A few words about the Mind-Matter Mapping Project

Lian Sidorov
E-mail: liansidorov@gmail.com

In 2002, the National Science Foundation's *Science and Technology Indicators* report cited a nationwide NSF-sponsored survey which showed 60% of adult Americans agreeing that "some people possess psychic powers or ESP". As in similar European surveys, this percentage has been increasing in recent years, and is significantly higher among those with higher levels of academic achievement (Radin, 2006, pp 38-40.) In fact, among mainstream scientists, the belief that extra-sensory perception was "an established fact" or "a likely possibility" was shared by 56-67% of respondents, depending on the survey (Carter 2007, pp. 89). Among college and university professors, the overall acceptance rate for ESP was 2/3 (Radin 1997, pp. 226).

What is this belief based on? Personal experience? Wishful thinking? Scientific data? We can't make assumptions about the first two categories – but despite a remarkable avoidance of the topic by most mainstream academic publications, "rumors" about this line of research continue to percolate through the science community and popular media, ensuring that the subject remains in some twilight zone of public awareness.

This, of course, is an unsustainable position for any area of research. Without a minimal level of academic endorsement, funding streams and publishing opportunities, there is little hope for significant and credible breakthroughs in any scientific field – especially one as riddled with black boxes and paradoxes as the field of consciousness research. In one meta-analysis after another, statistical evidence has overwhelmingly shown that extrasensory perception and remote mental influence on physical systems, both in real-time and trans-temporally, are wide-spread features of our world. From remote viewing data used successfully in hundreds of intelligence operations (McMoneagle 1997, 2000, 2002; Smith 2005; May 1996; Targ & Katra 1998; Jahn and Dunne 2005) to distant EEG correlations between human senders and receivers (Radin 2006, pp 18-19, 75, 136-141); from placebo effects to remote healing influence on DNA conformation and gene expression (Benor 2001; Chen 2004; Chen, Sidorov and Dossey 2005; Sidorov 2003b; Rein and McCraty 1994); from mental influence on random event generators (Jahn 1981, Jahn and Dunne 2005, 2009, 2011, 2012) and low-intensity laser beams in distant Michelson interferometers (Radin 2007, 2012) to global REG network correlations during events with mass resonance, as shown by the Global Consciousness Project (Nelson and Bancel, 2006), we seem to live obliviously in a world that shimmers with the subtle, ongoing effects of belief, expectation and intent on a reality which may be less rigid and less deterministic than previously assumed. This nebulous boundary between matter and consciousness is the essence of the Quantum Enigma – and one could argue that no greater scientific challenge exists before us than to understand its topology. Yet almost no mention is made of these ubiquitous mind-matter effects in the mainstream scientific discourse, for such is the great achievement of Enlightenment that any heretic questioning the central dogma of Physicalism

knows to relegate himself automatically to the pyre of New Age publishing (and for those who forget, science editors are quick to point out the door).

To a naïve undergraduate looking at this data for the first time, the question is obvious: what do we do with it? How do we coexist with such facts – with the contradiction between the commonly-taught, brain-based view of consciousness, and the nonlocality implied by these hundreds of controlled, randomized studies (Jahn and Dunne 2005; Carter 2007; Radin 2006; Sheldrake 1999)? How does this evidence impact other fields of research, such as medicine or physics? What does it tell us about the way in which we communicate with each other, as individuals and as a species? And what are the implications with respect to the apparently objective, shared reality that we observe? How do our deepest beliefs and expectations interfere collectively to shape the outcome of the probabilistic components of our world? Luckily for our impressionable student, there is currently no place in academia where such questions can be asked with impunity – so friendly dissuasion and the typical salmon run dynamics of graduation all but guarantee that what comes out of the gate are well adjusted individuals with little memory of their temporary transgression and little tolerance for doubt (see Hess 1992).

But the questions never fully go away. This is in part because mainstream science keeps running into walls, quite spectacularly - whether it's the foundations of quantum mechanics, or the hard problem of consciousness, or the placebo effect it's trying to explain; and in part because, frankly, such questions and the phenomena they address have been with us since the beginning of recorded history.

The challenge we face, if we wish to understand these findings, is not only a political one, as discussed above; it is primarily a conceptual one. There is a great causal discontinuity between matter and consciousness, which makes every tentative model look woefully inadequate. But is that gap real or artificial? Perhaps the entrenched dogmas circumscribing our scientific foundations have limited the way in which we think about reality. Are we using the right tools? Are we asking the right questions? Complicating the picture is the fact that each discipline coming to bear on this unyielding question (neuroscience, physics, psychology, philosophy) has its own language, its theoretical boundaries and its own unwritten code as to what constitutes a legitimate approach. As we prepare to leap across this vast mind-matter divide, we often forget to consider our own condition: blinded by causal paradoxes and experimental indeterminism; deaf to each other's advice; constantly looking over our shoulder in an effort to avoid the attacks of "skeptic" fundamentalism (or even worse, the pink slip waved by weary department heads); and equipped with whatever we could beg, borrow or buy with the change in our pockets. Notwithstanding a handful of exceptions, this is generally the state of our expedition across the board – from the US to Japan and from the UK to Brazil.

Faced with such underwhelming odds, we ought to ask ourselves how else we can approach this. The last two of the four diagnoses listed above are unlikely to improve any time soon. But can we do anything about the rest?

When ICRL began developing this project (whose seeds were sown decades ago), it did so not in order to burden the world with yet another journal – but in the hope that we might push through our considerable limitations by coming together in a sustained, rigorous and mutually nurturing conversation about the

place of consciousness in the physical world. That is the PEAR legacy, its example, and probably the only way in which we can hope to make meaningful progress. Regardless of who our members are and where they choose to publish their ideas, what we wish to offer them above all is a place where these ideas can develop through continuous exposure to new research findings, emerging theories and conceptual challenges. The Web, with its cloud-based technology and new options for developing content collectively, gives us unprecedented opportunities to interact as a group, no matter where we are on the globe or when we can afford to "drop in" and pick up the conversation threads. Being able to jointly map intriguing data, questions and proposed experimental approaches provides us an instant snapshot of the latest developments in our particular area of interest – what is known, who is working on it and where the most promising research lines are converging. We can begin to see parallels and correlations, to translate the data of one field, such as remote viewing, into the hypothesis of another, like theoretical physics, and bring in cognitive science tools like knowledge of neurophysiological pathways and functional brain imaging results to refine and test those hypotheses. Because the point of it all, of course, is not to defend our individual pet theories – but to ensure that everyone understands them well enough to offer substantial critique; the point is not to retreat behind disciplinary ontologies and assumptions, but to break down those definitions in such a way that we can not only explain them to Einstein's barber, but in the process we ourselves begin to question those elements of certainty. And last, but perhaps most critically, the point of this exercise is to create a community, extending far beyond the quarantined zone of parapsychology, in which scientists of all backgrounds can find the courage to admit their doubts about the "promissory materialism" to which we are expected to swear absolute allegiance. How solid are our axioms – and how wrong can we afford to be? What tools are we able to construct together in order to test them?

This last question is perhaps the most important one we ought to ask ourselves. For once we decide to take the blindfold off and look deeper than neurophysiological *correlates* of consciousness, where do we turn? Where is the clean, *meaningful data* upon which we can build a new mind-brain, mind-matter interface model?

Whether we choose to look at remote target characteristics and the way our mind translates this information into conscious awareness (Warcollier 1927, 1958, 2001; McMoneagle 1997, 2000; Ullman and Krippner 1973; Targ and Katra 1998; May et al. 2000); or at the direction of information flow, error propagation and cognitive attractors (Warcollier 1927, 1958, 2001; Brown 2005; Schmidt 1993; Sidorov 2003a); or at mental strategies and errors in establishing operator-target entanglement (Jahn and Dunne 2012, 2005; Benor 2001; McMoneagle 1997, 2000) – these are the first, rudimentary elements of our new world geometry. They are tentative, shrouded in more questions than answers, and some will doubtlessly prove misguided – yet they are probably closer to the ground of reality than the postulates of materialism.

Our humble suggestion (and much of the motivation behind the Mind-Matter Mapping Project) is that we seek such non-axiomatic building elements both within and outside of formal protocols – that we engage both the fact-finders and the fact-organizers of consciousness research. Traditionally, peer-reviewed studies have provided the only source of empirical results used to develop theoretical models of psi interactions. But, we believe, we are approaching a stage where that conceptual envelope needs to be expanded; where scouting for such preliminary data points can and ought to be undertaken by those who have trained themselves for years in diving along the mind-matter interface. These are the remote viewers of the former Star Gate project and their students; the qigong masters and other healers who have

developed ways to visualize and influence biological processes; the TM sidhi and other expert meditators, who bring thousands of years of tradition to a self-knowledge that the West is only beginning to glimpse. Not every idiosyncratic method or observation constitutes data, of course; but without paying close attention to what these "psi practitioners" have to tell us, we are susceptible to trapping ourselves within the theoretical bounds of the very framework we are trying to escape. Science requires a systematic, logically organized approach – but we also need to remember that such models and inferences must be built on a solid foundation of facts. And the truth is that when it comes to mind-matter interactions, we have been trained to filter out most of the day-to-day facts. That place, where meaning and emotional content translate into physical information, remains for all intents and purposes a black box. To open it will require a sophisticated array of both subjective and objective tools. Perhaps one day theoretical physicists will remember the adage that to truly understand something, you have to do it yourself; until then, the path that leads through the incomprehensible heart of quantum mechanics needs to be mapped painstakingly – one question, one e-mail, one test at a time.

REFERENCES

Benor, Daniel J. (2001) ***Spiritual Healing: Scientific Validation of a Healing Revolution***. Volume I. Vision publications, Southfield MI 2001

Brown, Courtney (2005) ***Remote Viewing: The Science and Theory of Nonphysical Perception*** Farsight Press, Atlanta GA 2005

Carter, Chris (2007) ***Parapsychology and the Skeptics: A Scientific Argument for the Existence of ESP*** SterlingHouse Books, Pittsburgh, PA 2007

Chen K. (2004) An Analytic Review of Studies on Measuring Effects of External Qi in China. Alternative Therapies July-Aug 2004, Vol. 10 Nr. 4
http://www.qigonginstitute.org/html/Chen/Waiqianalysis_0704.pdf

Chen K, Sidorov L, Dossey L (2005***) Effects of intent and mental state on the biological subjects: A review and its implications to medical research***. Medical Paradigm. 1[2] 2005

Hess, David J. (1992). ***Disciplining Heterodoxy, Circumventing Discipline: Parapsychology, Anthropologically***. In David Hess and Linda Layne (eds.), Knowledge and Society Vol. 9: The Anthropology of Science and Technology. Greenwich, Ct.: JAI Press. Pp. 191-222. Electronic version available at http://www.davidjhess.org/DisciplHetJAI.pdf

Jahn, Robert G., ed. (1981) ***The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World (AAAS Selected Symposium)*** Westview Press, Boulder, CO 1981

Jahn, Robert G. and Dunne, Brenda J. (2005) ***The PEAR Proposition*** Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 195–245, 2005 http://www.icrl.org/pdf/PEARproposition.pdf

Jahn, Robert G. and Dunne, Brenda J. (2009) ***Margins of Reality: The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World*** ICRL Press, Princeton, NJ 2009

Jahn, Robert G. and Dunne, Brenda J. (2011) ***Consciousness and the Source of Reality: the PEAR Odyssey*** ICRL Press, Princeton, NJ 2011

Jahn, Robert G. and Dunne, Brenda J. (2012) ***Quirks of the Quantum Mind***. ICRL Press, Princeton, NJ 2012

May, E. C.; Spottiswoode, J. P. and Faith, L. V. (2000). The Correlation Of The Gradient Of Shannon Entropy And Anomalous Cognition: Toward An AC Sensory System. *Journal of Scientific Exploration, 14(1)*, 53-72

May, Edwin C. (1996) ***The American Institutes for Research Review of the Department of Defense 's Star Gate Program: a Commentary*** Journal of Parapsychology Vol. 60, March 1996

McMoneagle, Joseph ***Mind Trek: Exploring Consciousness, Time and Space Through Remote Viewing***. Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, VA 1997

McMoneagle, Joseph ***The Stargate Chronicles: Memoirs of a Psychic Spy***. Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, VA 2002

McMoneagle, Joseph ***Remote Viewing Secrets: A Handbook***. Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, VA 2000

Nelson, Roger. and Bancel, Peter (2006) ***Anomalous Anticipatory Responses in Networked Random Data*** AIP Conf. Proc. 863, pp. 260-272
at http://noosphere.global-mind.org/papers/pdf/GCP.AAAS.06.pdf

Radin, Dean (1997) ***The Conscious Universe*** HarperCollins Publishers New York, NY 1997

Radin, Dean (2006) ***Entangled Minds*** Simon & Schuster New York, NY 2006

Radin, Dean (2007) ***Quantum Optics: is Psi a Type of Knowledge?*** IONS library June-Aug 2 #15, 2007
http://www.noetic.org/research/project/quantum-optics

Radin, Dean (2008) ***Testing nonlocal observation as a source of intuitive knowledge***
Explore**. 2008 Jan-Feb;4(1):25-35.**
http://www.deanradin.com/papers/radin%20photon%20explore.pdf

Radin D., Leena Michel, Karla Galdamez, Paul Wendland, Robert Rickenbach, and Arnaud Delorme (2012***) Consciousness and the double-slit interference pattern: Six experiments***. PHYSICS ESSAYS 25, 2 (2012) http://www.deanradin.com/papers/Physics%20Essays%20Radin%20final.pdf

Rein G and McCraty R, (1994) ***DNA as a detector of subtle energies***. Proceedings of the 4th annual conf. of the ISSSEEM, Boulder, CO.

Schmidt, H. (1993) ***Observation of a psychokinetic effect under highly controlled conditions***. Journal of Parapsychology, Vol. 57, Dec. 1993

Sheldrake, Rupert (1999b) ***How Widely is Blind Assessment Used in Scientific Research?*** Alternative Therapies 5[3] pp 88-91
http://www.sheldrake.org/Articles&Papers/papers/experimenter/pdf/blind.pdf

Sidorov, Lian (2003a) ***Entanglement and Decoherence Aspects in Remote Viewing: a Topological Geometrodynamics Approach*** Journal of Non-Locality and Remote Mental Interactions II [1]
www.emergentmind.org/SidorovII(1).htm

Sidorov, L. and Chen, K. (2003b) ***Biophysical Mechanisms of Genetic Regulation: Is There a Link to Mind-Body Healing?*** in Science of Whole Person Healing: Proceedings of the First Interdisciplinary International Conference**,** Washington DC. 2003, Roy R. ed. (pp 202-230) iUniverse, Lincoln NE 2003;
http://www.emergentmind.org/Sidorov06.htm

Smith, Paul (2005) ***Reading the Enemy's Mind : Inside Star Gate - America's Psychic Espionage Program*** Tom Doherty Associates, New York, NY 2005

Targ, R. and Katra, J. (1998) ***Miracles of Mind*** New World Library, Novato, CA 1998

Tart C., Puthoff H. and Targ R., Eds. (2002) ***Mind at Large: IEEE Symposia on the Nature of Extrasensory Perception***. Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, VA 2002

Ullman, M. with Krippner, S. and Vaughan, A. (1973) ***Dream Telepathy*** Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. New York, NY 1973

Warcollier, René (2001) ***Mind to Mind.*** Russell Targ Editions, Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, VA 2001

Warcollier, 1927 ***Ce qui se transmet.***, Revue Metapsychique, 5, 1927, pp 355-373

Warcollier, 1958 ***La transmission de la pensee et la pensee***. Revue Metapsychique, II[7] 1958