E.5

# CLIPS—QUOTES and COMMENTS



— A BI-WEEKLY RELEASE —

OF

THE B. S. R. A.

3524 ADAMS AVENUE SAN DIEGO 16, CALIF.

# CLIPS -- QUOTES -- COMMENTS

## "E" - 5

## September 1, 1955

CONTENTS: PAGES:


????"Inside The Space Ships" ???. . . . . 1 - 3
(comment on a new book-)

REACTIONS to the Russell-Einstein statement . - 3

New Conceptions Of The Cosmos . . . . . - 4
(by Arthur Constance)

Nuclear Fall-Out Report (Part II, cont'd) . . 5 - 6
(by BSR Assoc. T.V.)

Photography of Akashic Records . . . . . 7 - 8

-- Filming The Past -- and Miscellaneous - . . - 8

Philosophy Of The Communicators . . . . . - 9
-(continued from "C.Q.C." E-4) -

--"Book Clearance" List ADDENDUM
-(as of Sept. 1, 1955)


- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -


"CLIPS, QUOTES, and COMMENTS" is issued on the first and fifteenth of each month, by the Borderland Sciences Research Associates -- 3524 Adams Ave., San Diego 16, Calif.

Twelve issues (6 months) for $5.00; six issues (3 months) for $2.50; two issues for $1.00. Contains only short articles and miscellaneous material, supplementary to the BSR bi-monthly ROUND ROBIN.

N. Meade Layne, Director -

? ? ? ? . . . "INSIDE THE SPACE SHIPS" . . . ? ? ? ? 

The controversy over the experiences, whether real or alleged, of Mr.George Adamski has been long drawn out, and seems to have increased with the publication of his latest book (Inside the Space Ships, Abelard-Schuman, 404-4th Ave.,NYC). We have largely kept clear of this dispute because of the personal element involved. And I take this occasion to repeat that I have long accepted Mr. Adamski's first adventure, in 1952, as being genuine in its essentials.

By the expression 'personal element' is meant simply that where an unusual and important experience is described, and it cannot be verified by witnesses or any other practicable means, then the character and personal background of the narrator comes into question, and adverse criticism becomes distasteful.

The Associate quoted below takes vigorous exception to photographs Nos. 13, 14, & 15 in the book referred to. His inference, which he finds inescapable, is that these photographs were fraudulently prepared, and his indignation is natural and logical. We print his criticism because as of present date it seems justified- and if so, it should be made known in the public interest. Neither our Associate nor myself (ML) has any object in making a personal attack on Mr. Adamski - but how can he be dissociated from his printed statements? If there is serious doubt about them, should we make this doubt known, or maintain silence?

ml

Associate
6 7 8 * (Concerning the "Space-Ship Photos" Nos. 13,14, following page 160, and No. 15, pg. 192 f. Our Associate writes in part):

. . . . "I am convinced beyond all doubt, and it is painfully obvious (after it has been pointed out) that these are not any kind of space ship photos. They are positively nothing more or less than photographs of nebulae** that have been doctored by the addition of terribly crude alleged portholes, put on the negative plate with pen or equivalent. Don't look at the portholes but at the thing as a whole and you will be looking at a nebula photographed edgewise. There are many such photographs in astronomical archives, and in almost any textbook or magazine article on astronomy. Thus, G.A.'s alleged space ship is several light years in length. The crudeness of the hoax is staggering. . .

" In his "Unexpected Postscript" chapter, G.A. goes into detail as to how these pictures were taken. I am not one to be floored by anything fantastic as such, but G.A.'s claims concerning this photo-taking spree are beyond fantasy - they are positively insulting to the intelligence of anyone who can add two and two.

"Let's ask a few honest questions concerning photos 13, 14, and 15. Here are alleged photos of space ships in the form of disjointed blobs of light. If we took this at its face value, how would the 'portholes' turn out to be the only real and solid parts of the ship - all the rest of it a light blob only? Obviously, it is

---

NOTE * As a matter of convenience we have assigned numbers to a few contributors and most active Associates.

Note ** More accurately perhaps, the "space ships" resemble photographs of galaxies (star systems), rather than nebulae, though there is some overlapping in the use of these terms. (ml)

possible to make such a photo by taking the negative plate and drawing in these five crude dots. For evidence that they were simply drawn in, note that they are not of equal size, and are not even very round. And since the person who drew them is not an artist he made no provision for perspective, so that the 'portholes' are equally large and the same general shape from one end of the ship to the other.

It is claimed also, that the mother ship hull was six feet thick - which suggests that the space people rely on crude thickness for strength and protection - which is 150% absurd. And with regard to G.A.'s obsession with 'portholes' on space ships, I assert that it is extremely doubtful that space beings would have anything as crude as portholes incorporated into the design. Such beings would have outgrown this relic of earthian ship design, as our own water and air craft are rapidly doing.

The fantasy becomes really labored when the author claims that he and one of the space people were photographed at the portholes. Note the crudely drawn-in travesties for portrait photos. This means that these pictures were made while they were at the other ends of 6-ft. long tubes, the thickness of the mother-ship hull. The perspective, angles, lighting etc. of such a feat are utterly impossible.

The inconsistencies here are legion, but let me add this one. Although G.A. refers to this porthole-equipped space ship as a "small mother ship" (pg.247), he does claim that it was still so big that elevators were used from one level to another inside the ship. Keep the heroic size of this 'small' space ship in mind, and it logically follows that the 'portholes' must have been several hundred feet or more apart. Plade two 6-ft.long sewer pipes some hundreds of feet apart and try to photograph faces at the other ends of same, and see if you can snap two,one, or neither of the two, in one exposure, with any kind of lighting you can conjure up.

Furthermore, if you compare the relative size of the portholes in comparison to the size of G.A.'s elevator-equipt 'mother ship', you'll wind up with such king-size portholes that the two alleged heads appearing in two of the portholes would have to be anywhere from a few feet to some yards across.

There are three distinctly nebula photos which are here being passed off as photos of space ships - Nos. 13,14,15. Any photo expert can take over from there on.

If you look sharply you can see some of the faint stars peppered around the nebulae called space ships. Experts in the field of astronomy should be able to identify thes nebulae very easily. It would be a service both to astronomy and to saucer research if some astronomical center would make this identification.

The explanation by Mr. Adamski as to why the 'saucer beings' were unable to take photos in or around their ships, is so labored and inconsistent that one is at loss for words. So, they had to fall back on G.A.'s polaroid camera, which by a stroke of luck he happened to have with him.

Here I will interject that, if I were to offer pictures of nebulae (taken by professional astronomers) with or without handmade portholes, and claim them to be space 'mother ships', I would take care to claim that the photos were taken with a Polaroid camera. Why? Because if some doubter pointed out a few of the inconsistencies, and rudely enough asked to see&inspect the negatives of my photos, I could floor the upstart by saying: "Sorry, old chap; everyone knows that a Polaroid photo does NOT involve a negative plate or film." Thus, without any negative, as such, I would be free from embarrassing questions on that score. Or would I?

I will sum up by adding that there are enough glaring errors in this book, to fill a much longer article or even a good-sized booklet. But what serious

saucer researcher has that kind of time to spare?

"Last but not least, no serious saucer researcher will dispute the fact that research into the claims and rationale of any such book as I have been discussing is part and parcel of his necessary and legitimate activities.

---

NOTE: "Associate 678" prefers to remainanon. at the present time, for three reasons:

1st: To nullify any charge that he wrote the above report as a publicity seeker.

2nd. In order that he may be unhampered in further investigations of this sort.

3rd. He offers his findings, calculated to be quite self-evident, as a public service to real and honest saucer research. Beyond that, he cannot spare any time for controversial correspondence on this matter. He will be glad to learn of any comments addressed to the BSR, provided they do not necessarily require a personal reply from him.

( Assoc. 678)

Editorial request:

The BSR Director and Associates will greatly appreciate it, if publications quoting from Clips & Quotes and/or Round Robin , will make brief acknowledgment of source & give Hdqrs. address: 3524 Adams Ave., San Diego 16, Calif.

ML

--- --- ---

REACTIONS: to the Russell-Einstein warning to all Governments. From NEWSLETTER published by the Society for Social Responsibility in Science; Gambier, Ohio. (No. 40; August 1955): (This issue also prints the entire text of the Announcement).

..."An unusual feature was the listing of those who were asked to sign but refused, together with their reasons for refusing. Three men - Lord Adrian of Trinity College; Professor Alexander Haddow, & Dr. H.J. Bhabba of India, declined for fear it might prejudice their jobs. Niels Bohr said "because no attention was paid to his own open letter to the United Nations. Pauli did not think the proposed Congress would do any good. The same objection was raised by Dr. Karl Siegbahn of Sweden. Arthur H. Compton said he approved the general objectives but could not support them in detail. Harold Urey said the statement was completely obvious. Max Born declined because he was working on a scheme of his own; the same reason was given for Otto Hahn's refusal. A Soviet and a Chinese scientist did not reply. It might be noted that no one declined on the ground that the dire warning of imminent disaster was over-stated.

"Reaction of newspapers to the statement is significant. Many American papers ignored the appeal entirely or gave it a hostile reception. TIME MAGAZINE called it "a dreary mishmash of gloom-laden cliches". In Europe the response was more favorable. . . A week later an even more distinguished group of Scientists issued a similar statement. Eighteen Nobel Prize-winners declared (in Bonn, July 15) that all countries must renounce force under pain of destroying themselves. "They will cease to exist unless they are ready to do this. . . . The full employment of weapons feasible today can infect the earth with radioactivity to such an extent that whole peoples can be annihilated. . ."

(end of quote)

The attitude of the American press has been on the whole very discouraging - and Time Magazine once more distinguishes itself by vicious stupidity.

ml

NEW CONCEPTIONS OF THE COSMOS: Article under this title, by Arthur Constance, in Flying Saucer Review, for July-August, 1955. Pub. at 1 Doughty St.,W.C. 1, Lon.,Eng. Bi-monthly, $3.50. Vol. 1 No.3. This new "slick" is ably edited, with distinguished contributors. Arthur Constance is well-known as author and publicist, and is very favorably disposed toward the "4-D" (etheric) interpretation of the aeroforms. His summary will interest BSR Associates: (pg.12 ff).

That we have had enough factual, well-witnessed sightings since 1946,apart from historical instances, to prove their non-terrestial reality.

That UFO come, or emerge, in a variety of shapes and sizes, and that they can change size, shape, color or speed while under observation.

That at the same instant they can be seen yet not photographically recorded; or, alternatively, recorded and not seen.

That they can materialize and dematerialize while under observation.

That some kind of other-than-this-world intellignece controls them, and that "beings" other than earthlings have sometimes occupied certain types.

That those controlling the UFO have made attempts to communicate. (I do not imply either success or failure in the attempts).

This statement by Mr. Constance is certainly most acceptable to BSRA - as is true also of his following remarks:

'I cannot imagine that further accumulation of sightings will help us to find an explanation. In each case we need to examine the accumulated data from all angles to find a solution. It may well be that all our social and industrial problems, and even the problems of atomic warfare will pale into insignificance as light on the UFO spreads ...

'The problem of the UFO is neither national nor international - it is a Cosmic problem ...

I am convinced we shall make no progress toward an explanation of the UFO until we dismiss time-and-space ideologies. As long as we think of the UFO 'coming' from anywhere - Mars or anywhere else - we are blinded ... interpreting the Cosmos in terms of our own three-dimensional existence. . . but if we believe in a material cosmos and nothing more we are faced with insoluble prob - lems regarding the UFO . . . I suggest that we concentrate on explanations rather than sighting accumulations. I believe we shall get somewhere when we dis - miss the concepts behind somewhere and when from our attempts to find a solution.

. . . We are making little progress in converting the man-in-the-street because we have no real explanation to give him. Do we believe they come from Mars or Venus? I think it is far more likely that Meade Layne is right, or at least on the right track, in saying that they emerge. From another dimension? What is a 'dimension'? What size or shape is our solar system? Yes, I know; any textbook can give a picture of it . . . All the material cosmos, the myriads of suns, mostly made of what? In the light of atomic research, of empty space - a cosmos consisting of multitudes of holes in the ether, the ether itself being more solid than the holes . . .'

All this, to our BSR associates, should be like a fresh breeze blowing through an ocean of smog. That our own so-called dense matter is in fact a rarefaction of the enormous densities of the ether - that "empty space" is a mere vocable, a metaphysical absurdity, that "space" must equate with the ethers before the concept is thinkable - all this is, we believe, quite familiar and intelligible to Mr.Constance, though he still touches such matters cautiously... But he has good company in Bertrand Russell, who writes that since an electron changes its orbit instantaneously, "perhaps there is NO INTERVENING SPACE",which means no time is required for the transit . 'A change of frequency is equivalent to a change of location' . . .

ml

AEC member Dr. Libby discussed radiation at length in his Chicago speech of early June. His statements and conclusions seem to differ most radically from statements of nuclear scientists already quoted in this article, and others to be quoted before it is finished

He stated that radiation over the U.S. has at all times been far below the danger level, and that the total amount received due to all nuclear explosions in 1954 was .015 roentgens. (You get 15 roentgens in one spot when you have an ordinary set of dental X-rays. The world in all its parts, he declared, is radioactive and always has been - and that people packed into dense crowds receive more dosage from radioactive potassium than that applied in the U.S. on January 1 of this year from the total test fall-out.

He mentioned numerous things which give off radiation in amounts "surprising to the layman", and added that an annual dosage of 15 roentgens is "considered safe for workers in AEC plants."

In summing up, Dr. Libby states: "as far as immediate or somatic damage to the health is concerned, the fall-out dosage rate as of January 1 this year could be increased 15,000 times without hazard. Natural radioactivities of the body, effects of cosmic radiation and of the earth's surface constitute hazards which are much greater than the test fall-out hazards."

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Let us here review the growth of the monster nuclear babies created by "science".

1. The ordinary original atom bomb made from U-235, a rare form of Uranium, and Plutonium, a man-made element derived from U-238, the abundant form of natural Uranium. Produces explosions of a 20 kiloton yield, equaling power of 20,000 tons of TNT. This type dropped on Hiroshima in August 1945, ten years ago. A report from Hiroshima on this 10th anniversay contains these words from the city's Mayor: "Our great fear of the atomic bomb is not because we have experienced it, but because people of the world do not understand how dreadful it is... It is our obligation to remind the world that 6000 victims of the atomic bomb are not having adequate treatment ... There are more than 98,000 who are daily threatened with the fear that they too may be affected by radioactivity". Hiroshima publications say that the A-bomb took from 240,000 to 260,000 lives, including outsider and troops.

2. "Improved" atom bomb - 1951. Produces explosions of a 500 kilo-ton yield; equals the power of 500,000 tons of TNT (25 times greater than the original bomb).

3. Hydrogen bomb - 1952: Uses A-bomb explosion to trigger the fusion of atoms of deuterium and tritium, which are heavy forms of hydrogen. The explosive force of this fusion process is determined by the size of the bomb and can equal mega - tons - i.e., millions of tons of TNT.

4. "Improved" hydrogen bomb; 1954 Bikini model. Scientists call it the "U-bomb", or ultimate weapon because it can be made cheaply with ordinary uranium into a size many times bigger. The Bikini bomb gave an explosion yield of ten megatons of fission energy, equal to ten million tons of TNT - 500 times greater than the original A-bomb. Scientists theorize from an AEC member's words (Dr. Libby's Chicago speech) that the U-bomb consists of anA-bomb and an H-bomb, plus a jacket or blanket of U-238 natural uranium. The A-bomb is believed to set off the H-bomb,

generating enough force to fission the atoms of U-238, thus making possible a super-bomb of inconceivable magnitude. On the U-bomb the AEC refuses comment.

(My Comment): The Libby speech totally ignored reporting fall-out over the US in Feb., March, April, May, 1955; four months of extensive nuclear test shots - 14 test blasts on the Nevada desert, and an underwater final in the Pacific - about which not one word has ever come out to my knowledge. This was the first time the AEC held such extended tests so close home. Yet the big report in July gave only radiation up to January 1955 - a month before the big nuclear tests started. Now read on, if you can stand it, and we'll see what a nuclear scientist was saying at the time of the above words of Dr. Libby. We meet again Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, formerly employed by the Government to help develop the A-bomb, now directing a private firm, Nuclear Science Service. Writing in Life magazine for June 27, he gives the public some warnings which are not of the AEC "absolutely no danger" variety. (Italics will be mine).

Dr. Lapp comments on the national civil defense test alert held in mid-June: "US planners either failed to appreciate or refused to face the facts about modern super-bombs. Americans would still be in the dark were it not for a momentous but little noticed speech which AEC Commissioner W.F. Libby gave at the University of Chicago in early June.

"The big news buried in this speech was that the bomb exploded at Bikini in March 1954 was not simply a hydrogen bomb, in which a small A-bomb is used to trigger a thermo-nuclear device; it was a three-step mechanism in which an A-bomb triggers a thermo-nuclear blast which sets off a final, vaster A-bomb. The Bikini bomb is thus a gigantic A-bomb whose radioactive after-effects are far deadlier than those of the H-bomb alone."

"Dr. Libby makes clear that this new superbomb is a revolutionary weapon - a break-through in the explosive art (sic) comparable to the development of the original A Bomb. It packs the punch of ten million tons of TNT, or 500 times the power of the Nagasaki 1945 bomb. The H bomb can derive most of its power from ordinary uranium, U-238. The H bomb as first conceived was beyond the ability of even the US to finance. U-238 costs only $20. a pound. The superbomb can be made as large as desired. A 10-megaton bomb is now only a nominal weapon. Bigger bombs would not cost much more. This means we have entered a new era of cheap destruction.

"For the imaginary attack the FCDA selected bombs of various potency. Of 51 bombs, 12 were at the same power as the Nagasaki bomb; 12 were 2½ times that size (equal to 50 thousand tons of TNT. Only six were of megaton size (one million tons of TNT or larger). None equaled the superbomb.

"Clearly FCDA's assumptions were highly conservative and indeed downright inadequate. We seriously underestimate Russian capability if we count on their using only small bombs. Bombs for strategic warfare will undoubtedly be in the megaton or multimegaton class."

(Comment: T.V.): What human mind can conceive such explosive power? I'll be hanged if I don't think Bernard Shaw was right when he said that this war-mad planet was "the insane asylum of the universe". All of which calls to mind a digression I must make here. How can one follow the journalistic rule for brevity while on this multimegatic merry-go-round of the savage-like manufacture of 'improved' and 'economical' weapons of super-deadly potency to be used on people - to achieve 'victory'. One is too deeply humiliated even to weep. But as to my digression, I continued by quoting a few paragraphs from an article date-lined Washington D.C.,May 15,1955, and concerning facts on nerve gas:

(to be continued)

(After giving data on the nerve gas, Assoc. T.V. returns to quotations from Dr. Lapp and the AEC. The information in this article is not pleasant raading, but should be made accessible).

PHOTOGRAPHY OF THE AKASHIC RECORDS -- In connection with the photographing of past events (Akashic Records) and a related question discussed by Associate I.J.P. (6 8 0) in our CQC E-3 (Aug. 1, '55), our Assoc. 6 7 9 sends us the following memo:

"I believe I can be of considerable help to Assoc. I.J.P.... I know of the work of DelaWarr, who has recently collaborated with Langston Day in the book NEW WORLDS BEYOND THE ATOM, the original ms. of which ...." (is to be published in the U.S.) "In this book D. outlinesthoir work in photographing past events via the Mark cameràs used in photographing disease radiation. This is revolutionary work that deserves careful study...."

At present we have no further information, but hope to review this book as soon as it is available. We shall appreciate any factual data on this subject.

The question referred to above, posed by Assoc. I.J.P., was simply this: Is the Akashic Record, or the 'memory of Nature' supposed to retain <u>everything</u>, including mistakes and 'false' statements. And consequently, could a supposed historical event be verified by the Records? If a great number of people (or only one person, for that matter) believe that an imagined and fictitious event really occurred, would not this thought-form be as real and permanent as if it h a d actually occurred on our plane of existence?

Thousands of thought-forms have been produced on sensitized plates, without lens or camera; and these may or may not be affected by what the experimenter is consciously thinking about or imagining. It is not necessary to assume that any excarnate entity is involved. What is the basic difference between these and an etheric entity in the "astral light" or 'memory of nature'? If we add to the data already at hand, the quality of <u>permanence</u>, this new achievement of photo - graphy pf past events becomes logical and plausible.

It should be equally obvious that Nature, the Great Mind, knows nothing about 'false' and 'true', real or unreal, right or wrong. These be man-made concepts and distinctions, as meaningless to Nature as reflections in a mirror or a voice to a recording instrument. There may well be levels of consciousness wherein such differences are perceived and established - but no camera is going to tell us whether a small boy 'really' carried the loaves and fishes or not, or whether the crucifixion 'really' took place according to the received version.

Of interest here are a few sentences from Col. A.E. Powell, a writor and scholar who needs no introduction. "Just guessing", says Col. Powell, "but it seems obvious that if the memory of Nature records anything it must record everything. What have truth and falsehood to do with it? If the crucifixion of Jesus took place, that fact will be recorded. Also recorded will be millions of individual imaginations of the affair!"

But then, Col. Powell shifts ground a bit. "Surely", he says, "there will be considerable difference between objective happenings a n d thought images of what may or may not have happened." Pour moi, I doubt it. At least I doubt whether a camera will ever find out t h e

difference. And as to a peculiarity of astral vision whereby mind-images "have no backs" (referred to by Col. Powell), this again seems to depend on the development and powers of the observer. Most new arrivals in the astral are considerably confused, see just what they expect to see; but it is likely that ALL planes are planes of illusion.

"I often wonder", says Col. Powell again: "if our personal memories are bits of the A.K. Seems reasonable. Why have a duplicate mechanism?"

One of the Mark Probert Controls answered that one several years ago. Memory, according to psychologists, consists of retention and recollection, the latter being of very small scope. But to recall or remember anything is really a process of tuning in on the Records, the memory of Nature; there is no such thing as retention per se - which is Col. Powell's "bit of the A.K." again.

- e n d -

Filming the Past.

As a further note relevant to photography of the Akashic Records, we quote a press clipping with a London date line - August 26, 1953, but not lacking in interest because of that - and substantiated in our own correspondence.:

"British scientist Invents Camera to Film the Past. . .

"Members of the Royal Society of Sciences listened with great interest to a report by one of its members, George Warr, who has promised to show, soon, his 'chronophotos'. These are images of past events registered by special apparatus constructed after ten years of labor. The device is based on Einstein's theories about the propagation of vibrations and on the techniques of television, which transform vibrations into images. Warr says he can register energy vibrations emitted by past events which, according to him, remain in existence years after those events occurred. In particular, Warr reported that he was able to photograph in 1952, his own wedding, which had taken place in 1928. . ."

A great deal of interest has lately developed in this field of research, and some of the results achieved by research are almost incredible - and include the photographing of objects many miles distant through the use of a 'sample' of the material. I regret that we do NOT have any compilations of data - nor permission from Dr. G.W. de la Warr (de la Warr Laboratories) to involve him in correspondence - but technicians having a serious interest can address him at Kingston, Yarnell's Hill, Oxford, England (enclose addressed envelope for reply). An American research man in the same field is Dr. W.D. Chesney, 215 Whitewater St., Milton, Wis.

THE HUNA RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS are announcing (or will soon announce) a NEW BOOK by Max Freedom Long, entitled GROWING INTO LIGHT. The author is well known by his Secret Science Behind Miracles and The Secret Science at Work, and as Founder and Director of the Huna Research organization. There is no question as to Mr. Long's scholarship and his success in making the HUNA techniques accessible to western students, and I hope to review his new book at greater length before long. The price is $3.00 (plus .09 for residents of Calif.); send this amount and ask for a 10-day inspection copy, to be returned by you if not satisfied, (& refund)

Address: -- Huna Research Publications
P.O. Box 875, Vista, Calif.

ml

## PHILOSOPHY OF THE COMMUNICATORS

(Deep-trance mediumship of Mark Probert: Continued from CQC-E-4 of August 15, 1955, re continuum & Ding-an-Sich)

CHANGE:

Certainly (say the communicators) change takes place, and to you it implies time - one thing now, and then another, in time sequence. You ask how awareness can act in an eternal Now and still experience change. Wherever there is consciousness there is time and motion and change. But these things are 'inside' consciousness. Consciousness is activity, and action means change. It is an activity that has duration, but there is no 'outside' time in which it exists. We do not believe the Cosmic Mind, the Omniverse, is in time; but it has duration in the present, and as our individual minds it thinks times and space and change

There is nothing in this to interfere with scientific thinking. But the basic concepts of science depend on metaphysics. Whenever science tries for final explanations, it becomes metaphysics or philosophy. When the occultist reduces an atom or an electron to myriads of 'holes' in the koilon, he is not doing anything radically different from the scientist who works the atom down to electrons, protons and other components. Both are still doing space-time thinking and picture-thinking, and imagining an ether as some kind of energy-stuff 'out there' in 'space'. These ideas are all right as methods for thinking the universe, and because of the nature of our minds we can't avoid them; we have to function in space-time-causation forms, but we should try to recognize the true situation.

THE SUBCONSCIOUS:

The communicators use this term with great reluctance. They affirm that it should be applied only to the control of the automatisms of the body - digestion, heart action and so on. Apart from this there is (they say) no sub- or unconscious mentation. Consciousness is never suspended, but shifts its focus of awareness (i.e, shifts itself). We are 'unconscious' of anything we are not aware of. If the readers'mind is closely centered on these words, he is 'unconscious' with respect to the rest of the omniverse about him.

What then is recollection or memory? The current notion seems to be that the fact recollected is somehow stored up in the "subconscious", and that the mind acting under the principles of association brings it into consciousness from that mysterious region. But what actually happens is this. Everything is stored up in the memory of Nature, or Astral Light or Akashic record. The all-pervading ethers are in some way modified, and permanently so. The mind tries to make contact with this record by following the clues or laws of association. When this 'tuning in' is accomplished, or the rapport established, then the 'forgotten' fact reappears in consciousness.

With regard to the seeming automatism of thought, it has been suggested that we are perhaps 'free' to select the category (as, say, mathematics) but subsequent thinking within the category (say, a theorem in geometry) is associative and automatic. The communicators seemed to believe that the automatism of thought and recollection can be recognized without employing the concept of a 'subsconsciousness' at all; also, that there is a small region of 'free' volition, in that we can open or close channels of contact.

The term subconscious is also very objectionable, since "no 'level' or functioning of consciousness is "below" or "above" another; we have only a shifting awareness - a focus of attention which is nevertheless constantly changing. And (to repeat) there is no un- or sub-conscious retention of experience by the individual mind. The idea of responsibility seems to appear in connection with the choice of categories mentioned above.

ml