

From the
AGE OF SYSTEM
into the
AGE OF RELATION

“RELATIONAL METAMORPHOGENESIS:
TRANS(RE)LATIONS OF GENERAL (BOUNDED) SYSTEMS”

By
Nicolas Bourbaki, Jr.

June, 1981

CONTENTS

Title Page

Dedication

Forward

Summary

I. Background

A. Introduction

B. System-as Totality

1. General Systems

2. General Systemantics

3. General Systemantilectics

C. System-as-Whole

1. Holistic/Holographic Experience (a Whole is NO-Thing)

a. Relational Philosophy

b. Relational Formalisms

c. Relational Sciences

D. System-as-Whole/Field/Energy: Experiential/Experimental Data

II. Symbolic Trans(re)lations of General (Bounded) Systems

III. Symbolic → Actual Trans(re)lations of General (Bounded) Systems

Notes

References

DEDICATION: TO BEN BENTOV
MAY OUR SEARCH ALWAYS BE IN THE HUMBLE PERSPECTIVE
OF YOURS, FOR INDEED
THE PENDULUM IS WILD!

FOREWORD

All “life systems”, in particular sociosystems, and even more specifically, the corporate institutions of science and technology, act to maintain themselves. Yet, given such systems in a changing environment, so also do all “viable life systems” act to transform themselves. In fact, all persons either individually or collectively are committed to some degree of change tempered by some degree of stability, or vice versa. Nevertheless this difference is the “paradox of systemic existence” and is experienced as a tension between “acts to maintain” and “acts to change” a given order.

If the order is the social order, or the state which is founded thereon, then the acts of a n individual or small group to change it can be resisted with enormous apparent power. Such is the case in current industrial societies which, to a great extent, are founded on the monopoly of systemantic reductionism in modern science/technology. Radical innovation which is out of consonance with the monopoly is either ignored , neutralized, or eradicated. Still, the essence of being human is that we can choose to be “crazy”. The essence of being politically human is that under certain circumstances we must choose to be crazy. Indeed, when the arrogance of a methodology (i.e., the causal methodology of systemantic reductionism) leads to the expenditure of billions of unknowing (and perhaps unwilling) tax-payers’ dollars without a philosophical/Theoretical/experimental alternative as a control (a la the fundamental tenent of science), only a profound craziness can begin to neutralize the insanity of pure positivistic mechanism in science.

It is important, perhaps even critical, that we neither disregard the above, accept it at face value, nor become obsessed with it. In the words of Don Juan, we must accept without accepting and disregard without disregarding. But this too is systemically paradoxical. This then brings us to the fundamental purpose for the Institute,, i.e. to develop the non-paradoxical symbol forms of RELATION(AL) SYSTEMS wherein there is the more frequent

AHA! R(S) – NESS IS

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

A. INTRODUCTION

The third quarter of the 20th century has seen a growing unrest with our present conceptualizations of experience. This trend is now rapidly approaching a crisis point which will necessitate a major shift in world view. The emerging paradigm is one in which the “deep structure” of the universe is viewed as a super hologram¹. The data underlying this conceptual revolution comes from various areas of the “frontiers of research” which are “other-than-norm”. The unifying feature throughout this data is the concept of a whole as a system which presences in every part². This, however, is precisely the critical property of the optical hologram. (See Appendix I)

In the large, orthodox research has always actively resisted or passively ignored all data which is “other-than-norm”. The current crisis in knowledge has been cogently summarized in the suggested need for a different scientific methodology for each (altered) state of consciousness³. The fundamental resolution of this crisis, however, necessitates a shift (or broadening) in paradigm⁴ such that the present sole concern with system-as-totality is extended to emphasize the system-as-whole. It is no longer questionable as to whether this shift will come; it is of concern, however, as to how long it will take since it has been previously observed that major conceptual changes may require 50 years⁵.

B. SYSTEM-AS-TOTALITY

The notion of system (and of subsystems) has two fundamental realizations. In one form a system is assumed to be identical with the totality of its subsystems (components). In this case, the system is viewed as existing only through the interrelation of its parts, the latter thus being prior to the totality. In the second form a system is assumed to be a whole which presences in each of its subsystems (parts). As such, the system and subsystems are mutually existent, neither being prior to the other. The notion of system-as-totality, representable through the interrelation of components, is the form which has dominated the evolution of modern science and society and which characterizes the bulk

of research on (general) systems, systemantics, and systemantilectics as well as its implementations; technologically, educationally, etc.

1. GENERAL SYSTEMS

“The history of ‘recent’ human evolution is significantly a record of the evolution of rational symbol systems, that is, of systems which conceptually image and extend human experience, both past and projected. Scattered throughout this history have been a few revolutionary developments which most profoundly influences the subsequent nature of human existence. Such developments include written language; mathematics; the scientific method; the industrial and technological revolutions, especially the technology of the media ranging from the printing press, to radio, film and TV; Xerox; and the computer revolution. And yet, despite this extended “golden age of rationality”, there is an ever growing suspicion that something is awry.

It is our contention that all preceding revolutionary developments of new symbol systems which seemingly resolved the immediate crises of the time, were really only variations on the theme of a single symbol form. In fact, it is a matter of record that through out history, human symbol systems have largely been representable in one explicit form, namely as the INTERRELATION OF SYSTEMS. The implicit assumption in this world view (let us summarily denote it as the SYSTEMIC world view) is that all systems can be connected through singular relations and that all relations exist only between systems. Although there are (almost) uncountable specific realizations of this idea, it still remains a singularly constraining form controlling nearly all symbol creations.

In an attempt to avoid being misunderstood, we should emphasize that we are no saying that this world view is wrong. Obviously there is an aspect, perhaps even the predominant aspect, of human experience which is consistently imaged in this symbol form. To cite only on current successful example, we note the brilliance and excitement of the SYSTEMIC physical/engineering achievements of the international space program.” ⁽⁶⁾ NOTE: A copy of reference ⁽⁶⁾ is included herein as APPENDIX II.

As a continuation of this applied research into the domain of bioengineering, it should be noted that the future developments in biosystems technology can be expected to be nothing short of formidable (see APPENDIX III)!

A partial review of the developments in general systems,⁽⁷⁾ including the origins and early formulations,⁽⁸⁾ philosophical systemization, and evolutionary and organismic systems theory⁽¹⁰⁾ can be gleaned from a recent doctoral thesis on humanistic systems theory.⁽¹¹⁾ Other critical contributions include work on the foundations of systemic mathematics, morphogenesis, stability/instability, and catastrophe theory.⁽¹⁵⁾ In parallel conceptual efforts, the work on general semantics, structuralism, genesa, synergetic-energetic geometry,⁽¹⁹⁾ mathematical life sciences,⁽²⁰⁾ and info/communication media⁽²¹⁾ to mention a few, are paramount. To exemplify applications of general systems, any work on systems analysis in organization development will suffice.⁽²²⁾ Finally, the very brilliant work on the unifying principle of systems transformation⁽²³⁾ are considered to punctuate the current conceptual state in the evolution of general systems.

2. GENERAL SYSTEMANTICS

Given the above, it must also be noted that it is common experience that systems-as-totalities are paradoxical, i.e. they work poorly or not at all and, when working, seldom work as expected. Nearly everyone is familiar with “Murphy’s Law”; if anything can go wrong, it will. Fewer, however, know of “O’Brian’s Law” which simply states that “Murphy was an optimist”. Perhaps the most brilliant lay summary of the problems/dilemmas/paradoxes of general systems is the work on systemantics⁽²⁴⁾ in which the first systematic (!) presentation of why systems fail is presented. To place this in philosophical perspective, there is the general work on the paradoxical nature of reality⁽²⁵⁾. However, it has been in the study of the foundations of mathematical systems that there have emerged the most profound insights into the paradoxical inconsistencies of general formal systems. Three milestones in this research are Russell’s Paradox⁽²⁶⁾, Godel’s Incompleteness Theorem⁽²⁷⁾, and the ERP (Einstein-Rosen-Podolsky) Paradox⁽²⁸⁾.

Although these examples are quantitatively sparse, albeit qualitatively dense in impact, they do underscore our major point of concern here which is simply that systemic reality is paradoxical in the system-as-totality form. As will be discussed further

subsequently, this condition is inherent in a specific property of systems-as-totalities, namely, they are defined through boundaries. As will be shown, boundaries and paradoxes are mutually generative ⁽²⁹⁾ .

GENERAL SYSTEMANTILECTICS

There are three categories of approaches to the “resolution” of paradox, only one of which is itself expressible in the systemic world view, or more particularly, in terms of systems-as-totalities. This is the system -> system shift approach in which the paradox is eliminated from the conceptual structure (level) of concern by shifting it to “an-other” system (level). This category includes all of the “hierarchical” and/or “meta-systemical” forms exemplified by Russell’s theory of types (30) , the meta-mathematical solution of the prisoner’s dilemma (31) , Bell’s theorem (32) and the many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics (33) .

In the next section, we will identify the two other categories of approaches to paradox resolution. In closing this section on the systemantilectical resolution of the systematical inconsistencies of general systems (-as-totalities) nothing could be more appropriate than to reference Bearden’s formulation of the “fourth law of Logic” ⁽³⁴⁾ . (Note: A copy of this seminal paper is added hereto as APPENDIX IV.) Since this paper obviously speaks for itself, we here only note that this work together with that on the laws of form (founded on the assumed existence of “discrimination”) ⁽¹²⁾ and the algebra of probable inference (in which all probabilities are assumed to be “conditional”) ⁽³⁵⁾ constitute the origins of the work-in-progress on boundaries ⁽²⁹⁾ . This latter represents the most condensed and lucid synthesis of the essence of system-as-totality and the preface to system-as-whole, specifically because the fourth law of logic has a representation in the form of INTERRELATED RELATIONS. Finally, we note that this effort also effectively consummates the development of Hegelian dialectics which itself implicitly reached beyond system-as-totality with a tacit INTERRELATION OF SYSTEMS & RELATIONS representation, a step toward non-paradoxical reality which is relational in essence.

C. SYSTEM-AS-WHOLE

The notion of system-as-whole, which can not be represented only through the interrelation of parts, has been predominantly characteristic of most “other-than-norm” experience. With the advent of optical holography, however, there is now a simple and lucid

physical paradigm for the system-as-whole, the hologram. Through this latter there is a direct visual demonstration of the critical property of the whole, that it is present in each part.

1. HOLISTIC/HOLOGRAPHIC EXPERIENCE (A WHOLE IS NO-THING)

Perhaps the most efficacious approach to a representative survey of literature on holism would begin with the identification of journals which have set the standards. At the top of this list would probably be Julius Stulman's Fields Within Fields ... Within Fields⁽³⁶⁾ since this journal has served to effectively conjoin holistic considerations with general systems research. Also noteworthy is Jeanne P. Rindge's Human Dimensions which has served admirably in bringing various holistic thinkers and other-than-norm data to a general sophisticated audience. Since most other-than-norm scientific data in this century either emanates from or has been influenced by psi research, The Journal of Parapsychology⁽³⁸⁾ from J. B. Rhine's Foundation for Research on the Nature of Man is mandatory reading for any serious student of holistic science. And last but certainly no least we note Arthur Young's The Journal for The Study of Consciousness⁽³⁹⁾ and Marilyn Ferguson's Brain/Mind Bulletin.⁽⁴⁰⁾

As networking references which would largely span the literature on the other-than-norm research and organizations conducting and/or implementing the same, we choose the following: The Guidebook for the Study of Psychical Research; the Worldwide Directory of the International Cooperation Council; Books for Inner Development; and Specula⁽⁴⁴⁾, the Journal of the American Association of Meta-Science.

For comprehensive reviews of other-than-norm research, the world of Ostrander and Schroeder⁽⁴⁵⁾, Watson⁽⁴⁶⁾, and Tompkins and Bird are paramount.

Finally, we note that two Journals^(48, 49) have recently devoted entire issues to the presentation of the holographic reality (See also APPENDIX V for a chronology of the holographic reality concept). An interesting review of this concept⁽⁵⁰⁾ focusing on the critical property of a consistent symbol system, namely that it not only stands for but actually is the Reality which it symbolizes, is added hereto as APPENDIX VI.

In concluding this section we can do no better in introducing the next than to cite a paper examining the holographic reality as a bridge between the rational and the intuitive⁽⁵¹⁾, being specifically the report of a meditator on an intuitive religious experience of the holographic reality (See APPENDIX VII), of AHA! R(S)-NESS IS.

2. RELATIONAL SYSTEMS

Recognizing that the interrelation of parts, that is, the INTERRELATION OF SYSTEMS symbol form, is insufficient for representing human experience, in particular, experience of system-as-whole (is no-thing) we have introduced the general presumption of the existence of four relational forms: the INTERRELATION OF SYSTEMS, the INTERRELATION OF SYSTEMS AND RELATIONS, the INTERRELATION OF RELATIONS, and RELATED (SYSTEM) –NESS (.R(S) –NESS). Logically, these four forms exhaust the number of possible categories which can be obtained by combining “systems” and “relations” through “relations”. The second and third of these forms have no explicit historical precedent and it is our creation and actualization of these forms which is the unique and radical departure point for a SYMBOLIC RELATIONAL (R)EVOLUTION in which a consistent symbol system not only images but also is the actional reality which it symbolizes.

Hence, SYMBOLIC RELATIONAL SYSTEMS are founded mainly on the experiential recognition of the essentiality of relation, especially the INTERRELATION OF RELATIONS, a thesis which is in direct contrast to the historical and current emphasis on system, particularly on thing and thingness. This revolutionary abstraction of INTERRELATED RELATIONS is realized as an ACTUAL RELATIONAL SYSTEM through the field, a representation for a system (either as totality or whole) quantifiable as energy; the field/energy for a system-as-whole is taken to be the wholing interrelation of part-part relations and part-whole relations.

In that we have included as APPENDIX II the paper entitled “Relational Systems: A Review Emphasizing Whole (Field; Energy)/Part (Particle; Atom) Interrelations in Relational Life-Systems Theories”, we here only summarize some of the principle findings of previous

D. SYSTEM-AS-WHOLE (FIELD; ENERGY)/PART (PARTICLE; ATOM) EXPERIENTIAL/EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Without qualification, the most disturbing data for systems science to deal with has been the “other-than-norm” observations of “action-at-a-distance (field) phenomena” and “subtle (unknown) energies.” In addition to the references of Section C above, especially the bibliographies of references 46 and 47, the work of Krippner⁽⁵²⁾ as one of the most persistent investigators of “other-than-norm” phenomena is critical. This latter reference, for example, contains an interesting paper by Tiller on energy field observations⁽⁵³⁾. Similarly, much of the

work of Hills⁽⁵⁴⁾ is committed to elucidating subtle energies. Examples of experimental work on remote perception by Rauscher⁽⁵⁵⁾ and PK phenomena by Hasted⁽⁵⁶⁾ specifically exemplify psychic-action-at-a-distance and the breakdown of space-time descriptions. The work on pyramids⁽⁵⁷⁾ is an instance of a rudimentary study of the “shape of fields” as is the work of Langham⁽¹⁸⁾ and Fuller⁽¹⁹⁾. In a recent re-introduction of the concept of an “ether”, Andrade has shown that special relativity can be derived from Newtonian physics by quantizing the ether⁽⁵⁸⁾. The development of the notion of the formalon (atom of “space/time”) is continuing in the work of Hamann and Bearden⁽⁵⁸⁾. The study of life field energies has an extensive history of which we here mention only Reich⁽⁵⁹⁾, because he also introduced the concept of a bion, the monumental work of Burr⁽⁶⁰⁾ and the more recent of Motoyama⁽⁶¹⁾. In ending this sparse exemplifying summary, we recall the now defunct Journal of Psychoenergetic Systems⁽⁶²⁾, note that there is a new lay-journal on other-than-norm energies⁽⁶³⁾, and remind you of the Journal of the American Association for Metascience, Specula⁽⁶⁴⁾.

As the last consideration of this section we want to draw attention to the work of T. Galen Heironymus⁽⁶⁵⁾, in particular the legendary Heironymus machine⁽⁶⁶⁾, since it is one of the most lucid exemplifications of a critical property of RELATIONAL SYMBOL SYSTEMS, i.e. they not only stand for but actually are the reality they symbolize. Hence, the fundamental purpose of the Institute, i.e. to develop the non-paradoxical symbol forms OF RELATION (AL) SYSTEMS wherein there is the more frequent AHA!.R(S)-NESS IS., is more clearly presented. By way of elucidation we note the following: The Heironymus machine is the physical (chemo; nuclo; and/or formo) manifestation of a hardware/software (robo) system implementing a symbol/communication (socio) system whereby a creative/reactive (psycho) system can change (bio) system energies. The important point here is that it has been observed⁽⁶⁷⁾ that the machine (hardware) system in its essential function can itself be replaced by the design of blueprint (the symbol system) which can in turn be replaced in the same function by the conscious operator (the psychosystem). Hence the machine is the symbol and the symbol actually is the machine it symbolizes! This symbol (ritual)/actual (thing) identification has also been explored by Des Pros in his most incredible study of life in the death camps⁽⁶⁸⁾ and has been applied by Wenger in his principle of description⁽⁶⁹⁾ – you become (are) what you describe. Finally we note that much other-than-norm experience (occult and esoteric; spiritual science; the supernatural; metascience; magic and alchemy; etc.) depends upon the principle of symbol/actual identity as in the

Kabbalah (language of symbol, language of love), “I Ching”, and of course in sympathetic magic^(70; 71). In closing we reference two organization critical in the study and technical development of whole field energy instrumentation” “The Psychotronic Association”⁽⁷²⁾ and the Mankind Research Foundation”⁽⁷³⁾.

REFERENCES:

1. C. Muses, "The Exploration of Consciousness and Reality", Consciousness and Reality, Editors, C. Muses and A. Young, pp. 102 (Outerbridge & Lazard, 1972)
2. H. Bortoft, "The Whole: Counterfeit and Authentic", Systematics, 9, No. 2, 50-56 (Sept., 1971)
3. C. Tart, Altered States of Consciousness (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1969)
4. T. Kuhn, "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962)
5. M. Polanyi, Personal Knowledge (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1958)
6. J. R. Hamann & J. C. Lamb, "Relational Systems: A Review Emphasizing Whole (Field; Energy)/Part (Particle; Atom) Interrelations in Relational Life-Systems Theories", Human Dimensions, 6 No. 2, 20 (1978)
7. L. von Bertalanffy, General Systems Theory (George Braziller, New York, 1956)
8. K. Boulding, The Image (University of Mich., Ann Arbor, 1956).
"General Systems Theory – The Skeleton of Science"
General Systems Yearbook, 1 (1956).
The Universe as a General System", Proceedings,
Society for General Systems Research (1977)
9. E. Laszlo, Introduction to Systems Theory (Gordon & Breach, Inc., New York, 1972)
10. G. Bateson, Steps to an Ecology of Mind (Random House, New York, 1972)
11. J. Stamp, "Holonomy (The Study of Whole/Parts): A Humanistic Systems Theory", Summary of Doctoral Thesis (Humanistic psychology Institute, San Francisco, California, 1979)
12. G. S. Brown, Laws of Form
13. A. M. Turing, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London Ser. B, 237, 37 (1952)
14. I. Prigogine, "Time, Structure, and Fluctuations", Science 201, 777 (1978)
15. R. Thom, Stabilite Strucutelle Et Morphogenese (Benjamin, New York, 1972)
16. A. Korzybski, Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics (The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company, Lakeville, Connecticut, 1958)
17. J. Piaget, Structuralism (Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1970)

18. D. Langham, Genesa: An Attempt to Develop a Conceptual Model to Synthesize, Synchronize, and Vitalize Man's Interpretation of Universal Phenomena (Sero Publishers, Inc., U.S.A. 1969)
19. R. B. Fuller, Intuition (Doubleday & Company, New York, 1972)
20. N. Rashevsky, Mathematical Biology of Behavior (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1959)
21. M. McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New American Library, 1964)
22. R. A. Smith, "Synergistic Organizations: Humanistic Extensions of Mans Evolution?", Fields within Fields ... within Fields, 3 No. 1, 39 (1970)
 "Unibutz: The one and many in the search for Peace-A Proposal for and interplanetary voyage and settlement", IBID. 4 No. 1, 8 (1970)
 "Synchronicity and Syntropy: The Cosmic Psychodrama", IBID. 5 No. 1, 74 (1972)
23. G. T. Land, Grow or Die: The Unifying Principle of Transformation (Dell Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1978)
24. J. Gall, Systemantics: How Systems Work and Especially How They Fail (Pocket Books, New York, 1978)
25. G. Melhuish, The Paradoxical Nature of Reality (St. Vincent's Press, Bristol, 1975)
26. See page 21 of M. A. Arbib, Brains, Machines and Mathematics (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965)
27. K. Gödel, On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related Systems (Basic Books, Inc. New York)
28. A. Einstein, Podalsky, N. Rosen, Physical Review, 1, 777 (1935)
29. Boundaries, eds., The IFHR staff (in process)
30. B. Russell, "Theory of Logical Types, Principia Mathematica, B. Russell, A. Whitehead, Vol 1, Chapter 2, 37 (University Press, Cambridge, 1925)
31. N. Howard, Paradoxes of Rationality: Games Metagames and Political Behavior (M.I.T. Press, Boston, 1971)
32. J. S. Bell, Bell's Theorem, Physics, 1, 195 (1964)
33. See: The Many- Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, A Fundamental Exposition, By H. Everett (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1973)

34. T. Bearden, "The Fourth Law of Logic", Specula 2, No. 1, 30 (1979)
The Excalibur Briefing (Strawberry Hill Press, San Francisco, in press)
35. R. T. Cox, The Algebra of Probable Inference (The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 1961)
36. J. Stulman, Editor, Fields Within Fields ... Within Fields
37. J. P. Ringe, Editor, Human Dimensions
38. J. B. Rhine, Founder,, "Foundation for Research on the Nature of Man", including "Parapsychology Press" which publishes the Journal of Parapsychology
39. A. M. Young, Founder, "Foundation for the Study of Consciousness" which published the Journal for the Study of Consciousness
40. M. Ferguson, Editor, Brain/Mind Bulletin
41. R. H. Ashby, Editor, The Guide Book for the Study of Physical Research (Samuel Weiser, Inc., New York, 1973)
42. L. P. Stewart, Editor-In-Chief, Directory: International Cooperation Council
43. C. Popenoe, The Yes! Guide (Random House)
44. T. Bearden, Editor, Specula
45. S. Ostrander and L. Schroeder, Psychic Discoveries Behind the Iron Curtain (Bantam Books, New York, 1970)
46. L. Watson, Super Nature (Bantam Books, New York, 1973)
47. P. Tompkins and C. Bird, The Secret Life of Plants (Avon Books, New York, 1974)
48. K. Wilber, Editor, Re-Vision
49. J. P. Rindge and J. R. Hamann, Editors, Human Dimensions, 6, No. 1 and 2 (1978)
50. J. S. S. Kopp, "A Holographic Reality" (Unpublished)
51. C. M. Owens, "Holographic Reality as a Bridge Between the Rational and the Intuitive" (Unpublished)
52. S. Krippner and D. Rubin, Editors, The Kirlian Aura: Photographing the Galaxies of Life (Anchor Press, New York, 1974)
53. W. A. Tiller, "Some Energy Field Observations of Man and Nature" IBID, 92
54. C. Hills, Supersonics (University of the Trees Press, Boulder Creek, California, 1975)
55. E. Rauscher, "Remote Perception As An Objective Science", Human Dimensions, 6 No. 2, 9 (1978)

56. J. B. Hasted and D. Robertson, "The Detail of Paranormal Metal Bending", Human Dimensions, 6 No. 3 & 4, 47 (1979)
57. G. P. Flanagan, Beyond Pyramid Power (DeVorss & Co., Marina Del Ray, California)
58. J. R. hamann & T. Bearden, "Experiential Foundations for a Relational Cosmichaology: Evidence from Para- and Meta- Science of Field/Atom (... Formalons; Nuclons; Chemons/Bions; Psychons/ Socions; Robons ...) Interrelations (In Process)
59. W. E. Mann, Orgone, Reich & Eros: Wilhelm Reich's Theory of Life Energy (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1973)
60. H. S. Burr, Blueprint for immortality: The Electric Patterns of Life (Neville Spearman LTD, London, 1972)
61. H. Motoyama with R. Brown, Science and the Evolution of Consciousness Chakras, Ki, and Psi (Autumn Press, Brookline, Mass., 1978)
62. S. Krippner, Editor, Psychoenergetic Systems
63. Energy Unlimited
64. T. Bearden, Editor, Specula
65. See References 46, 47, 71
66. Pat. No. 2,482,773: "detection of emanations from material and measurements of the quantities o said material" T. Galen Hieronymus; Granted 1948. See Page 63 of Reference 71 for patents on similar devices.
67. J. Campbell, Analog (1956 and following)
68. T. Des Pres, The Survivor: An Anatomy of Life in the Death Camps (Pocket Books, New York, 1977)
69. W. Wenger, Beyond O.K. (Psycheogenics Press, Gaithersburg, Maryland, 1979)
70. C. L. Weschcke, Editor, Gnostica
71. J. F. Goodavage, Magic: Science of the Future (New American Library, new York, 1976)
72. H. J. Nagorka, President, U.S. Psychotronics Association
73. C. Schleicher, President, Mankind Research Foundation, Inc.
74. J. R. Gibb, "Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Focus on Environmental Quality", The Cutting Edge: Current Theory and Practice in Organization Development, W. W. Burke, Editor (University Associates, Inc., LaJolla, California, 1978)

75. R. A. Wilson, The Cosmic Trigger
76. D. J. McKenna and T. K. McKenna, The Invisible Landscape: Mind, Hallucinogens and the I Ching (Seabury Press, New York 1975).