

Christmas Questions for Garvin

12/21/08

© Scott Virden Anderson

Several weeks before Christmas, Garvin and I had a long telephone conversation (notes from which I'll try to post here soon).

The week before Christmas, I took several days to read all of Garvin's papers posted on his site. On the basis of this "McCurdy Intensive," I formulated a series of questions for Garvin that he chose to reply to by email. Here they are with his replies.

It seems you feel that Tiller's work is paradigmatic.

A. Yes.

Do you still feel that Tiller's model is "a full-fledged paradigm?" ("Formalistic Review" p 52)?

A. It is structurally a full-fledged paradigm, having a group working hard on it, a formalistic model and a common methodology. It is not so widely recognized as q.m. or General Relativity are, so not 'full-fledged' in that sense. Tiller seems to feel that it explains the problem of the etheric field, and wants to move onward. But his paradigm is incomplete in the sense that he has not (as far as I know) written out and exercised the equations of magneto-electronics nor explored his postulated magnetic monopoles and electric dipoles 'behind the inverted mirror'.

Might we begin to draw a "scientific definition of subtle energies" from this new paradigm?

A. I don't think so. I think his work is more in the causal area. The problem we humans have here is we like to divide reality into neat, mutually exclusive classifications. (Linnaeus really reinforced this trend with his taxonomies.) My own current interpretation is that he and his four 'expert meditators', by willfully applied focus and intent, created a 'small island' of different informational connectivity (U-1 to SU-2 are the rather sterile encoding symbols for that). They transferred this informational connectivity to the IIEDs [These are electronic devices, hence he was exploring the electromagnetic-informational interface], which then could act as surrogates wherever around the world they were activated. // These kinds of phenomena are manifest in people with a long history of meditative introspection, of which there are many kinds of value: Uri Geller, I think, is one of the 'odd balls' who rather intuitively affects crystalline metallic atomic nuclei by effectively changing their 'positiveness', hence the spoons lose their rigidity and can be easily be 'pretzeled'. I think Tiller & Co. have done likewise with 'hydrated protons' (hydrogen ions) in a much more premeditatedly conscious way. // (The Van Vlenderen papers on upgraded Maxwell indicate

that this is not at all beyond the bounds of reality; but it's a basic postulate of the current paradigm that the proton and electron have unvarying equal and opposite charges. Doesn't seem that way.)

How about "causal energies?"

A. Having above inverted your topics, I would say here that subtle energies have to do with the cascade of transductions that take the informational aspect through biophysical, biochemical and organismic energetic biostructures to everyday living, functioning humans, able to respond to sensory stimuli in a wide variety of ways dependent on their worldviews, and likewise affect the world in a wide variety of ways, again dependent on their worldviews.

How might we relate the STS to the U1 (D) and SU2 (R) domains? (paragraph "Time is that aspect of reality..." on p36 of "Formalistic Review" is suggestive.)

A. I don't think we know enough to specify which frequencies are exclusively causal, subtle or gross, or are able to. I don't really think we should impose boundaries where none exist, rather in this current phase of paradigmatic construction observation and explanation are paramount.

Are there any other major approaches that you feel should be considered when it comes to "theoretical frameworks" for SE&EM? Swanson? Goswami?

I have trouble with Claude's theoretical approach; it seems to me to be too MEST. I really like the assemblage of 'paranormal' phenomena that he has collected and elucidated. Goswami's book title 'The Self-Aware Universe' is an absolutely key element for a realistic framework. Self awareness leads to paradox and contradiction, which is the normal state of affairs. Reductionist science leads to overemphasis of the limitedly rational and the logical and neglect of really significant phenomena outside of the practitioner's own 'paradigmatic box'.

I've not seen reference in your writings to Radin's extensive work with Psi or Rubik's extensive work with the Biofield. Any comments on these specific researchers?

True. What I know of Radin's work is of him as an unconventional and acute observer. The plenal coherence inferred from the REG readings attendant to such events as the first O.J. Simpson trial or 9/11 is to me explainable by many humans concurrently, but unaware of each other, entering into strong emotional states that 'shaped the plenum' as a result [as in Tiller's experiments]. // I don't know as much about Bev Rubik's work as I should. I was going to her breakout session last summer, but was literally deflected en route by a request for Reiki help by Bob Nunley. I did get to talk to her one-on-one at a party at Carol Schneider's after the conference. I'd love to compare her ideas with my own. (See Figs 3 & 4, Life's Transductive Chain)

Is it appropriate to think of the plenum as lying "off the Planckian end of the STS?" To me, your work suggests that the plenum is perhaps better thought of as *permeating the whole* of the STS.

You're right there. The plenum is perfusive. It is the medium upon which our conventional/ classical/ U-1 reality is superposed. But if you go back to *Time as Enabler*, conventional reality is within the light cone. The greater region outside the cone would seem to lie at frequencies higher than the Planck Point, times longer ago than the Bang, or in the region between the axes and the curve on the Quantum Hyperbola diagram. You indirectly raise a good point here: Is there any region of reality that is 'pure plenum'?? In his out-of-body experiences, Bob Monroe seems to have visited three other realities than our classical one. Jack Stucki seems to have found ways to intersect with a very similar reality to Monroe's, one containing the souls of departed ones.

You said in our last conversation "your entry goes right at the heart of conventional science and what's missing." Could you say a bit more about what you mean here?

It has to do with the need for a rethinking of language in the face of the changed perceptions. Our language, as Mark Connor would say, is built around 'little-t time'. Few languages have such elaborate verb structure, built around little-t time, as English. I want to cast my introductory remarks to the 2nd 30 minutes in terms of changing language to better match our emerging view of reality.

The term "causal" is clearly problematic. (See attached dialog with Adi Da – "The Causal Position." Your thoughts? (The progress of yoga suggested here is one in which subjectivity is progressively objectified.)

If by 'objectified' you mean cast solidly into our reality, I don't think so. If you mean 'perceived to be real', that's much better. No one has ever seen an electric field as such, but there is little doubt as to it being real because of the consistent results that flow from its intellectual use. I think some of the disconnect that arose between you and Adi Da happened because you were using 'if-then' logic of our general western perception, whereas he was using a perception of complex, non-linear, interactive causality. A problem here is that this leads to contingent answers that are decided by choice (free will), thus collapsing the indeterminacy at least for a time until the next paradox/ contradiction turns up. Quantum mechanics is built around this process: is 'it' a wave or a particle?? Choose, and 'it' will accordingly become a wave or a particle. Choosing electrons to be waves will enable an electron microscope to be built; choosing the electron to be a particle will enable a cathode ray tube to be built.

In "Formalistic Review" you state, "The next task along this line of inquiry is to construct a basic model of time which will incorporate Tiller's 4th space tensor, Prigogean time, hypotemporal time, the noumenal reality reflected by Gödel's Insufficiency Theorem, and the Michelson-Morley result of invariant light speed." Do you feel you've made any progress along these lines?

***Time as Enabler, Appendix* is the last I've done on this. It seems to go OK until I try to use a three-space to tie will, information and action time together. I'm confident that I'm on the right track, but three space may not be a good way to go.**

John Wheeler apparently pointed out that “for there to be information, someone has to be informed.” How might this related to your statement “Pure information is pattern is order is atemporal is time-less?” (“Formalistic Review” p60)

In-formation basically means ‘that which forms within’. There are plenty of things that are formed within that are not ‘someones’. So he is talking from the perspective of a living human operating at (supposedly) the highest level of situational and logical awareness/ alertness. Well, we humans are informed in many ways, most of which lie in the unconscious/ subconscious areas. The perception I’m trying to bring forward is pattern, static template of itself, but able to form and focus conscious will into physical action in or reality. Example: the structure of DNA (not just the protein factory, but the whole string that interacts with the plenum) that is played like a musical instrument by a consciousness that is both immense ant tiny in ways that we sense must be there, but cannot yet adequately describe (i.e. our current area of effort). The patterns of aware consciousness derive from sensations, emotions and perceptions that we experience subjectively and associatively, but are ‘transparent’ to us, and thus exceptionally hard to grasp. (I much doubt that Wheeler was a religious person, but in light of this later perspective, based on information subsequent to his lifetime, he would require a Brahman or a Jehovah to forcefully maintain his position.)