

If you draw a circle in the sand and study only what's inside the circle, then that is a closed-system perspective. If you study what is inside the circle and everything outside the circle, then that is an open system perspective.

Buckminster Fuller

Chapter 11

Consciousness Craft

Consciousness is corded. Through exploring human consciousness I experienced a direct link to the Earth, the underworld, and the cosmos. Inter-dimensional and extra-dimensional consciousness. I experienced how consciousness cords could be used to travel, learn, and communicate. You, too, can use these cosmic cords to explore multiple dimensions and evolve as a galactic being. The vision inspired by Jamie Maussan's video, the possibility of humans possessing a consciousness craft, can become your reality.

Yet, first we need to examine human consciousness. It is the key. The study of consciousness is an experiential and also an academic endeavor. The following consciousness discussion is somewhat academic. I made it an easy read. Take time to enjoy it and then apply it to your experience.

Throughout Western history, humans defined consciousness by developing models of the mind based on functions of the brain. Often these models reflected inventions and cultural threads of thought. In early Alexandria culture, Galen (AD130-200), an anatomist, examined the brain and determined it to be filled with empty spaces, called ventricles. He determined these empty spaces were filled with a gaseous, ethereal substance inhaled from the cosmos. This ethereal substance that filled empty spaces of the brain was called spirit (Illing, 2004).

Later in history, the mind was imaged as a fountain with an animating spirit that flowed through its spaces. Descarte (1596-1650), who solidified the separation of mind and body, perceived the brain as similar to a pipe organ, moving air through a complex array of heart and arteries. Freud (1856-1939) perceived the mind as similar to a hydraulic system or steam engine. It is interesting that the steam engine was invented during his lifetime. The stem of the mind, of course, was desire and sexual impulse. Nice analogy, Doctor.

In the 20th Century, behaviorists saw the brain as a sophisticated telephone switchboard, again relying on technological inventions. In their model, memory was a matter of setting up internal switches. When signals were properly routed, then actions were easily performed. Post WW II, engineers developed *Cybernetics*, which posited that information was the attribute of an interaction between subjective and objective. They perceived a holistic model of the mind as an organism. The field of Artificial Intelligence is dedicated to developing intelligent machines. As such, they often view the human brain as a computer. As quantum computing advances, they integrate it into technological models of the mind.

So, where are we today? Any further along than Freud or Cybernetics? Was there a consensus in the definition of consciousness? Unfortunately, no. Finding an agreed upon definition of consciousness proved elusive. Maybe that was because consciousness studies are subjective as well as objective. I found that consciousness studies, though ancient, had only recently, in the 1990s, been accepted into the academic university curriculum. In current consciousness studies, biologists researching the neurological workings of the brain joined with mathematicians postulating quantum theories. These experts united with philosophers eager to move beyond dualism and perhaps even resurrect Platonic ideals more amenable to quantum

science. As these academics dialogued, a definitive, consensual definition of consciousness dissolved. Academic waters muddied, though they may soon clear.

Common definitions of consciousness often refer to its opposite, the unconscious. One who is conscious is awake and alert. One who is unconscious is in an altered state, either chemically or sleep induced. Susan Blackmore, in her book, *Consciousness: An introduction*, molded consciousness studies into a textbook based curriculum. She defines consciousness as “knowing something, or attending to something” (p.5). It is the equivalent of subjectivity, the first person view of the world. Consciousness doesn’t fit neatly into brain studies or biological definitions. She boldly asserts, “studying consciousness will change your life” (p.5). One is left wondering whether her consciousness assertion includes changing your scientific theories and academic assumptions.

Others, such as Leslie Brothers, a psychiatrist, question whether consciousness is an entity or a thing. Is it only a concept? Stuart Hameroff, an anesthesiologist, who handles patient consciousness on a daily basis, asserts that consciousness in a restrictive sense is experience. It is an awareness possessed by biological systems. Joe Bogen, neurosurgeon, maintains that the brain produces consciousness. He looks at levels—subcellular, cytoskeleton, microtubules, cellular, circuit levels, as well as how one brain interacts with others. Agreement is scarce. Disagreement is the consensus (Kuhn, 2005).

At a Tucson Conference in 1994, philosopher David Chalmers pulled the consciousness discussion toward what he defined as the “hard problem” and the “easy problem”. The easy consciousness problems were not solved, but we are making progress. The easy problems included the brain’s ability to discriminate, categorize, and react to environmental stimuli;

integrate information; report on its own mental states; focus attention; and exert deliberate control over behavior. The hard problem was determining how standard physiological processes translate to subjective experience (Huff, 2005). What is it like to be a biological organism? What is it like to be in a given mental state? The thorny philosophical mind body issues were once again on stage and experience the star as the hard problem.

The media weighed in on the hard problem and speculated in movies such as *Matrix* (1999) that evil computer aliens imposed a version of reality on humans from the outside. Chalmers seems to question the scriptwriter's fantasy. Instead, he theorizes that the brain appears to be constructing reality from within on the fly as waves of sensory information flood from the outer world. He marvels at how our brain processes a tsunami of sensory data (Huff, 2005). Our brain's involvement is essential.

In *Wider than the Sky: The Phenomenal Gift of Consciousness*, 1972 Nobel Prize winning neuroscientist, Gerald Edelman uses magnetoencephalography, a non-invasive technique, to explain the workings of our brain. He measured tiny electromagnetic currents in small groups of neurons to develop neurological correlates of consciousness. He determined that there is no one place in the brain where consciousness takes place. No command center. There is also a wide variation in neural response among individuals responding to the same stimulus or scene. Finally he determines that the brain or the mind is not "software." He agrees with William James, "thoughts don't necessarily need a thinker." His research points to the possibility that our working brain was not designed, but evolved, as he postulates a "neural Darwinism"(O'Reilly, 2005).

The promising model of anesthesiologist Hameroff and mathematician Penrose proposes that quantum computation occurs in *cytoskeletal microtubules* within the brain's neurons. "The basic idea is that consciousness involves brain activities compiled to self-organizing ripples in fundamental reality. Brain stimulates reality based on sensory input and is also intimately connected to that reality at the quantum level" (Huff, 2005).

What about cosmic consciousness as the evil alien computers? Is it a media parody of reality at the quantum level? "In Panpsychism theory, mind is fundamental in the universe. All matter has associated mental aspects or properties.... Everything in the universe is seen as conscious" (Blackmore, 2004, p.11). Critics of panpsychism question why are there both physical and mental properties. This criticism is another door that leads to the hard problem. But Chalmers indicates that the door must be opened. At the 1994 Tucson conference, he claimed that consciousness was a fundamental constituent of reality. It may be a building block of the universe, as photons are to light. Consciousness may be an inherent requirement of all that surrounds and composes us (Huff, 2005).

Is the evil alien computer simply a means of imaging consciousness at the quantum level, albeit a fearful image? Physicists, neurosurgeons, philosophers, and mathematicians substitute the less threatening term *proto-consciousness* to indicate that consciousness may be a fundamental constituent of reality, a building block. Is this a spiritual force? Danah Zohar (2001) merges religion and science with proto-consciousness. In her book *SQ: Connecting with our Spiritual Intelligence*, she writes that David Chalmers found the following:

proto-consciousness is a fundamental property of all matter, just like mass, charge, spin, and location. In this view, proto-consciousness is a natural part of the fundamental physical laws

of the universe and has been present since the beginning of time. Everything that exists—fundamental particles like mesons and quarks, atoms, stones, tree trunks...possess proto-consciousness. (p.81)

Is proto-consciousness the universal “mud” where Buddhists image the stem of the lotus rooting, emerging to flower as individual spiritual path? Are we all rooted in proto-consciousness and emerge from the stem of creation to follow our designated spiritual paths this lifetime? Zohar agrees, “If neural oscillations in the brain were a coherent version of a fundamental property pervading the whole universe, then our human SQ roots us not just in life but at the very heart of the universe. We become children, not just of life, but of the cosmos” (Zohar, 2001, p. 82).

Proto-consciousness, the mud of consciousness, may also be the answer to riddles of string theory. According to Michio Kaku, string theory was stumbling over the possibility of a world hidden from our senses. Quantum theory made it impossible to pinpoint the exact location of atomic particles like electrons. They had no single location. Subatomic worlds operated by outlandish laws that called into question many scientific theories. Kaku began to solve the riddle of subatomic worlds by positing the possibility of parallel worlds. He identified the difficulties of merging string theory and cosmological concepts like the big bang. The laws of string theory physics break down with the big bang. String theory formulas failed to work with the big bang theory. Then a once dismissed theory of super gravity re-emerged with an elegant 11-string theory. After years of being dismissed by the string theorists, the super gravity model of 11 strings offered hope. “The astonishing conclusion was that all the matter in the Universe was connected to one vast structure: a membrane. The quest to explain everything in the Universe

could begin again and at its heart would be this new theory. It was dubbed *Membrane Theory* or "M Theory" (Barlow, 2002).

In the super gravity model, gravity was noted as extremely weak in comparison with other forces. They questioned whether this weakness was because gravity was leaking from our universe. Then the question was flipped, what if gravity was in fact leaking into our universe from another universe, perhaps a parallel universe. Membrane Theory and 11 string dimensions indicated it was so.

How does consciousness fit in Membrane Theory? If mathematicians could work with the force of gravity to develop formulas to fit Membrane Theory, what about the nature of consciousness? *Was consciousness leaking out of our brains? Or was consciousness leaking in from a membrane into our brains and bodies?* Was M theory, mother theory? Were our prehistoric matrilineal ancestors on to a significant cosmic fact that we moderns have overlooked? Might our culture be preparing to re-embrace the Great Mother? Was the evil alien computer really a nurturing great mother—Kwan Yin, Magdalene, Mother Mary, Isis, Mother of the Universe?

Consciousness research, like a secret code, stimulates an intellectual desire to solve the puzzle. Our minds innately desire closure—problem solved. Yet, consciousness research is a boundless frontier. One theory spawns multiple questions. And yet, being human, the search to quantify, classify, comprehend, and use consciousness takes precedence. Regardless of the thicket of criticism, the image models made passé by science and technology, the subjective trump card, humans are conscious beings. We want to know who we are.

Through research and learning, your consciousness expands. New vistas and possibilities form. Research and theories beget the development of consciousness. The search is eternal.

Exoconscious Ufology

A college-student relates a story of night communication with an extraterrestrial. A scientist explains he has been in contact with grays since childhood. A pilot recounts a vast extraterrestrial craft paralleling his jet and his reluctance to make a formal report. A former army intelligence officer finally testifies to a secret career in alien crash retrieval.

Who are you to believe? How can you test or validate individual experience? Are these witnesses imagining encounters or are they real-time events? The sheer number of contact testimonies, like the sheer number of craft sightings, demands attention, examination, and validation. To accomplish this, ufology needs exoconsciousness.

The foundation of exoconsciousness was developed by Harvard anomalous researcher and psychiatrist, John Mack. He termed his work with contact experiencers “legitimizing the witness.” He sought a compatible scientific framework to give voice and structure to a reality beyond the common daily conscious experience. I honor his legacy with exoconsciousness.

“Legitimizing the witness” highlights the experiencer phenomenon of consciousness to consciousness contact between humans and other-dimensional beings. It validates the possibility of a relationship between intelligent beings from differing realities. It authenticates the possibility of communicating an experience beyond language, opening the door of symbol, myth, mathematics. It opens the possibility of enhanced human linguistic abilities and creation of a new language. It pushes the envelope of human conscious abilities into a frontier where we develop skills and abilities once thought the stuff of science fiction, now becoming reality.

“Legitimizing the witness” is not a new struggle. Religious, spiritual, and metaphysical testimonies are fraught with the inability of witnesses to communicate their experience. Prophets, mediums, clairvoyants, and intuitives hone a repertoire of skills beyond the 3R’s of classical education. Altered states of consciousness are common in religion, spirituality, and metaphysics. Switch on any religious network and witness the swaying, chanting, repetitive, hypnotic music that nurtures the believers. Click on any Buddhist or New Age website and witness the step-by-step instruction toward an altered state of consciousness into the bliss of oneness. Open a classical metaphysical text and read the formulated concoctions for transcendence. Exoconsciousness, utilizing extraterrestrial dimensions of our human consciousness, to communicate, travel, and create inter-dimensionally is simply a current description of altered states.

While religion and philosophy struggle with “legitimizing the witness”, they also provide a rich background for understanding consciousness. Classical theology approached consciousness through the doorways of moral theology and concepts such as the soul. They searched for a means to understand eternity glimpsed by humans. Then through Newtonian science, criticism and analysis, they pulled apart mind from body. They relegated the body as an earthly being and the mind as connected to a possible soul or eternity.

In an attempt to distinguish humans from other life forms, classical theologians concentrated on free will and the ability to conceptualize. Eventually they formulated human free will into structured church doctrine. Human volition, seen as one of the primary features separating humans and animals, was a powerful force that could be used for good and evil. So a hierarchical doctrine was composed as a means of controlling human freewill. It was perceived

as divine...but...well not really. Freewill needed structure and control. Philosophers and theologians still struggle with the human ability to pick and choose, to create experiences and to exercise freewill. The ancient scholars chose freewill as the distinguishing trait of humanness. And this trait has caused no end of academic difficulty. Was freewill a poor choice?

To understand conscious behavior, prior to scientific experimentation and technology, philosophers and theologians began a detailed, (sometimes convoluted) inductive analysis of mental states. Socratic and Platonic philosophers commenced the allegorical examination of the conscious mind comparing it to shadows in a cave, where the shadows represented created illusions. Neo-platonic philosophers such as Hegel, continued the examination of illusion within human constructs of reality by employing a phenomenological method that bracketed experience.

To unravel the conscious mind, psychologists devised several tests to determine if an individual or animal is conscious. The Turing Test was devised to determine if computers could simulate human consciousness. In the Turing Test a judge engages two other parties—one human, the other machine-- in a natural conversation. If the judge cannot reliably tell which is which, then the machine is said to pass the Turing Test. In this case both the human and the machine appear human. In order to keep the test setting simple and universal they devised a text messaging conversation that could be used by both humans and machines. To date, the test remains controversial. Possibly the evolved ability to text message while driving gives humans an edge in the competition.

The Mirror Test developed by Gordon Gallup, was based on whether or not animals were able to recognize themselves in a mirror as a baseline for consciousness. According to the test,

18 month-old humans, some apes, and bottlenose dolphins indicated self-recognition consciousness.

The Delay Test focused on the delay between stimulus and response as a means of separating instinctual/reflexive response from determined conscious choice or involvement.

Freud and classical psychologists, rooted in science, philosophy, and religion brought a new framework to understanding consciousness. They provided the language and experimentation to understand the various levels of consciousness—subconscious, unconscious, conscious mind. From there modern psi-researchers such as William James, J.B. Rhine, and the contemporary researcher, Dean Radin, provide essential information about para-psychic abilities.

Moving into the 21st Century, we considered the research of Hammeroff, Penrose, and Chalmers that integrated quantum science with consciousness research. The consciousness theories of Hammeroff, Penrose, and Chalmers would not be possible without the accompanying scientific breakthrough.

Are contemporary consciousness theories integrating quantum theories and computer science any more valid or reliable than Freud's comparison of the brain to a steam engine? If so, like the chicken and egg—which comes first: human consciousness theories or technological inventions? Or are they both human constructs, one mental, one physical?