology, 59 (4), 423-30, 1968.
- Arieti, Silvano: THE EXPERIENCES OF INNER STATUS IN PERSPECTIVES IN PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORY. Edited by B. Kaplan and L. Wapner, New York, International Universities Press, Inc., 1960.
- THE LOSS OF REALITY. Psychoanalysis, 48:3-24, 1961.
- THE MICROGENY OF THOUGHT PERCEPTION. Archives of General Psychiatry, V.6, pp.454-68, 1962.
- Arnheim, Rudolf: VISUAL THINKING. Berkley and Los Angeles, 1969.
- Banham, Katharine: TEMPORARY HIGH SCORING BY A CHILD SUBJECT. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol 30, No. 2, June 1967.
- Banreti-Fuchs, K.M.: PERCEPTION WITHOUT AWARENESS. Acta Psychol., 26, 148-60, 1967.
- Begleiter, H. and M.M. Gross, B. Kissin: EVOKED CORTICAL RESPONSES TO AFFECTIVE VISUAL STIMULI. Psycholophysiol. 3, 336-44, 1967.
- Beloff, John: CAN PARANORMAL ABILITIES BE LEARNED?. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 61, No. 2, April 1967.
- Bevan W.: SUBLIMINAL STIMULATION: A PERVASIVE PROBLEM FOR PSYCHOLOGY. Psychol. Bull., 61 (2), 81-99, 1964a.
- Bhadra, B.H.: THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEST SCORES TO BELIEF IN ESP. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 30, No. 1, March 1966.
- Boardman, W.K. and S. Goldstone: EFFECTS OF SUBLIMINAL ANCHORS UPON JUDGEMENTS OF SIZE. Percept. Mot. Skills, 14, 475-82, 1962.
- Bogan, Joseph E.: THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BRAIN II: AN APPOSTIONAL MIND. Bulletin, Los Angeles Neurological Societies, Vol. 34, pp 135-62, 1969.
- Bower, T.G.R.: THE VISUAL WORLD OF INFANTS. Scientific American, Vol. 215, pp. 80-92, December, 1966.
- Brier, Bob: A CORRESPONDENCE ESP EXPERIMENT WITH HIGH-I.Q. SUBJECTS. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 31, No. 2, June 1967.
- Brindley, G.S., and W.S. Lewin: THE SENSATIONS PRODUCED BY ELECTRICAL STIMULATION OF THE VISUAL CORTEX. The Journal of Physiology, Vol. 196, No. 2, May 1968.

- Buzby, Dallas E.: SUBJECT ATTITUDE AND SCORE VARIANCE IN ESP TESTS.
Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 31, No. 1, March 1967
- PRECOGNITION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 32,
No. 1, March 1968.
- Campbell, Donald T.: BLIND VARIATION AND SELECTIVE RETENTION IN CREATIVE
THOUGHT AS IN OTHER KNOWLEDGE PROCESSES. Psychological Review, Vol. 67, No.
6, November 1960.
- Colquhoun, W.P., and D.V.J. Corcoran: THE EFFECTS OF TIME OF DAY AND
SOCIAL ISOLATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEMPERAMENT AND PERFORMANCE.
British J. Soc. Clin. Psychol. 3, pp 226-31, 1964.
- Davies, D.R. and G.R.J. Hockey: THE EFFECTS OF NOISE AND DOUBLING THE
SIGNAL FREQUENCY ON INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE IN VISUAL VIGILANCE PERFORMANCE.
Brit. J. Psychol., 57, 381-9, 1966.
- Davis, H.: ENHANCEMENT OF EVOKED CORTICAL POTENTIALS IN HUMANS RELATED TO
A TASK REQUIRING A DECISION. Science, 145, 182, 1964.
- Davis, H., and T. Mast, N. Yoshie, S. Zerlin. THE SLOW RESPONSE OF THE
HUMAN CORTEX TO AUDITORY STIMULI: RECOVERY PROCESS. EEG & Clinical
Neurophys., 21: 105-113, 1966.
- DelCampo, A.: BLIND CAN SEE THE SHAPE OF THINGS. Medical World News,
October 7, 1966.
- Dentler, Robert A. and Mackler Bernard: ORIGINALITY: SOME SOCIAL AND
PERSONAL DETERMINANTS. Behavioral Science, Vol. 9, No. 1, January, 1964.
- Desoille, R.: THE DIRECTED DAYDREAM. New York: Psychosynthesis Research
Foundation, #8, 1965.
- Deutsch, J.A. and D. Deutsch: ATTENTION: SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS.
Psychol. Rev., 70, 80-90, 1963.
- Dixon, N.F.: COMMUNICATION WITHOUT AWARENESS: THE IMPLICATIONS OF
SUBLIMINAL PERCEPTION. J. Psychosom. Res., 8, 337-41, 1964.
- Dixon, N.F. and M. Haider: CHANGES IN THE VISUAL THRESHOLD AS A FUNCTION
OF SUBCEPTION. Quart. J. Exp. Psychol., 13, 229-35, 1961.
- Duane, T.D. and Thomas Behrendt: EXTRASENSORY ELECTROENCEPHALOGRAPHIC
INDUCTION BETWEEN IDENTICAL TWINS. Science, Vol. 150, p. 367, October 15,
1965.
- Eason, M. Jean Clare and Boleslaw A. Wysocki: EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION AND
INTELLIGENCE. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 29, No. 2, June 1965.
- Ehrenwald, Jan: HUMAN PERSONALITY AND THE NATURE OF PSI PHENOMENA.
Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 62, No. 4,
October 1968.

- Eriksen, C.W.: DISCRIMINATING AND LEARNING WITHOUT AWARENESS: A METHODOLOGICAL SURVEY AND EVALUATION. *Psychol. Rev.*, 67:279-300, 1960.
- Eysenck, H.J.: PERSONALITY AND EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION. *Journal of the Society of Psychical Research*, Vol. 44, No. 732, June 1967.
- Fehrer, E. and I. Biederman: A COMPARISON OF REACTION TIME AND VERBAL REPORT IN THE DETECTION OF MASKED STIMULI. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 64, 126-30, 1962.
- Fehrer, E. and D. Raab: REACTION TIME TO STIMULI MASKED BY METACONSTRAST. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 63, 143-7, 1962.
- Fiss, H.: THE EFFECTS OF EXPERIMENTALLY INDUCED CHANGES IN ALERTNESS ON RESPONSE TO SUBLIMINAL STIMULATION. *J. Person.*, 34 (4), 577-95, 1966(a).
- FitzHerbert, J.: EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD. *International Journal of Parapsychology*, Vol. 3, 81-91, Summer 1961.
- Flescher, Irwin: ANXIETY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF INTELLECTUALLY GIFTED AND CREATIVELY GIFTED CHILDREN. *The Journal of Psychology*, 56, pp. 251-268, 1963.
- Freeman, John A.: A SEQUEL REPORT ON A HIGH-SCORING CHILD SUBJECT. *The Journal of Parapsychology*, Vol. 30, No. 1, March 1966.
- BOY-GIRL DIFFERENCES IN A GROUP PRECOGNITION TEST. *The Journal of Parapsychology*, 27, 175-81, 1963.
- Gellhorn, E.: AUTONOMIC-SOMATIC INTEGRATIONS. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1967.
- Gibson J.J.: EFFECT OF THIRST ON STIMULUS RECOVERY AND SPONTANEOUS IMAGERY. *Percept. Mot. Skills*, 23, 631-8, 1966.
- THE CHANGE FROM VISIBLE TO INVISIBLE. *Perception and Psychophysics*, Vol. 5, pp. 113-116, 1969.
- Green, C.E.: EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION AND THE EXTRAVERSION SCALE OF THE MAUDSLEY PERSONALITY INVENTORY. *J. Soc. Psychical Research*, 43, 728, 1966.
- SPONTANEOUS 'PARANORMAL' EXPERIENCES IN RELATION TO SEX AND ACADEMIC BACKGROUND. *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, Vol. 43, No. 729, September, 1966.
- Haber, R.N.: EIDETIC IMAGES. *Scientific American*, Vol 220, pp. 36-44, April 1969.
- Haider, M., and P. Spong, D.B. Lindsley: ATTENTION, VIGILANCE, AND CORTICAL EVOKED-POTENTIALS IN HUMANS. *Science*, 145: 180-182, 1964.
- Hochberg, Julian and Virginia Brooks: PICTORIAL RECOGNITION AS AN UNLEARNED ABILITY. *Amer. Journal Psych.* Vol. 75, pp 624-28, 1962.

Honorton, Charles: CREATIVITY AND PRECOGNITION SCORING LEVEL. Journal of Parapsychology, Vol 31, No. 1, March 1967.

Ivanov, Alexander: SOVIET EXPERIMENTS IN "EYE-LESS VISION". International Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. VI, No. 1, Winter, 1964.

--SOVIET EXPERIMENTS: 1921-27, 1932-38. International Journal of Parapsychology, Spring, 1963.

--SOVIET EXPERIMENTS IN ESP, 1921-1927, 1932-1938. International J. of Parapsychology. 1965, 5, 217-230.

Johnson, Martin and B.K. Kanthamani: THE DEFENSE MECHANISM TEST AS A PREDICTOR OF ESP SCORING DIRECTION. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 31, No. 2, January 1967.

Kabrisky, M.: A PROPOSED MODEL FOR VISUAL INFORMATION PROCESSING IN THE HUMAN BRAIN. Urbana, London: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1966.

Klip, Willem: AN EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH TO THE INTERPRETATION OF THE QUANTAM THEORY. Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, Vol 44, No. 734, December 1967.

Koestler, Arthur: THE LOTUS AND THE ROBOT. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Kogan, I.M.: INTERNATIONAL ANALYSIS OF EXPERIMENTS IN TELEPATHIC COMMUNICATION. Radiotekhnika, Vol. 23, No. 3, 87-92, 1968.

--THE INFORMATION THEORY ASPECT OF TELEPATHY. (Translated from the Russian by F.J. Krieger), Proc. University of California at Los Angeles, June 7-8, 1969.

Kozyrev, Nikolai: AN UNEXPLORED WORLD. Znamya Magazine, 1963.

POSSIBILITY OF EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE PROPERTIES OF TIME. Washington D.C.: Joint Publications Research Service, No. 45238, May 1968.

Libet, B. and W.W. Alberts, E.W. Wright, B. Feinstein: RESPONSES OF HUMAN SOMATO-SENSORY CORTEX TO STIMULI BELOW THE THRESHOLD FOR CONSCIOUS SENSATION. Science, 158 No. 3808, 1597-1600, 1967.

Levine, F., and J. Stowell: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CREATIVITY AND CLAIRVOYANCE. J. Parapsychol. 27, 272, 1963.

Mihalasky, J. and Douglas Dean: BIO-COMMUNICATION. Conference Record, 1969 IEEE International Conference on Communications, Cat. No. 69C29-COM.

Margenau, Henry: ESP IN THE FRAMEWORK OF MODERN SCIENCE. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol 60, No. 3, July 1966.

McConnell, R.A.: ESP AND CREDIBILITY IN SCIENCE. American Psychologist, Vol. 24, No. 5, May 1969.

- Mihalasky, John: EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION IN MANAGEMENT. Advanced Management Journal, Vol. 32, No. 3, July, 1967.
- Moss, Thelma: ESP EFFECTS IN "ARTISTS" CONTRASTED WITH "NON-ARTISTS". The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 33, No. 1, March 1968.
- Murphy, G.: CREATIVITY AND ITS RELATION TO EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION. J. Amer. Soc. Psych. Research, 4, 203-14, 1963.
- Mutschall, Vladimir: THE PRESENT STATUS OF RESEARCH IN TELEPATHY IN THE SOVIET UNION. Foreign Science Bulletin, Aerospace Technology Division, Library of Congress. Vol. 1, No. 8, August 1968
- Nash, Carroll B.: THE EFFECT OF SUBJECT-EXPERIMENTER ATTITUDES ON CLAIRVOYANCE SCORES. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 24, No. 3, September 1960.
- RELATIONS BETWEEN ESP SCORING LEVEL AND THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALTY INVENTORY. Paper read at the Sixth Annual Conv. of the Parapsychol. Assoc., New York, 1963. Abstract in Journal of Parapsychology, 27, 274, 1963.
- Neisser, U.: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY. New York, Appleton Century Crofts, 1967.
- Nicol, J.F.: SOME DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF SCIENTIFIC RECOGNITION OF EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION. In G.E.W. Wolstenholme and E.C.P. Miller (Eds.) Extrasensory Perception, New York: Citadel Press, pp. 24-37, 1966.
- Osis, K., and M.E. Turner, Jr.: DISTANCE AND ESP: A TRANSCONTINENTAL EXPERIMENT. Proc. American Society of Psychical Research, Vol. 27, 1-48, 1968.
- Pine, F.: INCIDENTAL STIMULATION: A STUDY OF PRECONSCIOUS TRANSFORMATIONS. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 60:68-75, 1960
- Piaget, Jean: "Comments on Vygotsley's critical remarks concerning" THE LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT OF THE CHILD and JUDGEMENT AND REASONING IN THE CHILD. The M.I.T. Press, (pamphlet), 1962.
- Potzl, O. and R. Allers, J. Teler: PRECONSCIOUS STIMULATION IN DREAMS, ASSOCIATIONS, AND IMAGES. Psychol., Issues 11:3, 1960.
- Pratt, J.: PARAPSYCHOLOGY IN RUSSIA AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA. J. Soc. Psych. Res., 1963, 42, 16-20
- PRELIMINARY EXPERIMENTS WITH A 'BORROWED' ESP SUBJECT. J. Soc. Psych. Res., 1964, 42, 333-345.
- Pratt, J. and J. Blom: A CONFIRMATORY EXPERIMENT WITH A 'BORROWED' OUTSTANDING ESP SUBJECT. J. Soc. Psych. Res., 1964, 42, 381-388.
- Pritchard, R.M. and W. Heron, D.O. Hebb: VISUAL PERCEPTION APPROACHED BY THE METHOD OF STABILIZED IMAGES. Canad. J. Psychol., 14:67-77, 1960.

- Rhine, J.B.: CURRENT QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FIELD OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 29, No. 4, December, 1965.
- PSI AND PSYCHOLOGY: CONFLICT AND SOLUTION. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 32, No. 2, June 1968.
- Rhine Louisa E.: PARAPSYCHOLOGY. THEN AND NOW. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 31, No. 3, September 1967.
- Ryzl, Milan: TRAINING THE PSI FACULTY BY HYPNOSIS. J. Soc. Psych. Res., 1962, 41, 234-251.
- IN SEARCH FOR THE REGULAR CONTROL OF ESP. Indian J. of Parapsychology, 1962, 3, No. 2, 34-38.
- PARAPSYCHOLOGY IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IN EUROPE. International Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 10, No. 3, Autumn 1968.
- Ryzl, Milan and John Beloff: LOSS OF STABILITY OF ESP PERFORMANCE IN HIGH-SCORING SUBJECT. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 29, No. 1, March 1965.
- Ryzl, Milan and J. Pratt: CONFIRMATION OF ESP PERFORMANCE IN A HYPNOTICALLY PREPARED SUBJECT. J. of Parapsychology, 1962, 26, 237-243.
- A FURTHER CONFIRMATION OF STABILIZED ESP PERFORMANCE IN A SELECTED SUBJECT. J. of Parapsychology, 1963, 27, 73-83.
- A REPEATED-CALLING ESP TEST WITH SEALED CARDS. J. of Parapsychology, 1963, 27, 161-174.
- THE FOCUSING OF ESP UPON PARTICULAR TARGETS. J. of Parapsychology, 1963, 27, 227-241.
- Ryzl, Milan and J. Ryzlova: A CASE OF HIGH-SCORING ESP PERFORMANCE IN THE HYPNOTIC STATE. J. of Parapsychology, 1962, 26, 153-171.
- Schmeidler, G.R.: TESTS OF CREATIVE THINKING AND ESP SCORES. Indian Journal of Parapsychology, 4, 51-57, 1963.
- Schmidt, Helmut: PRECOGNITION OF A QUANTUM PROCESS. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 33, No. 2, June 1969.
- Segal, S.J. and V. Fusella: EFFECTS OF IMAGING ON SIGNAL-TO-NOISE RATIO WITH VARYING SIGNAL CONDITIONS. Brit. J. Psychol. 60 (4), 459-64, 1969.
- Shevrin, Howard, and Dean E. Fritzier: VISUAL EVOKED RESPONSE CORRELATES OF UNCONCIOUS MENTAL PROCESSES. Science, Vol. 161, July 1968.
- Segy, Ladislav: GEOMETRIC ART AND ASPECTS OF REALITY. The Centennial Review, Vol. II, pp.419-55, 1967.

Sergeyev, G.A.: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE SELF-ADAPTATION FUNCTIONS OF THE HUMAN OPERATOR. Foreign Technology Division, Air Force Systems Command, FTD-HT-67-337, September 1967.

Shevrin, Howard, and Phillip Rennick: CORTICAL RESPONSE TO A TACTILE STIMULUS DURING ATTENTION, MENTAL ARITHMETIC AND FREE ASSOCIATIONS. Psychophysiology, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1967

Shevrin, Howard, and Lester Luborsky: THE REBUS TECHNIQUE: A METHOD FOR STUDYING PRIMARY-PROCESS TRANSFORMATIONS OF BRIEFLY EXPOSED PICTURES. Journal of Mental Disorders, No. 133 PP. 479-488 (1961).

Singer, Jerome L., and Rosalea A. Schonbar: CORRELATES OF DAYDREAMING: A DIMENSION OF SELF AWARENESS. Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 25, No. 1, 1-6, 1961.

Spence, D.P.: THE MULTIPLE EFFECTS OF SUBLIMINAL STIMULI. J. Personality, 29:40-53, 1961.

Sternberg, S.: HIGH SPEED SCANNING IN HUMAN MEMORY. Science, 153, 652-4, 1966.

Stevenson, Ian: AN ANTAGONIST'S VIEW OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY. A REVIEW OF PROFESSOR HANSEL'S ESP: A SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 61, No. 3, July 1967.

Stoss, L. and H. Shevrin: THE EFFECTS OF HYPNOSIS ON SUBLIMINAL PERCEPTION. Int. J. Clin. Exp. Hypnosis. 1966(a).

Szilard, Leo: ON THE DECREASE OF ENTROPY IN A THERMODYNAMIC SYSTEM BY THE INTERVENTION OF INTELLIGENT BEINGS. (Translated by Anatol Rapoport and Mechthilde Knoller from the original article, "Uber die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen." Zeitschrift fur Physik, 1929, 53, 840-856.) Reprinted: Behavioral Science, Vol. 9, No. 4, October, 1964.

Thierman, T.: A SIGNAL DETECTION APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF SET IN TACHISTOSCOPIC RECOGNITION. Percept. Mot. Skills, 27, 96-8, 1968.

Thouless, Robert H.: PARAPSYCHOLOGY DURING THE LAST QUARTER CENTURY. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 33, No. 4, December 1969.

U.S. Joint Publications Research Service (Distributed by Office of Technical Services); U.S. Department of Commerce: SOVIET RESEARCH ON ESP AND THOUGHT TRANSMISSION. OTS: 61-31,493. JRPS: 9511, June 20, 1961.

Vasiliev, L.L.: EXPERIMENTS IN MENTAL SUGGESTION. Hampshire, England, ISMI Publications, 1963.

Walkup, Lewis E.: CREATIVITY IN SCIENCE THROUGH VISUALIZATION. Journal of Creative Behavior, Vol.1, pp.283-90, 1967.

White, Rhea A.: A COMPARISON OF OLD AND NEW METHODS OF RESPONSE TO TARGETS IN ESP EXPERIMENTS. The Journal of the American Society for Psychological Research, Vol. LVIII, No. 1, January 1964.

Zwosta, M.F. and R. Zenhausern: APPLICATION OF SIGNAL DETECTION THEORY TO SUBLIMINAL AND SUPRALIMINAL ACCESSORY STIMULATION. Percept. Mot. Skills, 28, 699-704, 1969.

1970

Adamenko, Victor G.: THE PHENOMENON OF SKIN ELECTRICITY. Tekhnika Molodozhi, No. 11, Moscow, 1970.

--OBJECTS MOVED AT A DISTANCE BY MEANS OF A CONTROLLED BIOELECTRIC FIELD. Journal of Paraphysics (International), Vol. 6, No. 1, 1972.

Adamenko, Victor G., and S.D. Kirlian, G.A. Sergeev, G.D. Shushkev, E.G. Gryaznukhin, V.V. Kulagin, A.S. Roman, V. Iniushin, N.I. Musalevskaya: PROBLEMS IN BIOENERGETICS: ALMA-ATA, U.S.S.R. PART ONE: INSTRUMENTS AND RECORDING DEVICES; PART TWO: SOME PROPERTIES OF BIOPLASMA. Journal of Paraphysics (International), Vol. 6, No. 1, 1972.

Alexander, Eugene, D.: IN-THE-BODY TRAVEL: A GROWTH EXPERIENCE WITH FANTASY. Psychotherapy, Theory, Research and Practice, Vol. 4, 24, Winter 1971.

Amari, S.: DYNAMICS OF PATTERN FORMATION IN LATERAL-INHIBITION TYPE NEURAL FIELDS. Biol. Cybernetics 27, 77087, (1977A).

--NEURAL THEORY OF ASSOCIATION AND CONCEPT-FORMATION. Biol. Cybernetics 26, 175-185 (1977B).

--TOPOGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION OF NERVE FIELDS. Bull. Math. Biol., 1979.

Armai, S. and A. Takeuchi: MATHEMATICAL THEORY ON FORMATION OF CATEGORY DETECTING NERVE CELLS. Biol. Cybernetics 29, 127-136, (1978).

Anastasi, Anne, and Charles E. Schaefer: NOTE ON THE CONCEPTS OF CREATIVITY AND INTELLIGENCE. The Creative Education Foundation, Vol 5, No. 2, 2nd Quarter, 1971.

Arieti, Silvano: CREATIVITY, THE MAGIC SYNTHESIS. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1976.

Arnheim, Rudolf: THE GESTALT THEORY OF EXPRESSION. Intervert perspective in art: display and expression. Leonardo, Spring. (18), pp.51-73, 1972

Ashner, Jules: SOVIET PSYCHOLOGISTS REVERSE STAND, URGE NEW ACTION ON PSYCHIC RESEARCH. APA Monitor, April 1974.

Barber, T.X.: PITFALLS IN RESEARCH: NINE INVESTIGATOR AND EXPERIMENTAL EFFECTS, in R.M.W Travers (Ed.), SECOND HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1973.

Beal, James B.: THE NEW BIO-TECHNOLOGY - POTENTIAL APPLICATION TO THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT. Private Document, 1972.

Bearden, Thomas E.: FIELD, FORMON, SUPERSPACE, AND INCEPTIVE CYBORG: A PARAPHYSICAL THEORY OF NONCAUSAL PHENOMENA. United States Army Medical Department, USA Medical Intelligence and Information Agency, MIIA-1-74, December 1974.

Beloff, John: PARAPSYCHOLOGY AND ITS NEIGHBORS. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 34, No. 2, June 1970.

Bleykher, V.M.: PARAPSYCHOLOGY: SCIENCE OR SUPERSTITON?. U.S. Department of Commerce, Joint Publications Research Service, JPRS 60883, December 28, 1973.

Bohm, D.: QUANTUM THEORY AS AN INDICATION OF A NEW ORDER IN PHYSICS. PART A. THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW ORDERS AS SHOWN THROUGH THE HISTORY OF PHYSICS. Foundations of Physics, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1971.

--QUANTUM THEORY AS AN INDICATION OF A NEW ORDER IN PHYSICS. B. IMPLICATE AND EXPLICATE ORDER IN PHYSICAL LAW. Foundations of Physics, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1973.

Bower, T.G.R.: THE OBJECT IN THE WORLD OF THE INFANT. Scientific American, Vol. 225, pp. 30-38, 1971.

Brada, Jiri: INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS AND ENERGY TRANSFER. Proc. Of 1st Conference on Psychotronic Research, Prague, 1973.

Chari, C.T.K.: PRECOGNITION, PROBABILITY, AND QUANTUM MECHANICS. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 66, No. 2, April 1972.

Chauvin, Remy: TO RECONCILE PSI AND PHYSICS. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 34, No. 3, September 1970.

Costa de Beauregard, O.: S-MATRIX, FEYNMAN ZIGZAG AND EINSTEIN CORRELATION. Physics Letters, Vol. 67A, No. 3, August 7, 1978.

Deikman, Arthur J.: BIOMODAL CONSCIOUSNESS. Arch. Gen. Psychiat., Vol. 25, December 1971.

D'Espagnat, Bernard: THE QUANTUM THEORY AND REALITY: QUANTUM MECHANICS CURIOUSLY DISAGREES WITH THE DOCTRINE THAT THE WORLD IS INDEPENDENT OF MIND. Scientific American, Vol. 241, No. 5, November 1979.

Douglas, John H.: THE GENIUS OF EVERYMAN (1): DISCOVERING CREATIVITY. Science News, Vol. 111, No. 17, April 1977.

--THE GENIUS OF EVERYMAN (2): LEARNING CREATIVITY. Sciences News. Vol. 111, April 30, 1977.

Dreistadt, Roy: THE PROPHETIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF GENIUSES AND TYPES OF EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION. New School for Social Research, N.Y., Vol. 8, No. 2, May 1971 (Reprinted from Psychology).

Dubrov, Aleksandr P.: BIOGRAVITATION AND PSYCHOTRONICS. Impact of Science on Society, Vol. XXIV, No.4, 1974.

Ehrenwald, Jan: PSI PHENOMENA AND THE EXISTENTIAL SHIFT. Journal of the American Society of Psychical Research, Vol. 65, No. 2, April 1971.

--CEREBRAL LOCALIZATION AND THE PSI SYNDROME. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease. Vol. 161, No. 6, 1975.

--A NEUROPHYSIOLOGICAL MODEL OF PSI PHENOMENA. Paper read to the Annual Meeting, American Psychiatric Association, Dallas, at a panel, "Science and Psi: Transcultural Trends", sponsored by the APA Task Force on Transcultural Psychiatry, May 1972. The Journal on Nervous and Mental Disease, 1972.

Eriksen, C.W. and J.W. Rohrbaugh: SOME FACTORS DETERMINING EFFICIENCY OF SELECTIVE ATTENTION. Amer. J. Psychol. 83 (3), 330-42, 1970.

Eisenbud, Jule: SOME NOTES ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE PARANORMAL. Journal of the American Society for Physical Research, Vol 66, No. 1, January 1972.

Farnham-Diggory, Sylvia, ed.: INFORMATION PROCESSING IN CHILDREN. New York, 1972.

Fidel'man, V. Ye, and V. V. Gulevskiy, et al: PROCEDURE AND RESULTS OF AN EXPERIMENTAL CHECK OF POSSIBILITIES FOR TELEPATHIC COMMUNICATION. Air Force Systems Command, Translation Division, Foreign Technology Division, FTD-ID(RS)T-1336-77, August 10, 1977.

Fukushima, Kunihiko: A MODEL OF ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY IN THE BRAIN. Kybernetik 12 58-63, Springer Verlag, 1973.

--SELF-ORGANIZING MULTILAYERED NEURAL NETWORK. Biol. Cybernetics 20, 121-136, 1975.

--SELF-ORGANIZATION OF A NEURAL NETWORK WHICH GIVES POSITION-INVARIANT RESPONSE. Proceedings of the Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. Tokyo, pp. 291-293 (1979b), August 20-23, 1979.

Gabe, R.M. and M.J. Keating: THE VISUAL SYSTEM AND "NEURONAL SPECIFICITY." Nature (London) 237, 375-378 (1972).

Greenberg, Joel: BLIND DRAWINGS: A NEW PERSPECTIVE. Science News, Vol. 114, No. 20, November 11, 1978.

Greidanus, J.H.: PSYCHO-PHYSICAL THEORY (Improved). Reprinted from Proceedings, Series B, Vol. 78, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam-Oxford, 1975.

Harvahk, J.V.: A BIOPHYSICAL MAGNETOMETER-GRADIOMETER. U.S. Army Advanced Material Concepts Agency, The Virginia Journal of Science, Vol 21, #2, 1970.

Hockey, G.R.J.: SIGNAL PROBABILITY AND SPATIAL LOCATION AS POSSIBLE BASES FOR INCREASED SELECTIVITY. Quart. J. Exp. Psychol., 22(1), 37-42, 1970(b).

Kanthamani, B.K., and Remakrishna Rao: PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ESP SUBJECTS: I. PRIMARY PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND ESP. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 1971.

--II. THE COMBINED PERSONALITY MEASURE (CPM AND ESP). J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 36, No. 1, March 1972.

--III. EXTRASVERSION AND ESP. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 36, No. 3, September 1972.

--IV. NEUROTICISM AND ESP. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 37, No. 1, March 1973.

--V. GRAPHIC EXPANSIVENESS AND ESP. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 37, No. 2, June 1973.

Kahuda, F.: PARAPSYCHOLOGY EXPERIMENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA. U.S. Joint Publications Research Service. JPRS L/6420, September 13, 1976.

Kaznacheyev, V.P. and S.P. Shurin, L.P. Mikhailova, N.V. Ignatovich: DISTANT INTERCELLULAR INTERACTIONS IN A SYSTEM OF TWO TISSUE CULTURES . Psychoenergetic Systems, Vol. 1, pp. 141-142, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers Ltd., U.K., 1976.

--REPORT: APPARENT INFORMATION TRANSFER BETWEEN TWO GROUPS OF CELLS. Psychoenergetic Systems, Vol. 1, p. 37, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Ltd. U.K., 1974.

Kelly, E.F., H. Kanthamani, I.L. Child, and F.W. Young: ON THE RELATION BETWEEN VISUAL AND ESP CONFUSION STRUCTURES IN AN EXCEPTIONAL ESP SUBJECT . J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 69, No. 1, January 1975.

Kennedy, J.E., and Judith L. Taddonio: EXPERIMENTER EFFECTS IN PARAPSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 40, No. 1, March 1976.

Kishimoto, K. and S. Amari: EXISTENCE AND STABILITY OF LOCAL EXCITATIONS IN NEURAL FIELDS. J. Math. Biol. 7, 303-318 (1979).

Kogan, I.M.: UNSOLVED RIDDLES: PHENOMENA AMONGST US. Leninskoya Znamya (Lenin's Banner), p.4, april 28, 1974.

Kongro, Anatoliy: EMOTION DETECTOR EXPERIMENTS. U.S. Department of Commerce, Joint Publications Research Service, JPRS 57407, November 2, 1972.

Kreitler, Hans and Shulamuth Kreitler: SUBLIMINAL PERCEPTION AND EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 37, No. 3, September 1973.

--ESP AND COGNITION. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 38, No. 3, September 1974.

Lancaster, Elizabeth: DRAWINGS BY CROSS-COUNTRY "THOUGHT RECEPTION". The Psychic Scene by Martin Ebon (ed.), NAL, 1974.

Malsburg, C. von der: SELF-ORGANIZATION OF ORIENTATION SENSITIVE CELLS IN THE STRIATE CORTEX. Kybernetik 14, 85-100 (1973).

McBain, William N., and Wayne Fox, Susan Kimura, Miles Nakanishi, John Tirado: QUASI-SENSORY COMMUNICATION: AN INVESTIGATION USING SEMANTIC MATCHING AND ACCENTUATED AFFECT. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 14, No. 4, 281-291, 1970.

McConnell, R.A.: THE MOTIVATIONS OF PARAPSYCHOLOGISTS. J. of American Society for Psychical Research. Vol. 69, No. 3, July 1975.

Mihalasky, John: HOW EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION CAN PLAY A ROLE IN IDEA GENERATION. American Society of Mechanical Engineers Publication No. 72-DE-5, 1972.

--ESP; CAN IT PLAY A ROLE IN IDEA-GENERATION?. Mechanical Engineering, December 1972.

Moon, Marvin L.: ARTISTS CONTRASTED WITH NON-ARTISTS CONCERNING BELIEF IN ESP: A POLL. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 69, No. 2, April 1975.

Murphy, Gardner: THE PROBLEM OF REPEATABILITY IN PSYCHICAL RESEARCH. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 65, No. 1, January 1971.

Nash, Carroll B.: CUTANEOUS PERCEPTION OF COLOR WITH A HEAD BOX. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 65, No. 1, January 1971.

Nauka, Tekhnika I.: PSYCHIC ENERGY. Technology and Science, pp. 11-14, March 1974.

Prestige, M.G. and D.J. Willshaw: ON A ROLE FOR A COMPETITION IN THE FORMATION OF PATTERNED NEURAL CONNECTIONS. Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. B 190, 77-98 (1975).

Puthoff, H.E. and Russell Targ: A PERCEPTUAL CHANNEL FOR INFORMATION TRANSFER OVER KILOMETER DISTANCES: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE AND RECENT RESEARCH. Proceedings of the IEEE, Vol. 64, No. 3, March 1976.

Ransom, Champe: RECENT CRITICISMS OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY: A REVIEW. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 65, No. 3, July 1971.

Rhine, J.B.: THE IMPORTANCE OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY TO WILLIAM MCDUGALL. The Journal of Parapsychology. Vol. 35, No. 3, September 1971.

Rhine, Louisa E.: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BASIC CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGY IN PARAPSYCHOLOGY. The Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 35, No. 1, March 1971.

Rorvik, David: THE THETA EXPERIENCE: ELECTRONIC INSIGHTS. Saturday Review of the Sciences, May 1973.

Segeyev: PRINCIPLES OF SPECTRAL ANALYSIS OF A BIOPLASMOGRAM DURING EMOTIONAL STRESS. Moscow: Kontrol' Sostoyaniya Cheloveka-Operator, pp. 18-26, 1970.

Sergeyev, G.A.: THE METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY. U.S. Joint Publications Research Service, JPRS 1/4922, June 3, 1974.

Shevrin, Howard, and William H. Smith: AVERAGE EVOKED RESPONSE AND VERBAL CORRELATES OF UNCONSCIOUS MENTAL PROCESSES. Psychophysiology. Vol. 8, No. 2, 1971.

Shevrin, Howard: BRAIN WAVE CORRELATES OF SUBLIMINAL STIMULATION, UNCONSCIOUS ATTENTION, PRIMARY- AND SECONDARY-PROCESS THINKING, AND REPRESSIVENESS. The Psychological ISS, No. 8, Monograph 30, pp56-87, 1973.

Sidgwick, Mrs. H.: ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT. Parapsychological Review. 1, No. 5, 26-32, 1970 (Reprinted from Proc. Soc. Psych. Res., 22, 1-18, 1908).

Socialist Industries. AUTOGRAVITY? Reprinted from Socialist Industries, U.S.S.R., September 9, 1973.

Sputnik (from the newspapers Izvestia and Moskovsky Komsomolets): BILLIONS OF TRANSMITTERS INSIDE US? AN UNKNOWN BIO-INFORMATION CHANNEL HAS BEEN DISCOVERED: USING THIS 'WIRELESS TELEGRAPH', THE CELLS OF THE ORGANISM TRANSMIT DANGERS SIGNALS. May 29, 1975.

Struckmeyer, Frederick, R.: PRECOGNITION AND THE "INTERVENTION PARADOX". Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 64, No. 3, July 1970.

Szenhagothai, J.: THE NEURON NETWORK OF THE CEREBRAL CORTEX: A FUNCTIONAL INTERPRETATION. Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. B 201, 219-248 (1978).

Taddonio, Judith L.: ATTITUDES AND EXPECTANCIES IN ESP SCORING. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 39, No. 4, December 1975.

--THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXPERIMENTER EXPECTANCY TO PERFORMANCE ON ESP TASKS. J. of Parapsychology, Vol. 40, No. 2, June 1976.

Takeuchi, A. and S. Amari: FORMATION OF TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS AND COLUMNAR MICROSTRUCTURES IN NERVE FIELDS. Biological Cybernetics, Springer-Verlag, 35,63-72, 1979.

Tornuyev, Yu. V.: ON THE ORIGIN OF AN ELECTRICAL FIELD OF AN EXCITED ISOLATED NERVE IN THE AIR. Fiziologicheskii Zhurnal im, I.M.Sechenova, Russian. Vol. 58, No. 9, 1972.

Walker, Evan Harris: THE COMPLEAT QUANTUM MECHANICAL ANTHROPOLOGIST. U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratories, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. Presented at the Rhine-Swanton Symposium on Parapsychology and Anthropology, 73rd Annual American Anthropological Association Meeting, Mexico City, November 19-24, 1974.

Westlake, Philip R.: THE POSSIBILITIES OF NEURAL HOLOGRAPHIC PROCESSES WITHIN THE BRAIN. Kybernetik, VII, 4, September 1970.

White, Rhea A.: THE INFLUENCE OF PERSONS OTHER THAN THE EXPERIMENTER ON THE SUBJECT'S SCORES IN PSI EXPERIMENTS. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 70, No. 2, April 1976.

--THE LIMITS OF EXPERIMENTER INFLUENCE ON PSI TEST RESULTS: CAN ANY BE SET?. J. of the American Society for Psychical Research, Vol. 70, No. 4, October 1976.

Willshaw, D.J. and C. von der Malsburg: HOW PATTERNED NEURAL CONNECTIONS CAN BE SET UP BY SELF-ORGANIZATION. Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. B 194, 431-445 (1976).

Yarovoy, Yu.: ONE CELL SPOKE TO ANOTHER. U.S. Department of Commerce, JPRS 59133, No. 3, May 25, 1973.

Zinchenko, V.P. and A.N. Leont'yev, B.F. Lomov, A.R. Luriya: PARAPSYCHOLOGY: FACT OR FICTION?. Voprosy Filosofii, Russian, No. 9, pp 129-136, 1973.

1980

Arnheim, Rudolf: VISUAL DYNAMICS. American Scientist. Vol. 76, November-December 1988.

Costa de Beauregard, O.: CPT INVARIANCE AND INTERPRETATION OF QUANTUM MECHANICS. Foundations of Physics, Vol. 10, No. 7/8, August 1980.

Cotman, Carl W. and Manuel Nieto-Sampedro: BRAIN FUNCTIONS, SYNAPSE RENEWAL AND PLASTICITY. Ann. Rev. Psychol., 33:371-401, 1982.

Dodge, Christopher, H.: RESEARCH INTO "PSI" PHENOMENA: CURRENT STATUS AND TRENDS OF CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN. Summary Report. The Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, 83-511 SP, June 2, 1983.

Eccles, John: BRAIN, SOULD AND THE NATURE OF THE HUMAN PERSON. The News World, New York, September 1, 1980.

Eimas, Peter D.: THE PERCEPTION OF SPEECH IN EARLY INFANCY. Scientific American. Vol. 252, #1, January 1985.

Fukushima, Kunihiko: NEOCOGNITRON: A SELF-ORGANIZING NEURAL NETWORK MODEL FOR A MECHANISM OF PATTERN RECOGNITION UNAFFECTED BY SHIFT IN POSITION. Biological Cybernetics, Springer-Verlag, 36, 193-202, 1980.

Ingvar, D.H.: SERIAL ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE AND SPEECH RELATED TO PREFRONTAL CORTICAL ACTIVITY: A SELECTIVE REVIEW. Human Neurobiology, Springer-Verlag, 4:177-189, 1983.

Kandel, Eric R.: FROM METAPSYCHOLOGY TO MOLECULAR BIOLOGY: EXPLORATIONS INTO THE NATURE OF ANXIETY. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 140:10, October 1983.

Libet, Benjamin: UNCONSCIOUS CEREBRAL INITIATIVE AND THE ROLE OF CONSCIOUS WILL IN VOLUNTARY ACTION. The Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Vol. 8, No. 4, Cambridge University Press, December 1985.

McKusick, Marshall: PSYCHIC ARCHAEOLOGY: THEORY, METHOD, AND MYTHOLOGY. Journal of Field Archaeology, Vol. 9, 1982.

Meyers, Isabel Briggs with Peter B. Myers: GIFTS DIFFERING. Pgs. 112-116, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA, 1980.

Miller, Robert Keith: DISCRIMINATION IS A VIRTUE. My Turn, Newsweek, July 21, 1980.

Stapp, Henry P.: CONSCIOUSNESS AND VALUES IN THE QUANTUM UNIVERSE. Foundations of Physics, Vol. 15, No. 1, January 1985.

Zakharchenko, Valeriy Mikhaylovich and Georgiy Viktorovich Skrotskiy: DEVELOPMENT OF OPTICAL BRAIN DISCUSSED. From the book, "Cybernetics: Practical Affairs," in the series "Cybernetics: Unlimited Possibilities and Possible Limitations," a collection of articles, compiled and edited by Viktor Davydovich Pekelis. Moscow, Kibernetika. Dela Prakticheskiye in Russian, 1984.