

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY REGARDING PSI AND EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN EXPERIENCE¹

Ingo Swann

BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

Born on 14 September 1933 in Telluride, Colorado, Ingo Swann was educated there and in Utah where he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in biology in 1955. He served in the U.S. Army in Korea and Japan between 1955 and 1958 as a secretary and aide on the staff of the Commander of the Pacific Forces. Between 1958 and 1969 he worked in international civil service at the United Nations Secretariat in New York.

He began acting as an experimental test subject in parapsychology laboratories in 1970, and in 1973 entered full time into classified government-funded psychoenergetics research at Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in California from which he retired in 1989. Based on prepared theses regarding research into novel parapsychological concepts and confirmatory laboratory work, in 1990 and 1991, respectively, he was awarded Master of Humanities and Doctor of Humanities degrees in parapsychology by The International College of Spiritual and Psychic Sciences in Montreal.

The *Encyclopedia of Parapsychology and Psychological Research* (Berger & Berger, 1991) lists him as an

American artist and exceptionally successful subject in parapsychological experiments. ... [who] has demonstrated remarkable ... paranormal abilities that he has been willing to have tested in experiments in several areas. ... In addition, Swann's "contributions to paranormal research are not confined to his role as subject. He also is very articulate about his subjective experience, and slips easily into the role of co-researcher investigating the underlying laws of the phenomena" (Targ and Puthoff, 1977: 37). (p. 414)

Major among Swann's achievements was the discovery in 1972, with Dr. Janet Mitchell and Dr. Karlis Osis at the American Society for Psychical Research, of "remote-viewing"—a novel protocol for testing long-distance clairvoyance, which was thereafter further developed and refined with Dr. H.E. Puthoff and Russell Targ at SRI in California, and which protocol was also independently replicated by other research groups. During his 19 years of active research, Swann has participated in over two million experimental and developmental ESP "trials" involving several hundred experimental variations whose parameters have ranged from loosely controlled to extremely rigidly controlled—the latter experiments under the direct oversight and adjudication of boards of scientists appointed by his research sponsors. A general overview of the public accessible portions of his work are reviewed in the four volumes of the Time/Life book series entitled "Mysteries of the Unknown": *Psychic Powers* (Time-Life Books, 1987a), *Psychic Voyages* (Time-Life Books, 1987b), *Mind Over*

Matter (Time-Life Books, 1988), and *The Psychics* (Time-Life Books, 1992).

Swann (1975) has provided selected autobiographical sketches of his early psychic experiences and research work in *To Kiss Earth Good-Bye*; his gained understanding of strategic mind-dynamic processes of clairvoyance and ESP was published as *Natural ESP* (Swann, 1987/1991); his gained understanding of time-transcending (future-seeing) was published as *Your Nostradamus Factor* (Swann, 1993). Swann has never claimed to "be psychic" (as has been noted in interviews and the media many times), and he has attempted to perform ESP research only within competent laboratory conditions. His life-long interest has focused on studies of creativity and the various kinds of creative processes and abilities of which he feels psi phenomena are adjunct and contributing parts. His views on psi thus often differ from parapsychological approaches, which he feels isolate psi phenomena from holistic human phenomena and functional creative processes.

The enthusiastic parapsychologist, Dr. Alex Imich, bless his heart, who is now 90, and who works overtime to stimulate larger interest in psi matters, has been pestering me for about two years to write an "autobiographical piece" for Rhea White's meaningful publication *Exceptional Human Experience*. Rhea has even sent along an invitational letter to do so, saying that I should make the piece "as honest and direct as you can."

The reason Alex has had to pester me is that I no longer like to review my life's personal anecdotal particulars, especially in the simplistic stereotyped ways expected of "a psychic." What I've experienced in the way of psi or exceptional experience has been experienced by others living today and back through antiquity. Such experiences (or abilities) are therefore present in our species, and I've always been more interested in the species potential than in my own manifestations of it.

Confirming the species potential, however, also led to the discovery that it is usually encapsulated (especially in the modern scientific times into which I was born) in social-order values and norms that are antipathetic to it, and which socially condemn psi and exceptional human experience. It's therefore very difficult for me to "go" autobiographical without calling up and re-experiencing my bathos and frequent dismay with such social orders. So I'd rather not make the attempt—for I'm not a happy camper regarding the social surrounds in which I've lived and still do. But there are Alex Imich's eyes to deal with, eyes limpid and yet brimming with enthusiasm, which moreover look wounded when I say I can't be bothered. So to please and honor him and Rhea's noble publication, it seems I've got to emerge "as honest and direct" as possible from my autobiographical bathos. As I take it, they expect me to focus on my exceptional experiences, including psi, and cough up some appropriate anecdotes. But I

¹ Some time ago I asked Ingo Swann, who is an accomplished artist in addition to the skilled activities he describes in this article, to write his EHE autobiography. For reasons he gives here, he did not do so, but instead submitted a seemingly autobiographically-toned theoretical paper. In essence, however his contribution is exemplary of the EHE autobiography technique: he is not just writing "about" ideas but the concepts and insights he shares are direct outgrowths of or related to his exceptional experiences, especially those of the psychic and creative type. This is the sort of article we would like to encourage authors to write: prose that is informed by the writer's encounter with his or her personal exceptional experiences.—Ed.

can't deal with these piecemeal as separate from the social surrounds in which I've lived and which have had calamitous impact on everyone's psi and exceptional experience thresholds. So Alex and Rhea are not getting a personal ego story here, but an analysis and condemnation of those social surrounds, based on my 19 years of research experience. Rhea has graciously allotted me 50 draft pages; but it would take many more to competently condemn social orders antipathetic to psi and exceptional experience. So much must be left unsaid, and occasionally I direct readers to sources that buttress my observations and eloquently and authoritatively expand on their contexts.

In my sense of things, psi and exceptional experience are manifestations of our species' astonishing ability pools, which I will be discussing, and whose generic existence is the only issue—as Rhea White is making increasingly clear. Few realize that these ability pools exist, and so most people are otherwise focused on and fascinated by their different manifestations, which are seen as separate unrelated phenomena, and which are socially treated as such, and also usually as "problematical." Our ability pools, however, are not the problem. The problem resides rather in social ignorance of their existence and how in societies design their pressuring and conventionalizing forces in the presence of such ignorance. Autobiographically speaking, then, I was born into widespread and socially enforced ignorance of such matters. However, this ignorance (actually an important gap in knowledge) was not seen as such by the "Logic and Reason" that socially prevailed during my formative years. More pointedly, I was born into the Modern Age of Scientific Progress, which contained the Age of Normalcy and the Age of the Five Senses Only. The constructs and rhetoric of these three Ages constituted social "realities," and adaptive adherence to their hyperbole constituted acceptable social behavior.

The constructs of these three social Ages were based upon incorrect models of the human. And, although times and hyperbole have changed since, present-day society in general is still yoked, as a cart to the socially-controlled ox, to these past incorrect models of the human that still seriously distort how the phenomena emanating from the more correct model of the human should be considered. Psi and exceptional human experience emanate from the correct model, but were condemned in the three Ages referred to, and so are still seen as wrong or woo-woo, and as socially incorrect; and the on-going basis for this derives from the powerful social misconceptions into which I was born.

In the first half of the limited space allotted to me here, I'll review and condemn these three important socializing misconceptions, for they are part and parcel of my autobiographical bathos. In the second half, I'll step outside of them and point up unfamiliar, but easily identifiable, metaphor-like facts I've discovered that condemn them even further.

MY CENTRALIZING VISION

But first, autobiographical sketches have to start with something that identifies the autobiographer. Although I can't speak for everyone, many have a "centralizing vision" that empowers their lives. We've developed only a very small ambiguous vocabulary to refer to this, and so its nature and particulars are difficult to discuss. Some call it "commitment" or "calling." Once this vision (whatever it is) congeals, so to speak, then events and directions in life appropriate to it seem spontaneously to collect around it. Mystics tend to say that "opportunities will be

encountered" commensurate to the vision, commitment, or calling. The existence of centralizing visions are easily identifiable in many life stories.

In my case, as a child I developed the concept that I was only one "life-unit" in a veritable ocean of other ones (human, animal, plant, and mineral), and that all of them were encapsulated in cosmic (or universal) forces, visible and invisible. Although I couldn't articulate it very well until the term "ecology" took on, it seemed to me that there was an ecology of life-unit behavior encompassing life management in both the visible and invisible.

I don't know where this centralizing vision came from, but it was in place before I entered the first grade in school, and it certainly exceeded the boundaries of any academic, rote-learning knowledge I might have acquired so young. Four decades later, though, I found this centralizing "life-unit, visible-invisible" vision entirely compatible with the yoga sutras of Patanjali, while the perceptions of the invisible accord with certain of the siddhis (supersensory powers) identified in the sutras nearly 3,000 years ago.

The "invisible" part of this concept was easy enough for me to entertain. For example, in very early childhood I could "see" invisible "energies" and "thought-forms" flowing or jumping between people, animals, plants, and even buildings and geophysical objects. But I soon learned that it was not socially acceptable to see such things, and so the literal sighting of them decreased, and ultimately, it vanished through contrary social conditioning. I've since learned that this is a very old order of human supersense perception widely spread throughout our species. Although equally widely suppressed in the modern scientific epoch, it sometimes remains vestigially active in almost everyone under the popular phrase "vibe-sensing," but it has remained unresearched in any organized form. It is, I believe, the most broadly-shared basic form of exceptional human experience, with many ignored psi implications and extensions.

There was clearly no social support for this centralizing vision, and so it faltered at times, while other of life's exigencies caused me to vacillate about it. Yet, such centralizing visions "pull" toward them appropriate events and opportunities. A strategic one occurred in my ninth grade in high school. The school librarian, seeing me reading so many books with particular mystical leanings in them, suggested one day that I might like to read a dusty old book no one had checked out for many years—and handed me a copy of R. M. Bucke's *Cosmic Consciousness*, first published in 1901. Here, at least in part, was the Cosmic Connection that thereafter fertilized my cosmic life-unit vision.

In 1970, the centralizing vision pulled toward it, albeit completely unexpectedly, another opportunity when (at the age of 38) I was invited to act as a guinea-pig subject in various psi experiments then going on at the American Society for Psychical Research. I did not realize that this would manifest as a late full-blown career change of extraordinary dimensions, at first involving several parapsychology labs, but later two think-tanks, classified government funding, hundreds of scientists, and dozens of "oversight committees." Because I need the limited space ahead for other matters, and I've already detailed the beginnings of this event in my book *To Kiss Earth Good-Bye* (Swann, 1975), I will not rehash them here. As you probably already understand, my centralizing vision did not fit into the modern-age social and cultural milieu into which I was born. So those milieus have to be juxtaposed against or superimposed over my centralizing vision, for the whole of them together have influenced my life. I've given

a lot of thought as to why society rejects psi and other exceptional experiences; and, in fact, in line with my funded research, I was asked to prepare a series of historical background papers accounting for the rejection.

The extensive interlocking details accounting for this rejection are so many and varied that I can't discuss them in the space allotted. But, generally speaking, everyone is born into a social environment of some kind and (a) usually wishes to modulate their behavior so as to fit into it, while (b) the arbiters of the social forces seek to effect this modulation by broad social mind-set conditioning. The inability to fit into the conditioning or attempts to escape from it are usually seen as heretical or anti-social, or, in today's parlance, as politically incorrect.

Some have told me that such conditioning does not exist in the U.S. because of our social polymorphism. But, indeed, I can point up at least three powerful social conditioning forms that generally ensnared all our polymorphous social layers and established the universal modernistic rejection of psi and exceptional human experiences. It is autobiographically correct of me to point them up, for, you see, I was born not just into a physical body and into a family, but also into them.

MY LIFE'S GREATEST DISAPPOINTMENT

The first, and most important, of these specific social forces accounts for my Great Disappointment; and it makes me madder than a fundamentalist who's just discovered a discordant truth. It's this: I was born (in 1933) into the ferment of what was heralded as the Modern Age of Scientific Progress whose spokespersons enthusiastically proclaimed that by the year 2000 this Age would result in universal utopian harmony and a better life for all. So by the age of 10, I believed in this prediction, which energized and excited social milieus far and wide. And I desperately wanted to live to see this magnificent socio-scientific-governed utopia (exact words flaunted back then) come about and be some kind of a vital part of it.

Well, the year 2000 is now but five years ahead. A better life for all is nowhere in sight; social systemic failures have begun or are pending; species are dying at a rate of a hundred a day. The promised "Progressive" social enthrallments into which I was born have largely wrecked the delicate ecological balances necessary for life on Earth, and etc., etc. So here is one reason I don't like to turn autobiographical because I have to reflect on such matters, and doing so just calls up my outrage and sorrow for what might have been. I'm discontented and disappointed with the status quo human condition that by now is characterized by planet-wide supermonumental waste of humans and their individual and species potentials, by fabulous intellectual failures and flops, and by egregious examples of awfulness. I'm full of complaints about how badly humans have so superficially designed their existence. The real human has become lost in what has amounted to socioscientific expectations that have turned out to be little more than hubris and flabdoodle.

I've dragged you through this Great Disappointment interlude because it contributes to important sociological points I'll make later. The first is that exceptional human experiences were "scientifically" rejected in the late, not-so great Age of Scientific Progress, and science mainstream social propaganda actively enforced their social condemnation and still does now. I'm obliged to note that those born after the middle 1950s will not realize the tremendous, if not awesome, social-shaping presence that faith in

Modern Science had during the eight earlier decades.

THE COST OF SCIENTIFIC REJECTION OF EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN EXPERIENCE

To clarify an issue that might have become confused by now, it seems necessary to stipulate that I'm not against the scientific method, which is to discover, accumulate, and test for facts, and I was, I think, reasonably well trained in this method's principles when I majored in biological science in college. I can at least tell the difference between science and scientism, the latter meaning the basing of superficial conclusions alleged to be scientific by manipulating or misinterpreting scientific evidence, or basing them upon the absence of discovered facts. When, then, I entered parapsychology in 1970, lab researchers thought they were getting a talented "psychic." Instead, what they got, to the consternation of some of them, was not a pliant psi guinea pig, but someone trained in basic scientific methodologies. It disgusts me to autobiographically beat this personal tom-tom, but scientific mainstream society (and parapsychology) defines "a psychic" as someone who is not or cannot be scientific by virtue of the fact that science rejects psi to begin with. In other words, "psychics" cannot discover and align facts—when, in fact, many I've known can do so quite well. The problem is that those facts are not socially wanted in science, and hence they are not wanted socially at large, either.

But when I joined the ranks of psychic guinea pigs and parapsychologists, I was still much under the impression that it was laudable to help, as it was commonly said, "establish the scientific reality" of psi and exceptional human experiences. I thought, then, that facts were the issue, and that all that was needed was a demonstrative increase in them in order to shift scientific social realities more in their direction—and, as well, "convince the scientific skeptics."

There is some merit to this, of course. But another factor must be considered. It did not dawn on me for about seven years (and after much bitter experience) *that superficial and incorrect social realities were the real and only issue, and societies that govern themselves by superficial realities have little need of facts.* Such societies prefer to elevate socially-shared flabdoodle to factual status and have no need of psi and exceptional human experience fact-finding, largely because such facts expose to questioning the artificially contrived or fake nature of superficial social realities. As I will strive to show, the issues and facts that emerge from psi and exceptional experience are profound ones having to do with the fundamental image of the human being and the human species. Superficial social norms can't possibly be maintained if such issues and facts are seriously accepted. So by decidedly active social measures they are socially "marginalized" negatively—that is, held in disrepute or contempt, or more bluntly put, ghettoized.

The enormous destructive implications of this negative ghettoizing can only be comprehended if it is understood (a) that superficial social flabdoodle produces only superficial forms of creativity, and (b) that nonetheless it is tacitly admitted that more comprehensive forms of creativity emerge from psi and exceptional human experiences. The literature in this regard is monumental. For example, the historically established link between intuition (a multiple psi form) and creativity (another multiple psi form) is sometimes noted even in superficializing societies. But the intuitional arm of the creative process is in the company of psi and exceptional human experience, and so its

contributive importance is marginalized and there is a vacuum of fact-finding regarding it. In any event, the negative social marginalizing of psi and exceptional human experience is still nearly complete. As a case in point, Rhea has to use her own money to publish *Exceptional Human Experience* because only about 150 subscribe—out of about 5 billion humans on Earth today! When it is considered (and there can be no argument here) that exceptional human experiences are at least the source of all high-gear or high-stage creative enterprises, and of enhanced superawareness as well, a particularly ominous social reality becomes visible regarding Rhea's noble effort. Roughly put, this grim reality has something to do with the wasteful flushing down the toilets of superficializing social formulas of the abundant availability and species meaning of exceptional human experiences and psi supersenses.

Although the trashing of psi and exceptional human experiences have earlier historical precedents, a new form of it (which still hangs on) began with the onset of modern science (about 1845), and was firmly and unequivocally in place in modern society by the Age of Scientific Progress into which I was born. And the trashing was socially reinforced in academe and major mainstream media. For example, *Time* magazine (clearly a leading socioformative force in our society), when forced to observe some psychical or parapsychological development, printed its observations in its notorious "Fraud Box" column (where the parapsychology luminary, Dr. J. B. Rhine, frequently found himself roasted and vilified). Indeed, *Time* did not cease its psi "Fraud Box" scatology until the early 1970s, when the discovery of the extent of Soviet psychical research (as biocommunications) stunned and alarmed the American intelligence communities, and the term "psychic warfare" was pandered about rather seriously. Anything that alarms our intelligence communities cannot, of course, be placed in a "Fraud Box"—if you get my point here.

Even so, psi and exceptional human experiences still remain socially ghettoized, or at least very marginalized, and are treated accordingly in many mainstream documents valued in science, psychology, and academe. For example, the most recent (1994) edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (or DSM-IV), the clinical "bible" of the mainstream American Psychiatric Association, stigmatizes all of these supersense experiences (including mood variations accompanying creativity) under the diagnostic criteria for schizophrenia (with accompanying hallucinations) or as one of the dissociative disorders. The research basis for this stigmatization is practically non-existent, a fact I've taken pains to discover. And indeed, this kind of socioscientific flapdoodle is also the condition that produced the ghettoized sidestreams of "psychical research" and "parapsychology" and "anomalous research," whose advertized goals were to do the research in those exceptional and supersense areas that "scientific" mainstream psychology and psychiatry condemned a priori.

It's worth pointing out that the Modern Scientific Age was the first to condemn psi and exceptional human experience on such a broad social scale, holding the basis for the condemnation to be a self-evident fact. The assumption behind the condemnation of human supersenses and exceptional experiences was that early influential leaders of modern science cemented it into its materialistic mold by establishing that humans possess only five physical senses. Because these five could not account for "psychic" supersenses or exceptional experiences, then the latter

"must" arise from some deranged aspect of ourselves.

It is really too bad that the 1994 classifiers (over 1,000 of them) of DSM-IV's mental disorders did not avail themselves beforehand of a strategic book published 10 years earlier in 1984 by Robert Rivlin, a linguist from England, and Karen Gravelle, an American biopsychologist, titled *Deciphering the Senses: The Expanding World of Human Perception*. The subtitle is somewhat misleading, for it is not the world of human perception that is expanding but scientific recognition that we possess many more senses than just our physical five.

As the book's cover jacket explains:

For centuries we have used an oversimplified and inaccurate model to explain the human senses. Even now, high school biology classes still teach "the five senses." But recent scientific research has discovered that there are many more than five senses and [the research] has radically changed our understanding of what the senses are and how they work.

The book then goes on to list and describe 17 senses (i.e., supersenses) beyond the usual five, most of which have to do with "receptors" we all have that are spread throughout the bio-organism in various ways and which receive various kinds of subtle (biocommunicating) information, which is then decoded by neurons distributed throughout our bodies (not just our infamous brains). Some of these receptors have to do with sensing subtle electric fields. Some are "directional" receptors in our skin, such as are involved with "sensing" north without a compass. Even the hairs on our body possess "wave motion" receptors which can sense someone in back of us or down the street. Some of these newly-discovered receptors "sense" positively-negatively "charged" chemicals or magnetic shifts, and produce a systemic "electrical spike" that charges into the brain via a complex neuropeptide forwarding system.

As the two authors point up, these newly discovered senses are normal [in everyone], but continue to be thought of as outside the scope of normal sensory experiences, which is to say, extrasensory (p. 15). The best thing about this particular book is that it makes it clear that the gap between science and parapsychology topics is now closed, and that there is no longer any scientific justification for rejecting human psi possibilities. The bioperceptual basis for many kinds of experienced "psi" perceptions or exceptional forms of awareness and "psychic" kinds of consciousness has been affirmed. And affirmed not in parapsychology labs but in other kinds of labs whose researchers and technicians do not view themselves as parapsychologists. Yet the debate between parapsychologists and skeptics drags on, principally, perhaps, because neither the skeptics nor the parapsychologists themselves have read this one book. Now, it has to be admitted that 17 senses certainly are better than just five, and you'd think everyone would be interested in these additional ones. But alas, about as many read this book as subscribe to Rhea's *Exceptional Human Experience*, and so five billion humans still think they have only five senses. Why, though, these senses are called "senses" is beyond me. They are abilities pure and simple—abilities because human biopsychic systems do not just sense things. They do something with or because of what is sensed—which presumably is why we have them in the first place. Which is the same as saying that our senses and supersenses are meant to enable us for some specific purposes. It is our social reality-barriers that work to prevent us from optimizing on our subtle abilities/senses. This means, I suppose,

that our reality-barriers are more precious to us than is learning to optimize all of our abilities, which means, again, that if we alter our reality-barriers we might suffer an exceptional experience—such as connecting up with one of our own "unknown" already-indwelling supersense abilities that are "native" to ourselves as cosmic "life-units."

If my life has any autobiographical meaning, the value does not hinge just on working to identify psi (supersense) faculties in ghettoized labs, but also in working to identify the social reality-barriers that prevent us from optimizing our whole supersensing systems. To track down these reality-barriers, it proved necessary for me to look outward from ghettoized psi labs into human social frameworks as a whole—some of which are quite "exceptional" when it comes to wasting human potentials. The autobiographical point of the foregoing discussion has been to point out that not only was I born into the very big social-intellectual flop called the "Scientific Age of Progress," but, as Rivlin and Gravell indicate, into "an oversimplified and inaccurate model to explain the human senses." Now it is clear, cold logic to assume that if you base your understanding on an incorrect model of something, then the chances are very high that your overall understanding will be incorrect, too. Yet, this incorrect model has had (and largely still does) militate scientific support, and any data that disagree with it are militantly vilified.

Incorrect models really do need to be "deconstructed." Yet so pervasive is the incorrect five-senses model that it is worth pointing up that even the followers of deconstructivist Paul de Man (who have recently gained powerful influence in most American universities), who are more than willing to deconstruct everything else, do not touch this proven incorrect model with a 10-foot pole. Although deconstructivist rhetoric is reshaping superficial aspects of our society, there is no mention in it at all of human supersenses and exceptional experiences, and it is politically incorrect to refer to them.

THE NORMAL-ABNORMAL SYNDROME

At the risk of tiring you with what appears to be only my autobiographical complaints about past history, I was born into yet another powerful social influence whose elements are seen as stupid and nonproductive by some today, but whose baleful heritage still widely lingers on. These elements are exceptionally antipathetic to psi supersenses and exceptional human experiences, and in fact account for the widespread social fear of them. It is one thing to be merely unscientific, for there is faith that science will progress and straighten things out. But it's quite another to be considered *abnormal*. Psi supersenses and exceptional human experiences are widely considered abnormal, and how this came about has its place herein. So, in addition to the other social superficializing flapdoodles I was born into, I was also born into the Modern Scientific Psychology Age of Normalcy—or the Age of Establishing What the Normal Human Should Be—in which mainstream social forces preoccupied themselves with what constituted normal-abnormal human psychology and behavior. Although this Age had started up earlier, it got itself into full gear during the 1920s and was in full swing by the 1930s. Then, as now, abnormal was defined as deviating from the normal or average. Everyone knew what "a deviant" was, and by the 1930s no one wanted to be one. So there was a great social rush to fit into the "normal." The term norm has two important connotations regarding how our exceptional human experiences and

supersenses are socially ghettoized. The first definition given in most dictionaries is "an authoritative standard or model." Definition 3(b) (in Webster's *Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*) is given as "a trait taken to be typical in the behavior of a social group." Typical traits are those most shared in a social group in a most common-denominator kind of way; and, I suppose, they are what bind such groups into social units, at which point they take on the social-control contexts of an authoritative standard having something to do with what behavior is tolerated or not by the social units. The difference, then, between norm and lowest common denominator is very narrow, for what most social groups most share are their lowest common denominators. If everyone does it, then it's OK—while what everyone should not be doing is of little interest. Because human stupidity (which takes little effort) is more easily sharable than is human excellence (which takes effort), social norms tend to collect around the former.

Prior to the Modern Scientific Age of Normalcy into which the circumstances of my birth catapulted me, the terms abnormal and normal never had the relevancy they took on for the first 50 years of the 20th century. The reason was that what we now conceive to be psychology and psychiatry had not existed. The goal of both these novel scientific disciplines was, of course, meritorious: to cure the mentally (abnormal) ill and return them to normalcy. But this great curing effort required a commensurate effort regarding finding out what normal was, and so this had to be determined in order to know what to return the abnormal to. Since this was the Age of Science, the normal had to be scientifically discovered—which meant applying scientific methodology to the situation. What this methodology then consisted of (and still largely does, even in parapsychology) is pertinent to this essay. It is called averaging. Average, in this sense, means approximating or resembling an arithmetic mean in being about midway between two extremes—this midway point then being called the norm or normal. Psychological or performance testing can be designed and implemented broadly to discover what occurs the most regarding human behavior and abilities, and these are then considered normal, whereas what occurs the least is then considered abnormal. Now, all of this is well and good regarding finding out what occurs most frequently. But this statistical process, converted from the practice of scientific scrutiny of frequently versus less-frequently occurring phenomena into psychological social meaning and standards, simply meant that what most people do or how they think or behave becomes the statistical social norm. What this amounted to in the long run was that *normal* was determined to consist of the most commonly shared behavior, while what was least shared was interpreted as *abnormal*.

So, in my younger years, the psychological curing of abnormal consisted of clinical efforts to return it (or level it) to the statistical norm via psychotherapy, chemical or electroshock inducements or, more importantly today, via de-educational efforts to deprive one of understanding regarding the real nature of the "abnormal." Because our psi supersenses and exceptional human experiences fall into the abnormal category, they can be reduced therapeutically or chemically or we can be de-educated concerning them. There are, of course, many extraneous but serious social implications to all this beyond the contexts of human supersenses and exceptional experiences. But the overall social effect of this, in my younger years, was that whatever could not effectively be normalized, so to speak, or more frankly put, submitted to psychological levelling, was disenfranchised of

intellectual value and social meaning—this with the exception of two fields of human endeavor, sports and finance, where the above-average was valued.

But, in my opinion, this normalizing was particularly calamitous regarding human abilities, for it surely is of as great importance to understand extreme or exceptional abilities as it is to understand average ones. It is worth mentioning, in passing, that *norm* and *abnormal* presently are politically incorrect terms, the correct ones being "conventional" and "unconventional," and that renewed interest is taking place in the unconventional largely due to the socializing failures brought into existence by attempting to normalize things. There is even renewed interest, as we will see toward the end of this piece, as to where genius (as exceptional "abnormal" ability) has gone to. Thank goodness that I don't have to bear the brunt of these observations by myself. Indeed, they've been more eloquently put by the psychologist James Hillman and the social observer Michael Ventura (1993) in their book *We've Had A Hundred Years of Psychotherapy and The World's Getting Worse*. I've dragged you through this particular discourse because surely something of what constitutes "normal" and "abnormal" depends on first identifying the full spectrum of human abilities and the full spectrum of human experiential thresholds. Neither spectra have been vigorously identified, and even initial attempts (such as those undertaken by the ghettoized scientists, psychologists C. G. Jung and Abraham Maslow) have been socially and scientifically thwarted.

Differences alone cannot really be used to adjudicate between normal and abnormal, and neither can "socially functional normal" and "socially dysfunctional abnormal" be used effectively. For example, at the start of his career, the then peer scientific brotherhoods of Albert Einstein, who definitely was different, almost universally judged him in print to be "mentally deranged." Yet, as it turned out, Einstein ultimately personified not just an exceptionally psi-gifted persona (in physics), but also an exceptional human-species experience, and is now a socio-scientific icon of both.

THE NATURE OF THE PSI AND EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN EXPERIENCE "PROBLEMS"

It is now possible to see that I was born not just into a life in which I could create my own way, but into social forces determined to modulate everyone into their standards. I think it is fair to say that "psychics" and those sensitive to invisible and intangible matters beyond the limits of the five senses were considered not only a danger to the logic and reason of science, but as social feces. I've not the least inclination to soften this phrase because in my 19 years in psi research I have rubbed up against hundreds of respected scientists, some of whom refused to be in the same room with a psychic or sit at the same table. And it's the threat of this acute discrimination (verging on cultural fascism) that still ghettoizes psi and exceptional experience away from the mainstream.

In any event, psi and exceptional human experiences were denied by Modern Science; they were "abnormal" in the light of the "averaged normal"; and they exceeded the range and limits of the infamous Five Senses. How, then, could psi and exceptional human experiences be fitted into these social realities via terms acceptable to them? One may as well figure out how to fit a mountain range into a sardine can in ways that don't discomfort the nicely arranged sardines.

Parapsychologists, though, thought they knew of a way. Beginning about the year I was born, they began driving earlier eclectic forms of psychical research into a strict scientific mode via statistical presentations of psi phenomena. Their understanding was that statistical quantification of phenomena was not only the core methodology of Modern Science but was accepted in all other existing fields of scientific endeavor. Early parapsychologists thus predicted that psi shortly would be accepted into the scientific "fold." This effort, too, becomes part of my autobiographical substance, for, as already mentioned, when I entered parapsychology in 1970, I believed this was the correct course and busted my synapses to help provide a statistical increase of "evidence for psi." Well, among others, the late historian of psychical and parapsychological matters, Brian Inglis, points out in his writings, especially in *The Hidden Power* (1986), that parapsychology has provided six times more statistical evidence than would be asked of any other field of scientific endeavor. And still psi is scientifically, and thus socially, ghettoized. And still most researchers and investigators of psi and exceptional human experience, whether parapsychologists or not, continue to try to "integrate" their work into, or explain their findings in terms of, existing social realities that are based on incorrect models to begin with.

In case you think I'm talking through my hat here and that social meanings are not the central issue, I suggest you read the record of a curious "debate" that took place between parapsychologists and scientific skeptics published in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* (1987) Vol. 10, pp. 539-643. The parapsychologists titled their section "The Anomaly Called Psi: Recent Research and Criticism." But the skeptics, who supposedly were criticizing the "recent research," titled their section "Parapsychology: Science of the Anomalous or Search for the Soul?" The skeptics did not debate parapsychology statistical findings very vigorously (which were largely scientifically unassailable), but they worried themselves as to the social meaning of them. They accused the parapsychologists of covertly attempting "to establish the reality of a nonmaterial aspect of human existence. ... specifically "the soul," whose existence modernist science had empirically rejected at its rather disorganized inception (ca. 1848). To the skeptics, psi apparently means soul, the scientifically ultra-forbidden word—hence one seldom heard in parapsychology enclaves in my long direct experience in them. In any event, I might observe that the skeptics' argument about "a nonmaterial aspect of human existence" (p. 553) is not with parapsychologists, who want no part of the matter, but with advanced physicists who are entertaining nonmaterial notions about everything, including the "mind" and "consciousness." Besides, if scientists want to bother with utilizing accepted scientific methods to accumulate statistical evidence about the soul, why should there be socially-motivated militant attacks to discourage them from doing so? Statistics are statistics, you know.

The brunt of my argument here is that the Modern Age into which I was born just after its midway point generated several incorrect models of the human species and its behavior. These incorrect models became socially accepted as correct ones, were broadly reinforced by educational standards based upon them, and in turn were widely supported by media "analysis."

Incorrect social models, once assumed to be correct, have no need of statistical evidence that challenges their assumed correctness. Here, then (in sum), correct evidence cannot be fitted

into incorrect models, and efforts to do so only result in ghettoizing, if not bastardizing, the evidence. But incorrect social realities are nonetheless very powerful and, understandably, few can get up the steam to point out the incorrectness, such as authors Rivlin and Gravelle dared do in their marginalized book about our 17 senses. The "Problem" of psi and exceptional experiences is not that they exist, but that they can't be fitted into the passionately defended incorrect social models of the human species.

So why continue to try? Why try to fit discovered facts into incorrect models that must pass into history because they are incorrect? Why not instead just go to work to try to find out what the more correct collective model of the human species might be? Surely a great deal regarding potential human excellence and creativity depends on arriving at a model of the human that is as near correct as possible. And integral to this model, perhaps at its very foundation, is the true extent of our sense-perception abilities and the true meanings of our exceedingly varied exceptional human experiences.

I'll even go a step further. The shared alleged sanity of social paradigms congealing around an incorrect model of the human being, of the human species, is surely questionable—and if you think not, well just look around you.

I've now reached the mid-point of my allotted space here. So far in this autobiographical bathos I've alluded to matters that, I think, are somewhat recognizable, and no longer wishing to fit what I've learned into incorrect models, must henceforth talk outside of them. But I think I should mention that Postmodernism and the New Sciences collectively have begun the long arduous process of deconstructing the powerful social effects of the intellectual flops of the Modern Age into which I was born. Not only because of my two decades in parapsychology research, but because of my interest in life beyond socially marginalized psi ghettos, I've mulled over all of the foregoing a lot, juxtaposing this or that aspect in various ways. It is fair to say that I've arrived at some conclusions that are at least autobiographically meaningful.

MY DISCOVERY OF A MISSING LIST

In about 1975, after five years experience of the field of intraparapsychological confusions and machinations, and with extra-field confusions with incorrect social-scientific models of the human, I got to wondering about two things. Regarding the first, I should mention that I'm not the only one to wonder about what a more correct model of the true human, its visible and invisible powers and realms, might look like. Second, I got to wondering why supersense (psi) abilities and exceptional experiences were not more easy to identify and receive social acceptance. After all, such have been with our species from time immemorial—even though largely bowdlerized (edited out) in our modernist conventional history texts. Pursuing this line of reasoning, it eventually dawned on me that something is missing, awesomely missing. Let me work into what this is. As most of us do (or did), I had some supersensing abilities as a child. Most families enthusiastically watch abilities emerge in their children—provided the socially acceptable right ones emerge, not the socially unacceptable wrong ones.

Regarding this, in 1986 I had a moment of amusement when I read David Henry Feldman's (1986) *Nature's Gambit: Child Prodigies and the Development of Human Potential*. Feldman is a professor of Developmental Psychology at Tufts University. He had the idea of getting parents of four child prodigies to cooperate

in letting their youngsters develop without censoring their natural inclinations and abilities. The children were monitored until they were young adults.

It was a difficult experiment, not so much for the children, but for the adults involved. Among other developments, the children remembered past lives, were clairvoyant and telepathic, saw discarnate beings, predicted what was going to happen, invented things beyond their years. Most of Feldman's book, however, is devoted to rehashing the stupefaction, consternation, and disbelief of the adults (including Feldman), who were oriented within incorrect models into which their own children's manifesting supersense abilities could not be fitted. So not many read his book, and it sank into the flushed toilets.

I had similar abilities as a child, but I now know one doesn't need to be a prodigy to have them in some form. These and other abilities arise in the broad spectrum of social classes and levels of childhood intellect. But society, so little united in anything else, is united in dividing "correct" from "incorrect" abilities, and puts an end to the latter.

It's very important to realize that no one really knows what is an ability or not, and this concerns the heading of this section: a missing list. My whole life would have been easier, and everyone else's too, especially so regarding my career in parapsychology, if one thing had existed all along. If this one thing existed, Rhea's *Exceptional Human Experience* would sell like hot cakes to a more interested five billion, the great utopia might have had a chance of obtaining in 2000, parapsychology would not need to have existed as a ghettoized sidestream, and the human species might rouse out of its ability doldrums and not become the monumental flop it is in process of becoming.

Yet, this one thing does not exist, and here is what it is. I've already referred to the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV)*. This is a 886-page descriptive list, with complete index, of what psychiatrists take to be mental disorders, and it is consulted by academe, law enforcement, doctors, scientists, educators, the media, social workers, and culturati. So it is easy to find out what the wide variety of our species' mental disorders are thought to be, excepting occasional necessary revisions of the list. On my bookshelves sit several kinds of dictionaries, which list most of the words we use and their meanings. Next to these are several encyclopedias, major among which is a four-volume one listing and describing most of our species' philosophical concepts, past and present. I also possess encyclopedias that list and describe medicines, anatomy, stars, sea creatures; that list geologic formations, types of volcanoes, rocks, gems, jewels, algae, clouds, types of neurological motor systems, types of sexual positions, types of ocean currents, money, cycles, solar flares, and etc. ad infinitum. Humans makes lists of everything so that anyone who can read can simply go and familiarize or orient themselves in the quickest way possible. But I've not described all these encyclopedic lists to show how well read I am—but to point up in the boldest way possible that there is one list that is not on my shelves. It is nowhere to be found because it does not exist. What I'm referring to is an encyclopedic descriptive list of human abilities and experiential thresholds—whether they be known or suspected to exist within our species. Without an encyclopedic descriptive list of our abilities, we cannot familiarize or orient ourselves to their scope or spectra, as we can do in the case of practically everything else. Without this list most of us do not know what our abilities are or might be. Without this list few have

any idea of what abilities to strive to awaken, develop, or enhance. And, unless I miss my guess, in this descriptive encyclopedic list of human abilities would appear those abilities we call psychic and those that emerge out of exceptional human experiences, and which would probably even account for the experiences themselves.

Yet, after some 40,000 years of our presence on Earth we don't even have a somewhat coherent rudimentary list of any our thousands of abilities. Thus, we have no easy way to orient ourselves to our abilities, and the cost of this must be dismal disorientation regarding their extraordinary spectra—resulting in disastrous personal and social consequences, epic wastefulness of human potentials, and the fabulous ability-failures for which our species is rather noted. So, today, five billion people have no, or only a haphazard, idea of the extent of the general human ability spectrum or pool—and, in my opinion, each and every ability in that pool is equally as "exceptional" as the other.

So I've had to work for my own research reference purposes at compiling one of my own. It's obviously very incomplete, but even so has brought to light a particular realization. I began compiling this list with the questions: What is the spectrum of all human abilities? What is the full extent of the spectrum of our experiential thresholds? It's easy enough to get lost in the phenomenal details of these two spectra. But overall they bring something to mind, although few have thought of it this way.

OUR SPECIES ABILITY AND EXPERIENTIAL THRESHOLD POOLS

A general human species ability pool and a general species experiential threshold pool must exist as surely as does our general genetic pool. Our general gene pool (called the "genome") is now in process of being fully mapped—principally by the Japanese. Our genome preexists each of us, and each of us are but individual products of its different genetic DNA mixes or "distribution." We cannot become a genetic specimen that exceeds the possible configurations already "in" the genome. And there is absolutely no genetic marker or variation that has not been genetically "expressed" in our antecedents. Analogous to this, it seems quite credible to think that we cannot "have" abilities or experiential thresholds unless they are somewhere first to be had, and along this line of reasoning, a general human experiential cum ability pool must preexist us, although their forms may be distributed differently among us as individuals. I've studied this matter very assiduously, and I can't find any human ability that others in some form do not now and or have not already possessed in the past. There is no ability that is so completely new as to be completely unidentifiable in the past. The same can be said regarding our species' experiential thresholds, and so an experiential threshold pool must also preexist us as individuals. No exceptional human experience that I've been able to discover is so completely new as to be completely unidentifiable in someone else in the past.

Thus, I have to hold that abilities or exceptional human experiences do not manifest out of thin air, or so to speak, out of nothing. They arise in us because we possess a species-natural, indwelling basis or potential for them. If, say, telepathy or clairvoyance or out-of-body experience occurs at all to given individuals, they can only occur because their basis or foundations preexist in our general ability-experiential pools—and quite possibly are expressions of our genetic pool. Further, our genetic materials may account for our biological facts. But by far and

large, and traditionally so, we identify ourselves and what we are by our abilities and experiential thresholds. Beyond our biofacts, we *are* our abilities and our experiential thresholds. If our species-inherent ability/experiential pools did not exist, then neither would we differentiate ourselves from other primates. Supersense and exceptional experience faculties exist within our species, a fact that is patently clear because even though a great deal of social denunciation of them exists, they nonetheless spontaneously fire up among a broad spectrum of genetic and social types. Indeed, it can easily be shown that such firings-ups are more identical in their nature than are our genetic admixtures. For example, telepathy and clairvoyance are the same wherever they are found, as are out-of-body experiences, and so forth.

Such a thing as "ability-experiential doldrums" can exist, though. We can easily identify them in socio-ghettos (religious, scientific, philosophical, economic), where vast numbers of people congregate because they are educationally deprived of the means of ability-experiential awakenings beyond what their societies tolerate. The ability doldrums can also be so monumentally shared as to be planet-wide: as must be the case where Earth's five billion human inhabitants are "ability dead" enough to prevent the onset of planet-wide ecological destruction. Speaking of "abnormal," I'd submit that it *is* abnormal to trash a planet.

LIFE-UNITS, SOCIAL ORDERS, AND MIND-PROGRAMMING

I've always liked the term "life-unit." It erases the artificial conceptual boundaries between matter and energy, between physical and spiritual, and between visible-tangible and invisible-intangible, all of which are inclusive in the term. In fact, it seems the highest form of stupidity to think that we are not life-units. Life-units must have a broad spectrum of abilities and experiential thresholds in order to proceed as life-units—for if you can say how you proceed in living without your abilities and experiential thresholds, I'd be very glad to learn of it. Much depends, however, on how the spectrum manifests or fires-up in a given life-unit, or a collective of them, and why it does or does not.

It is very worthwhile to mention that we have an invisible-intangible "part." Bluntly speaking, this is our life part—which is exceedingly invisible, and so far as I've been able to ascertain, no one has pinned down what life is. I'm referring, of course, to what animates the astonishing collection of atoms, molecules, and chemicals that comprise our physical biopsychic systems—the "life essence" of the vitalists who met their cultural demise about 1920. Without this animating life essence our physical chemicals just separate into inert stuff. This invisible whatever-it-is that animates must have abilities that deal with its invisible nature. And it is these abilities that comprise those identified with psi and exceptional experiences, all of which derive from the invisible life-unit's part, and which constitute the basis of much social debate about them. Which brings me autobiographically to the last of the many modern science incorrect social models I was born into.

About 15 years before I was born, a great scientific debate had culminated between vitalists and materialists, the latter predicting that the explanation of the essence of life would be found in matter itself and not in some other nonmatter agency advocated by the vitalists. The materialists won the day then, and they completely converted Science to its philosophic principles, which promptly led to the complete cessation of scientific interest in our invisible constituents and their respective abilities. But by now it's quite

accepted in fact in the postmodern "new" sciences that the "explanations" for what causes life are not going to be found in matter, whose elements and atoms can on the one hand lay inert and inanimate, while on the other they can be combined and animated because of something no one knows what.

The social power of philosophical and scientific materialism was stupendous, and before the philosophy was found to constitute an incorrect model of existence it had colonized practically the entire human world. Since materialists are resistant to psi and exceptional experience, it was of some interest to me to find out what materialism essentially was, as contrasted to what materialists believed. Simply put in my terms, it's a hypnoid-like intellectual program that collects "minds" to it, and the mind-set collective then congeals into a social order that determines what values or meanings people should adhere to or not—and which, thereafter, are socially enforced. But in this sense, materialism, as a mind-set collective, is not unlike any other mind-set collective that congeals into a social order, and all of which are based in a centralizing model of some kind, usually one "explaining" existence. Materialism's central model was that nothing existed except matter. All social orders, whether religious, philosophic, sexual, aesthetic, scientific, political, or economic, etc., are founded upon some centralizing model that others respond to in hypnoidlike ways. All of them are products of someone's thinking. Segments of the human species erect and solidify these models based upon how they perceive (or how they are socially taught or expected to perceive) what they do and do not. Thereafter, facts—or assumed "facts"—that fit in with the model are appreciated, whereas all others are rejected. A great deal depends on whether the models are correct or not. Few consider this, though, and most feel that the socializing model to which they are hypnotically-like responding is correct, because in their ego-estimation of themselves they couldn't be responding to an incorrect one. All of these socializing models are manufactured mind-programs, and the singular clue that shows this is that there have been so many of them.

Thank goodness that I don't have to bear the brunt of this statement myself. In 1981, Charles Hampden-Turner, then Project Director at the Wright Institute in Berkeley, California, published *Maps of the Mind: Charts and Concepts of the Mind and Its Labyrinths*. In this book he discussed and diagrammed 57 of the most influential "maps of the mind" dating from ancient Greece up to modern times—but, of course, these 57 are a mere drop in the bucket of our mind-map-making diversity. Missing from Hampden-Turner's line-up of mind-maps are religious, economic, and political ones. Significantly missing, though, are any that include mind-dynamic parameters for psychic abilities, supersenses, and exceptional human experiences that clearly are associated with one of our most vaunted capabilities: our species-collective creativity—that is variously limited by what we do not perceive because of our social conditioning, which is manufactured by ourselves. It's easy enough to show that our "highest" forms of creativity are those that escape or jump over the limits of superficializing social conditioning.

But although these map omissions irritated me, still one can not read this book without realizing something important about our manufactured mind-maps. They are all, as would be said in computer lingo, social-order-making "software programs."

OUR "HARD DISK DRIVES" AND OUR SOCIAL "SOFTWARE PROGRAMS"

To shorten this a little, leaving some things unsaid, I have by now concluded that we don't have minds. What we have instead is something more akin to a hard disk in a computer awaiting a software program to be installed in it. The hard disk contains our indwelling genetic ability and experiential threshold pools, our social software programs, usually based on some incorrect model, are then installed via social software mind-map conditioning and the natural activity of the three pools is then configured and expressed in ways that accord or not with the incorrect model. In large part, our lines of reasoning are outputs from these installed social software programs (whatever their origin), and when we encounter phenomena, events, happenings, circumstances, or exceptional experiences that don't fit into the software, we tend to view all the latter as we do computer viruses. We hunt down the viruses in order to eradicate them so as to keep our preferred social software programming intact.

So far as I can tell, humans do not yet possess a socializing software program that accords with our species' natural specifics that must exist in our hard-disk drives—and which account for the long-enduring historical presence of psi and exceptional experience. So the various manifestations of the hard-disk drives that leak through social software programs are considered social viruses, hunted down, eradicated, or at least socially marginalized or ghettoized.

THE CORRECT MAP

But one thing about our software social programming seems patently clear. We are a socializing species that unequivocally depends on the benefits of social-group interacting, and without some kind of integrating social software program we would not be able to do so. We need social software. Yet here are revealed two exceedingly strange situations. First, we are not born with a social software program already installed; we are born into one already existing, with the option of adapting to it or, daringly, to some other one more suited to our egos, inclinations, or centralizing life visions. But second, our fermenting battles with social software programs occlude another more significant factor of our species. We are the only species on Earth born so minimally equipped with what we need to know and do to survive, much less do anything else beyond that. All other species are largely preprogrammed to do what they are supposed to do, and many are complete tiny replicas of their adults. All other species have a short infancy, but their species reprogramming survival is evident even during it. Humans, though, have an exceedingly long and helpless infancy, so they have to learn how to survive. In fact, we have to learn how to do anything at all, and we do so by artificially acquiring our software program information. I fail utterly to see why Evolution would evolve a creature-species that absolutely and beyond question needs to program itself in order to survive individually or as a species. Indeed, we are more like a hardware-designed robot awaiting the insertion of software programming that will thereafter determine its functioning. Everything about us depends on how much of all information we can learn after we are born—and it's what we do or do not learn that thereafter modulates our behavior and functioning. In this sense, then, all incorrect social models are learning-impaired, and those that prohibit certain kinds of learning are dangerous to our species' overall survival. Learning theory and information theory are thus exceedingly important to us, albeit seemingly far afield from the ghettoized social toilets into which

psi and exceptional experience have been culturally jettisoned. But, indeed, if I had space herein to do so, I could show that psi and exceptional experiences are our only natural inborn, thus spontaneous, hard-disk forms of interacting with visible-invisible information, while all others have artificially to be learned as introduced software programs. But I've dragged you through this little discussion in order to make another point. Computer inventors and programmers realize the exceedingly important meaning of memory, without which no computer would be possible, and very early this concept figured large in my research activities regarding psi, etc., which is fully appropriate to the correct model of the human.

Again, to leave a lot of background information unaddressed, the question can be posed: Have you ever wondered where the term *human* came from? In the recent scientific past, when Latin names were being assigned to species, some "scientific" idiots decided to call us *Homo sapiens*, as bipedal primate mammals (*Homo*) that are intelligent-wise (*sapiens*). Well, we may allege ourselves to be bipedal primates. But the other alleged intelligent-wise part of our definition is at least somewhat wishful, and it more likely falls into the bright hope category of our behavior. Before we somewhat magically became *Homo sapiens* by what amounts only to a nomenclature coup, some ancient societies referred to our species as "hu-mans" ("hu" meaning people, both male and female, and "mans" meaning memory)—memory-people who could think in the contexts of what that memory provided as stored information. The ancient term "memory people" is virtually an open invitation for software-program-installing into some kind of hard disk, for we do become or act out or mimic only what we can program-remember we might or should. In this sense, then, if we are memory-people, it is memory vacuums that act as viruses in our mind-dynamic systems rather than information that does not fit into social software programs. Memory-learning vacuums (socially valued by many) prevent various kinds of information from being correctly processed or processed at all.

It is, I think, universally accepted that we are a memory-people species, the only glitch (a significant one) being that no one can account for memory, how its information is processed, or where it is stored in humans. But computer people know very well that memory in computers is achieved via electromagnetic imprints into the physical matter of computer hard drives and floppy disk software. The amount of electromagnetic-governed information that can be imprinted (coded) into a single molecule of physical matter is astounding. But not nearly so astounding as is the case with humans, that is, memory-people, whose inborn and acquired memory processes defy description so far. In fact, as geneticists now realize, our DNA molecules consist of some kind of electromagnetically stored information that self-replicates by seizing upon appropriate physical elements and chemicals, and by some kind of unfathomable process imprints them with "instructions" so that they do what they are supposed to do. Without this bioelectromagnetic patterning our genetic materials could not go ahead and erect our bio-facts. Thus, some form of bioelectromagnetism is what we essentially are.

Thank goodness, again, I don't have to argue this myself. These astonishing facts are gradually now being discovered, sorted out, and boggled over by the New Sciences. I'll not review these here, since they've been presented far more eloquently in several recent books, major of which so far are *Quantum Healing* by Deepak Chopra (1989); *The Body Electric: Electromagnetism and the Foundations of Life* by Robert O. Becker and Gary Selden

(1985); and *Blueprint for Immortality: The Electric Patterns of Life* by Harold Saxton Burr (1972). Deepak Chopra (and others) have made a fairly uncontested argument that our DNA molecules and resulting neural networks and immune systems "remember" how to do their thing. And so, from the ground up, we are memory-people whose atoms, molecules, and cells are remembering what they're supposed to do. In fact, what is called our "autonomic nervous system" and "immune system" remember what they're supposed to do regardless of the incorrect software lines-of-reasoning programs we install into our species-shared hard disk drives. For which, I think, we should be grateful. The bioelectromagnetic model of ourselves probably approaches the overall correct elements missing in so many past incorrect models. For one thing, it bridges our visible-tangible and invisible-intangible dichotomy, for all our bio-EM "parts" are "invisible," while at the same time our bio-EM links us directly into the whole of cosmic electromagnetism and into "information particles" that information theorists say exist everywhere. As all those researching bio-EM state, such must be the real basis for psi, and so the existence of the latter should be taken for granted. And all of the 17 senses I alluded to earlier are bio-EM determined. If you have any objections to the bio-EM model, your arguments are with those researching it, not with me.

In now closing this autobiographical essay, I'd like to return briefly to the human ability and experiential threshold pools, whose expressions can be nothing more or less than different levels or qualities of bio-EM interacting or realizing.

OUR ABILITY-EXPERIENTIAL POOLS EXIST IN OUR HARD-DISK DRIVES

After all that has been said herein so far, it now must be added that our hard-disk drives, into which whatnot software programs can be installed, must be made of something more basic than our superficializing (and transitory) social software programs that come and go, usually by virtue of their disastrous results that cause them to become passé and unfashionable. If it were true that our abilities and experiential threshold pools are part and parcel, so to speak, of our species' hard-disk drive, then they are natural to us and are in some fashion distributed throughout all individuals. That these natural abilities and experiential thresholds can be made to be dysfunctional by our social software programming is patently obvious.

Due to limited space herein, I've talked of these matters without providing concrete examples of many of them. But it is appropriate to give some examples of innate hard-disk abilities that link the context of this autobiographical essay into presently formulating social realities. Fortunately, as I was writing this, some hard-disk ability stuff was featured in *Life* magazine (Grunwald & Goldberg, 1993) regarding babies. It is now known that at three months they can add before they learn to count, that they can understand a hundred or more words before they can speak, and at three months their powers of memory are far greater than we ever imagined. At six months babies can recognize the native language around them because they are "universal linguists" capable of distinguishing each of the 150 sounds that make up all human speech. However, at six months they begin "the metamorphosis" into specialists that recognize the consecutive speech sounds of their native (software) tongue—and if more than one language is being spoken around them they are able to discern which sounds go with which (software) language,

isolate the differences, and begin to speak in both tongues before they have learned vocabulary styles and syntax. At seven months, babies have become expert lip-readers and connect vowel and consonant sounds to lip movements. Even though their expression of words and the thoughts behind them may be weak, it is now believed that the comprehension may exceed expression by a factor as high as 100 to one. And, although not discussed in *Life*, babies begin to speak what mothers and fathers are thinking (telepathy), and moreover, without having been tutored to do so, they perform the amazing feat of correct syntax alignment of verbs and nouns, etc. Where they get this syntax from is a great mystery, although some researchers believe it is a direct telepathic acquisition.

Thus, all babies at first being "universal linguists" (that is, having access to the universal hard-disk language pool), have by the age of two or three become Chinese, German, Swahili, or English speakers, etc. Clearly, then, universal linguistic abilities exist in our species ability pool—and infants depart from this universal linguistic potential in order to communicate in the special language of those around them. Infant humans also begin to adapt (begin to form software social programs, or "begin the metamorphosis" as *Life* puts it) into other environmental specializations so as to fit into them—such as moral, ethical, political, and religious specializations. They can "become" anything along these lines with the same equal ease that empowers them to specialize in a given language. So, down the lines of their lives a bit, they have become a human probably quite departed from the human universal ability pool because of specializing in what best fits them into family, peer pressures, and their social surrounds (as indeed was the case with me). If all the relevant facts would be admitted to, the highest incidence of psi abilities occurs in young babes and children—clearly indicating the existence of a psi component of the universal human ability pool, that same pool "containing" universal linguistic potentials. If infants can read lips they surely can "read" facial expressions and telepathic attitudes. So in anti-psychoic societies children can surely perceive that their emergent psi arouses disapproving frowns, anger, etc., on the faces of those around them. The infants then begin adapting to the anti-psychoic software programming earlier adapted to by those in their immediate and social environments. Another appropriate hard-disability example was provided by *Newsweek*, which conveniently published a long article on "The Puzzle of Genius: Where Do Great Minds Come From?" (Begley, 1993). Genius clearly falls into the category of exceptional human experience. However, the occurrence of genius seems to have declined during recent decades (little wonder), and so *Newsweek's* editors wondered not only about "Where Do Great Minds Come From?" but "Why Are There No Einsteins, Freuds or Picassos Today?" It was early established in the article that IQ alone does not account for genius because many with very high IQs do not turn out to be one. After a good amount of discussion on "risk-taking," "obsessive workers," "iconoclasts," "grey matter," "neural highways for transmitting information," "language," "mind and space," and "inspiration," the article generally concluded, somewhat in anguish, that genius is "the ability to make juxtapositions that elude mere mortals"—that genius is "the ability to connect the unconnected, to see relationships to which others are blind" (p. 50). So we now know what we've known all along, and once again explanations for genius have been reduced to stereotypes that fit into what is thought to be known. Well, I've read the autobiographical materials of many geniuses, and not one

of them has hesitated to allude to what is called psychic or exceptional experience potentials in which they have participated—including Nicola Tesla and Thomas A. Edison. Indeed, seeing "relationships to which others are blind" literally means (a) seeing the invisible, and (b) escaping social software programming based on incorrect models in order to see what the shared software programming is blind to. In other words, geniuses somehow escape the social software programming that "mere mortals" labor within and so the former can psych-out (or ken) meanings that other's don't or can't because of adherence to the confusions inherent in their incorrect model of social software programming. I've alluded to the word *ken* above because by means of it I can establish a link to what vestigially remains in practically everyone of psi and exceptional experience despite their superficial social programming. *Ken* is not presently in social usage, but in my childhood it was still used, and is also still used sometimes in backwater places and by science fiction writers. *Ken* refers to the range of vision, to the range of perception cum experiential thresholds cum Understanding (as a wide-spectrum ability.) Almost everyone still *kens* today under the popular phrase "psyching it out." To psych-out something we need to employ our kenning range of vision, and it is this range (whatever it is or not) that results in our perception of meanings. Hence observing, kenning, and psyching-it-out all mean approximately the same thing. What parapsychologists call "psi" is a kenning event, as are exceptional human experiences a kenning of something otherwise invisible. Babies ken, until they've learned not to. Geniuses do too, having escaped social programming not to. Life-units can ken, unless they've become socially programmed not to.

But, yes, you've guessed it. Kenning-psyching-it-out has received no research, even by parapsychologists who've ghettoized it as so plebian as to be beneath their notice. But here is the germinating seed of both psi abilities and exceptional human experiences. Nobody has ever objected to them per se, which is wise, because millions have them all the time. But the abilities and experiences have "different" meanings implicit in them, and it is these meanings that worry very many. Simply put, these "different" meanings disrupt older established or conventional ones that, as lines-of-reasoning stereotypes, rest on a broad base of social software conditioning formulated on incorrect models of the human being. Few appreciate having their precious lines of reasoning wrecked because of the surfacing of a "different" meaning—and most prefer only those meanings that fit within their socially programmed lines of reasoning.

In my career as a "psychic" researcher, very many have asked what I feel is the most significant psi ability or aptitude. So it would be autobiographically correct to close this brief essay with commentary pertinent to that issue. Those asking this question usually expect me to speak in terms of a stereotyped answer that fits into what they understand about psi. They expect me to speak in terms of ESP, telepathy, clairvoyance, etc. So, when I answer based on the broader understanding I have gained, they usually go away frowning, or dismayed, or confused.

All psi aptitudes can broadly be grouped together within one of our most significant ability potentials, the basis for which clearly and unequivocally exists in our universal human ability and experiential threshold pools. This potential, as I call it, regards our powers of observing—powers that everyone has. But this is unclear unless we define *observe*. This term has several meanings in most dictionaries, and we are led to believe it means just looking at something. The pertinent definition in this case is: to

... to realize or know through consideration of noted facts. Indeed, we can look at (perceive-sense) something without having any idea of what it is, or, more specifically, realize what it means. "To come to realize" actually means to perceive the meanings of something. Perception plus realizing (through consideration of noted facts) the meaning of what is perceived equals observing. Our powers of observing-meanings (as it were) are far more important to us than our powers of perceiving things alone. Things are nothing to us unless we can observe their meanings. How it is that our species attributes meanings to what is perceived or experienced is one of the greatest human mysteries of all time. Most of us are disinterested in this, however, largely because we adapt our software programming to predigested meanings circulating in the social environments into which we are plunked by the circumstances of our births.

What might be called a universal pool of meanings ought to exist—a matter with which, strangely, physicists (not parapsychologists) have involved themselves. Meanings exist whether we do or not, and even geniuses cannot discover something that absolutely does not exist. Commensurate with this universal meaning pool, a species-universal pool of human abilities and experiential thresholds also exists which interacts with the former through our abilities to perceive meanings. Different abilities connect up to different meanings, and so it somewhat stands to reason that the more we know of our abilities and experiential thresholds overall the more overall meanings will become available.

We know very little of the extent of our species hard-disk abilities and experiential threshold pools because no systematic effort has been made to map or list them. Thus, piecemeal studying of the phenomena of psi and exceptional experience may ultimately mean something, but it is not the correct task. If my 19 years in research have convinced me of anything, it is that it does little good to study psi abilities or exceptional human experiences of and in themselves. They are only parts of the life-unit's biopsychic-EM schematic (or "blueprint") of our overall interacting genetic ability, and experiential threshold pools—and so the full spectra-extents of all these pools are the proper and real field of inquiry.

REFERENCES

- Becker, R.O., & Selden, G. (1985). *The Body Electric: Electromagnetism and the Foundation of Life*. New York: Morrow.
- Begley, S. (1993, June 28). The puzzle of genius: Where do great minds come from? *Newsweek*, 12(26), 46-51.
- Berger, A., & Berger, J. (1991). *Encyclopedia of Parapsychology and Psychical Research*. New York: Paragon House.
- Bucke, R.M. (1901). *Cosmic Consciousness*. Philadelphia, PA: Innes.
- Burr, H.S. (1972). *Blueprint for Immortality: The Electric Patterns of Life*. London: Neville Spearman.
- Chopra, D. (1989). *Quantum Healing*. New York: Bantam.
- Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV)* (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.
- Feldman, D.H. (1986). *Nature's Gambit: Child Prodigies and the Development of Human Potential*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grunwald, L., & Goldberg, J. (1993, July). The amazing minds of

- infants. *Life*, pp. 46-52.
- Hampden-Turner, C. (1981). *Maps of the Mind: Charts and Concepts of the Mind and Its Labyrinths*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hillman, J., & Ventura, M. (1993). *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy and the World's Getting Worse*. San Francisco: Harper/San Francisco.
- Inglis, B. (1986). *The Hidden Power*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Rivlin, R., & Gravelle, K. (1984). *Deciphering the Senses: The Expanding World of Human Perception*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Swann, I. (1975). *To Kiss Earth Good-Bye*. New York: Hawthorn.
- Swann, I. (1991). *Natural ESP: The ESP Core and Its Characteristics*. Los Angeles, CA: Tarcher. (Original work published 1987).
- Swann, I. (1993). *Your Nostradamus Factor*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Time-Life Books. (Eds.). (1987a). *Psychic Powers*. Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books.
- Time-Life Books. (Eds.). (1987b). *Psychic Voyages*. Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books.
- Time-Life Books. (Eds.). (1988). *Mind Over Matter*. Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books.
- Time-Life Books. (Eds.). (1992). *The Psychics*. Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books.