

# THE CONCEPT OF RELATIVE NON-LOCALITY: THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS IN CONSCIOUSNESS RESEARCH

Vernon M. Neppe, MD, PhD, FRSSA<sup>1,2,3#</sup> and Edward R. Close, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>

**Three core concepts:** We argue that “non-local” events require further descriptors for us to understand the *degree* of non-locality, what the *framework* of the observer describing it is, and where we humans are located *relative to* the ostensible non-locality. This suggests three critical factors: *Relative to, from the framework of,* and *a hierarchy of “to what degree?”* “Non-locality” without the prefix “relative” compromises its description by making it an absolute: We must scientifically ensure that, qualitatively, we can describe events that correspond with each other—like with like—and differentiate these events from those that are hierarchically dissimilar. Recognition of these levels of “relative non-locality” is important: Non-locality from “the general framework of” the infinite, or mystic or near-death experient, markedly differs theoretically from “relative to our sentient reality in three dimensions of space in the present moment (3S-1t)”. Specific events may be described “relative to” our living 3S-1t reality, but conceptualized differently from the framework of observers in altered states of consciousness experiencing higher dimensions.

**Levels:** Hierarchical questions to ask would include

- Is the non-locality “pseudo” simply communication that some but not others detect through extending our usual communications? Or is it still

local “subliminal” communications? Or is it undetectable by humans, yet detected by some animals or machines? Or are psychological or brain happenings misinterpreted as non-locality?

- Is the non-locality impacting higher-dimensional hidden realities?
- Is it at the countable infinite—*transfinite*—level?
- Or does the non-locality happen at the infinitely continuous reality?
- Or at the highest level of that infinite—the mystical?
- Is the non-locality linked with theories in physics, such as quantal entanglement or the many other postulated causes? Relative non-locality in physics is likely different from non-locality in Consciousness Research.

**Immediacy principle:** We also propose that events happening immediately, not even requiring light speed, are fundamental properties of non-local time involving more dimensions than just 3S-1t.

**Keywords:** Classification, consciousness research, dimensions, immediacy, infinity, phenomenological levels, relative non-locality, TDVP, Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm

(*Explore 2015; 11:102-108 © 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.*)

## INTRODUCTION

The term “non-locality” or “nonlocal” is becoming increasingly fashionable,<sup>a</sup> and with this fashion, an imprecision has developed that may ultimately compromise the two main sciences that use these terms, namely, Physics and Consciousness

Research. There may be some usage overlap between disciplines, depending on interpretations of underlying causality: The most common current related phrases in physics are “quantum non-locality” and “entanglement.” However, this article focuses on the second discipline at this point, a statistically less common

1 Pacific Neuropsychiatric Institute, Seattle, WA

2 Exceptional Creative Achievement Organization, Seattle, WA

3 Department of Neurology and Psychiatry, St Louis University, St Louis, MO

We gratefully acknowledge permission to publish from the Pacific Neuropsychiatric Institute, which holds the copyright over this article.

# *Corresponding author at:* Pacific Neuropsychiatric Institute, 6300 Ninth Avenue NE, Suite 353, Seattle, WA 98115.  
e-mail: psyche@pni.org

<sup>a</sup> A Google search (May 29, 2014) indicated 66,700 hits for *non-locality* and 75,400 for *nonlocality*. For “nonlocal consciousness,” there are 9680 hits; for “quantum non-locality,” there are 64,800 hits, “quantum nonlocality” involves 37,800 hits, “non-local perception” involves 2930 hits, and “non-local perception” involves 38,800 hits. It appears therefore that non-locality in any consciousness sense constitutes less than one-third of all uses of “non-local” or “nonlocal.” Possibly, the hyphen in non-local is more commonly used in consciousness research and the single word nonlocal in Quantum Physics. For consistency, we use the term “non-local” throughout, but this also delineates another problem with the term: the requirement to search for both “non-local” and “nonlocal” and then to ensure one is not duplicating terms.

---

use, a namely, non-locality in Consciousness Research where terms like “non-local consciousness” and “non-local perception” are sometimes used as preferred synonyms for “psi” or for “extrasensory perception” (ESP).<sup>1</sup> There are, indeed, now many who use “non-local” as a prefix to substitute for many different kinds of psi phenomena.<sup>2,3,b</sup> Therefore, “non-locality” could just reflect ways to wrap up the same controversial animal in a fur coat: it could be a different way of describing another term for ESP, or for psi or parapsychology, as these latter terms may not currently be in fashion.

In the context of this article, we are using the definition we applied in *Reality Begins with Consciousness: A Paradigm Shift that Works*,<sup>4</sup> namely,

In both physics and consciousness research, ‘non-local’ (also ‘nonlocal’) refers to a distant connection of information, apprehension or perturbation. However, this is always ‘relative’ to the observer’s reference frame and perspective, so the term is more correctly ‘Relative Non-locality’

But given the “apprehension” elements (equivalent possibly to *relative non-local perception*) and the “perturbation” components (equivalent possibly to *relative non-local psychokinesis*), this definition does not emphasize the *quantum* non-locality per se. The quantal use may or may not even be related to “non-local perception or consciousness,” with the focus on the space combined with time elements not being local—instead, non-locality or “action at a distance” is the direct interaction of two objects that are separated in space with no perceivable intermediate agency or mechanism. As Tressoldi<sup>1</sup> indicates, non-local refers to “...non-local properties... that ...may operate beyond the space and time constraints of sensory organs.” We suggest that one application of the term “non-local” has been to move away from materialist reductionism: In the same way as the physicist may regard “entanglement” as synonymous with or exemplifying non-locality in physics, the consciousness researcher may regard “psi” as synonymous with or exemplifying non-locality in their discipline.

## WHY WE ARGUE FOR RELATIVE NON-LOCALITY LEVELS: THE STRUCTURE OF REALITY

We maintain that there are different levels of non-locality. This is based on, inter alia, our extensive work,<sup>5</sup> and consequently non-locality involves a much more complex concept than simply saying this is “local” and this is “non-local” in absolute terms. The purpose of this article is not to *prove* existence of the different levels. Instead, we want to *theoretically* conceptualize the possible levels and kinds of non-locality more accurately. For example, is every psi experience and other conceptually related phenomena, such as out-of-body experience, near-death experience, or survival after bodily death, happening at the same conceptual (possibly

<sup>b</sup> In common use, the term *psi* is the composite term used for extrasensory perception (ESP) and psychokinesis (PK) and equivalent to the layperson terms of psychic, paranormal, anomalous, and sixth sense and part of parapsychology.

“non-local”) level? And if not, is the highest level (such as a postulate of the “infinity of infinities” that some would say involves a “divinity”) in this model still even experiencing non-locality? Furthermore, can we theorize on what might exist, and in what way the differences in levels are pertinent?

## Beyond

Non-locality is sometimes understood as only “beyond” space and time. In a sense it is, in that it goes *beyond* the space and time constraints the observer is used to, so it is relatively “beyond.” But more correctly, “beyond space and time” may be an incorrect conceptualization, as “beyond” already implies that “it is beyond, relative to some level.”

## Discrete and Continuous Levels of Reality

Instead, one could hypothesize that at a conceptually “higher level,” the observer could experience everything *relatively* locally at that level and below—rather like looking into a box from the outside. The authors regard non-locality as hierarchical, and some complex math derivations support the existence of such a hierarchy.<sup>4</sup> One such concept implies *levels of discrete* dimensions. At the highest level is the so-called “transfinite”—Cantor’s “countable infinity”<sup>6</sup>: Even this transfinite still remains “discrete”—it is in quanta: in pieces; it is like “bits” in computers or pixels as in monitor screens. It looks continuous, but that is only because our sense organs cannot detect such small components. Essentially, even this highest level—the transfinite—is still “discrete.” Yet, all of these *discrete* levels—the various dimensions of which our three spatial dimensions (length, breadth, and height) in the present moment of time (called “3S-1t”) through to the transfinite—are all contained in—*embedded in*—the broader “*continuous* infinite,” making up a single reality.<sup>4</sup> At the highest level of that “*continuous infinite*” would be the “*infinity of infinities*” as Georg Cantor<sup>6</sup> mathematically conceptualized it.

## “Experience” and “Existence” are Different

Below these very high levels, there appear to be different levels of non-locality. This includes even non-locality in some of (what we argue are) the first nine dimensions.<sup>7-10</sup> Up to five of these nine are usually *hidden*: This is because we, living beings, only usually *experience* the first four—the 3S-1t. Most of the time, we do not even realize there is more to reality than just our experience of 3S-1t. It is these first four dimensions that most scientists applying the standard models of physics regard as “*all of reality*,” “*all of physics*,” and “*all of what exists*.” Yet, the authors dispute that 3S-1t is “all of reality”; instead, it is simply just “all of what we experience,” because we have mathematically demonstrated that there are nine finite discrete spinning dimensions. We argue, furthermore, that there are also higher levels of reality as well, namely, the still discrete “transfinite” and the continuous “infinite.”

## The Analogy of Top-Down and the Bottoms-Up box

This means that an “observer” experiencing events at each of these levels effectively is observing space and time “top-down,” and what is below that dimensional level is usually

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2685994>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2685994>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)