Telepathy: A Real-World Experiment

Cosmin Vișan[*]

Abstract

This paper explores what an experiment of consciousness might necessitate. So far, the experimental part of science is considered to be best studied under laboratory conditions in which variables are isolated and controlled in order to study certain aspects of a phenomenon. This paper will argue that certain aspects of consciousness can only be revealed under real-world conditions, for reasons having to do with fundamental ways in which meaning is generated in consciousness. Meaning will be argued to necessitate genuine preconditions in order to appear, thus laboratory conditions being inadequate to study certain aspects of consciousness. We will explore telepathic experiences that I had in relations with girls and highlight the real-world conditions that were needed for such experiences to take place, and then based on such considerations, an analysis of meaning will be undertaken.

Keywords: Consciousness, meaning, real-world, genuine, telepathy.

Introduction

There are many aspects of consciousness in need of an explanation. Probably one of the most perplexing of them is where do qualia come from. What determines the qualities that qualia have? Some people, like Donald Hoffman [1], believe that the qualities of qualia can be accounted for by mathematical reasons. Thus, an assumed mathematical experiment in the laboratory should be able to generate qualia on demand simply by just implementing the necessary mathematical structure responsible for each specific quale. This type of attempt is in line with what science taught us about how to obtain results that we desire. But what if such an experiment cannot be implemented for fundamental reasons?

What we will argue in this paper is that consciousness requires genuine real-world conditions in order to generate qualia. Also, as we are dealing with genuine real-world conditions, this raises almost inevitable a moral dimension that will limit science in what kind of real-world experiments it can undertake. Therefore, I will mention right from the start that the experiment that I undertook was immoral. Fortunately, nobody got to suffer, except maybe myself. This is again another aspect of what doing a real-world experiment requires: the active participation of the experimenter in the experiment, which is quite unlike the standard scientific experiments in which the scientists are gathering data from outside the experiment itself.

The results of the experiment might sound anecdotal, but it should be noted here that we are dealing with real life, and real life is by its very nature anecdotal. Also, given the fact that we are dealing with the participation of the experimenter in a real-world experiment, the number of data that can be gathered is highly limited. There clearly cannot be billions of data points collected as in particle accelerators experiments, and not even hundreds as in psychological experiments. The subjects cannot enter the lab and each spend 5 minutes completing a questionnaire. A real-life scenario requires building relations with people and this can range from days to years for a relation to be built with only one person, thus the amount of experimentation that a researcher of consciousness can do is highly limited. Nevertheless, I believe the "anecdotal" results obtained from this experiment are enough in order to inform further theories of consciousness and even to provide a proof-of-concept for other researchers to design better experiments and to increase as much as 2 possible the number of data points, thus providing further evidence and confirmation of the results obtained from the experiment that will be presented in this paper.

Qualia as a form of meaning

Before getting to describe the experiment, we will bring some theoretical considerations about qualia and the motivations for performing such an experiment. The initial problem is that qualia seem so mysterious that how can one even begin to theorize about them, not to mention design experiments for them? Of course, there are lots of "optical illusions" designed over the years in which qualia are being modified at the will of the designer of the "illusion". But there are no explanations for why such "illusions" work the way they do. Why are they able to modify qualia? For such an explanation to be found, we need to understand first what qualia are. This has been done in my very first paper, "Is Qualia Meaning or Understanding?" [2] in which I argued that qualia are forms of meaning. Thus, by replacing the problem "What are qualia?" with "What is meaning?" we have a more tangible grip on the problem, because meaning is a more intuitive concept, thus we can be more informed in designing a starting point for developing meaning experiments, rather than qualia experiments.

I will give here 2 examples to show how qualia are forms of meaning. First example is the duck-rabbit image. Every time we give to that image the meaning of "duck" we also experience the quale of "duck". Similarly, every time we give to that image the meaning of "rabbit" we also experience the quale of "rabbit".

The second example, going to lower level qualia, in this case colors, are the pairs red-green and yellow-blue. Red-green is usually found in nature in the case of fruits found in trees. This suggests that they appeared by evolution in order to help the animal to spot the fruits in the trees. Thus, the redness of fruits alerts the animal of something of importance for him being found there, while the greenness of leaves helps the fruits to be maximally contrasted, thus further

helping the animal spotting them. Thus, red has its quality of redness because it has the intrinsic meaning of "important". Or better put, when the abstract meaning of "important" is cast into the visual qualia domain, it exists as the color red. Similarly, green has the intrinsic meaning of "the opposite of red".

Regarding the yellow-blue pair, the quale of yellow appeared in order to help the animal spot the Sun on the sky, and the quale of blue appeared in order to contrast maximally with yellow in order to further help the animal spot the Sun on the sky. Thus, the intrinsic meaning of yellow can be considered to be "source of light" or something similar, while the intrinsic meaning of blue can be considered to be "the opposite of yellow".

We draw 2 conclusions from here. First is that such correlations between qualia and their functioning in the behavior of the animal are indeed suggesting that qualia are forms of meaning. Secondly, as qualia are forms of meaning, they appeared for meaningful reasons. Real-life situations, like food acquisition, or knowing the time of the day, lead consciousness to evolve inside itself new qualia that helped solve the respective evolutionary problems. As we can see, without the real danger of starving to death, probably no red-green qualia would have appeared in existence. Such drastic conditions cannot be simulated in laboratory. And they cannot be faked. You cannot trick the subjects to believe that they will starve to death, only to offer them food 5 minutes later. A real-life scenario in which death is a real possibility is required in order for qualia to be brought into existence to help the animal avoid its annihilation. And ultimately, the qualities are selected for meaningful reasons, not for mathematical reasons.

Having thus identified that the problem of explaining qualia reduces to the problem of explaining meaning, we can start imagining experiments in which we can generate meaning. Of course, meaning is generated each moment of our lives. When we read books or talk to people or watch videos, we continuously generate meaning. But such cases are not quite helpful in explaining how that meaning is generated. We need to develop more intricate experiments in which to subject our consciousness to carefully selected situations in order to see meaning coming into existence in accordance with those selected situations, thus spotting better what are the determining conditions that lead to meaning generation.

One such situation is subjecting ourselves to the danger of death, but since nobody is willing to subject himself to such a situation, we cannot know for sure of the results that this case could lead to, though near-death-experiences might just be such cases in which profound meaningful experiences are generated in the person subjected to the real possibility of death. Another case to which we can subject ourselves is a case of real loss of something of importance to us. And this is the first motivation for the experiment that I undertook. How can I subject myself to a situation that will force meaning to be generated in my consciousness?

Another motivation for the experiment that I undertook was to understand more about telepathy. During my life, I had countless telepathic experiences. The problem was that though they started to become more predictable as I experienced more of them, their predictability started to become an obstacle in actually bringing an explanation for them. Most of the time, the telepathies happened to me in emotional relations with girls, love or even less intense emotions. While at first such experiences seemed amazing to me, in time, as I had more and more relations, they started to become predictable. Every time I was starting a new relation, I knew that telepathies will come forsooth. So, even though this suggests that emotions are somehow related to telepathy, it doesn't actually bring anything more to the table[1]. One way forward is to notice that emotions have to do with what is important in the life of a person, with what is meaningful to a person. So, this suggests that telepathy has to somehow be related to meaning generation. Couple this with the motivation of finding out what determines meaning to be generated, and we have ourselves a plan for conducting an experiment.

Thus, I had to subject myself to a situation that generates telepathies, and at the same time I had to subject myself to a situation that can make me lose something of importance. The solution? Get into relations with multiple girls at the same time, thus subjecting myself to both the emotions needed for telepathies and to the danger of being caught cheating. Notice that for both conditions to be met, the experiment had to actually not be an experiment at all in the normal way in which experiments are understood, as something divorced from real-life, something safely done in laboratory with no dangers to anyone, but it had to be genuine real-life. The relations that I had to develop had to be real relations with real emotions, thus leading to real telepathies and to real dangers of suffering in case of getting caught. The objective set, let's get to describing the experiment and the results obtained and then theorize about the nature of meaning and what leads to its generation.

The experiment

Given the abilities offered to us by present day technology, I contacted a large number of girls on social media. But given the limitations of human condition, in the end the number of girls with which I was able to interact in real life was 7, which is nonetheless a high enough number for potential interesting telepathic connections to arise. The interactions that I had with them were normal human interactions, thus they are not relevant to be presented here. But what it is relevant is that the fact that the interactions were genuine, so not restricted to some laboratory protocols,

---

[1] There is one thing though that we can learn from telepathy, and this comes from the fact that telepathy is a sharing of experiences, so we can deduce from here that telepathy is a form of consciousnesses unification, idea that I explored in my paper "On the Phenomenon of Unification" [3]. But what exactly determines such unification remains to be explained.

they were of the right kind to partake in the generation of telepathies. The only condition that I had to be careful about is that they wouldn't know one of another, thus creating the conditions for exposing myself to the dangers of them finding out that there were multiple girls that I was interacting with, thus creating carefully selected conditions for meaning generation. Thus, having subjected myself to the prerequisites for the experiment, all that I had to do at this point was to wait for the genuine interactions to unfold themselves at their own will, and wait for the telepathies to happen. I will now present the results, starting from the less impressive. I admit that some of them might be just cherry-picking from my side, though some of them are more obvious true telepathies. I will let the reader judge with his own mind the qualities of my interpretations of the events. The names are obviously not the real ones.

1. While I was seeing Amy for few months, in one of the nights while she was at home, I went for a walk for the first time with Betty, also kissing her during the date. Next day Amy told me that she didn't sleep well that night.

2. While I was waiting to meet Cindy in a specific park at a specific place at a specific hour, I saw Dorothy on a bench. I went to talk to her a little and, having the experiment in mind, I asked her if she comes there often, in order to identify if it's something common or something influenced by my date with Cindy. She told me that that evening she felt like coming there, not being something that she was doing often.

3. At one point, Amy decided to not see me anymore. Giving that we were seeing each other for few months, I had some mild feelings for her, and I was saddened by her decision. Thus, we see that the experiment involved genuine real-world interactions and feelings. That same night, Emma slept at my place. During the night, because of the sadness of Amy not wanting to see me anymore, I dreamed with a meteorite that was falling on the city and was killing me. In the morning, Emma told me that she dreamed of a nuclear explosion that destroyed the city. This, I think, compared to events 1 and 2, is an obvious case of telepathy. And this case also highlights another trait of telepathies that I also mentioned in my previous paper "On the Phenomenon of Unification" [3], namely that when such a dream telepathy happens, the other persons decides on her own to tell me the dream, even though we usually don't tell each other our dreams.

4. This was for me the most impressive case. Amy was on a trip for the week-end, and I went to spend the week-end with Emma at her place. At a point I got a call from Amy, which of course I couldn't answer, Emma being around. I was worried that if I don't call Amy soon, she might suspect something. Then, a few minutes later, a neighbor calls Emma to tell her that her car was hit in the parking by another car. She went down to see what happened, and I took advantage of the situation to call Amy and talk to her for few minutes, before joining Emma in the parking lot to settle the accident. If this was a real

case of interactions between consciousnesses (me, Amy, Emma, the driver, the neighbor), then this is something that goes beyond classical telepathy, and I will actually use this case at length in the next section to develop a theory of what I will call "meta-meaning".

These are the main events that happened during the about 3 months' time that the experiment lasted for. As we can see, the telepathies didn't appear in the interactions with all the girls that I met. But the ones that happened are interesting enough to be able to develop a theoretical framework to try to explain them. Though in a way the experiment was by its very nature immoral, in the end no girl found about one another, and the relations ended naturally, thus nobody got to suffer, except maybe myself a little when Amy left me. I don't encourage such behavior. People should be honest and treat each other with respect in a relationship and they should work together towards the best outcome, ideally a life-long commitment. The interactions that I undertook here were only for the purpose of the experiment, and if two or more of the interactions might have developed into something more, I would have taken the necessary steps to only continue one of them. These are the types of challenges that a scientist might have to deal with in designing consciousness experiments, and I hope he will do his best to not produce suffering in other human beings.

Meta-meaning as generalized telepathy

Having collected the empirical data, is now time to make sense of them. Classically, in a normal romantic relationship, there are only 2 people involved, and the potential consciousness interactions that might arise can only be interpreted as classical telepathy. The most facile explanation for telepathy might be some kind of signal transmission and reception between a sender and a receiver. I argued in my previous paper, in light of other aspects of the phenomenology of consciousness that I will not remind here, that telepathy is better viewed as a unification between consciousnesses rather than a signal transmission. Basically, 2 consciousnesses unify into 1 consciousness, they experience a shared state of consciousness, then they split back and each remember the shared state.

The fact that telepathy is not perfect was explained at length in the previous paper as an effect of the general workings of the phenomenon of unification which for fundamental reasons is not perfect, but rather is a superposition between various sub-consciousnesses that are unified into a certain consciousness. I will not go into details here. What is important for the present paper is the fact that one explanation for telepathy is consciousnesses unification. But this explanation comes from classical telepathy that appears between 2 persons. But this experiment was designed to push the boundaries of classical telepathy and see what traits of it are maintained when more

than 2 persons are involved and what new traits appear that might point to some generalized version of telepathy of which the classical one is just a particular case.

Event 4 is precisely such a case in which a classical telepathy explanation is hard to come by. While events 1-3 can still be explained by classical telepathy by invoking a transitive effect, like Amy (by not sleeping well that night) finding about Betty through my consciousness, or Dorothy (by coming to the park at that particular time) finding about Cindy also through my consciousness, or Emma (by sharing a dream with me) finding about Amy through my consciousness, event 4 is beyond even such a transitive effect. Thus, let's analyze in more depth event 4 and see what generalized version of telepathic-like interaction we can invoke in order to explain it, while also taking care to then express classical telepathy as a special case of this more generalized phenomenon.

Our most intuitive feel for how events happen in the world is a classical causality in which events influence one another in a linear way which also corresponds to a linear view of time. This classical causality can also be applied to classical telepathy. Even if classical telepathy is not a signal transmission and reception, but rather a consciousnesses unification, it can still be thought in a causal kind of way in which one of the consciousnesses initiate the unification with the other consciousness. This explanation is also valid for card guessing experiments in which the intention of one consciousness of guessing the card can be thought of as initiating a causal force of unifying with the consciousness that looks at the card and thus sharing a conscious state through which it gets access to what the second consciousness looks at. But event 4 displays certain characteristics that make such a causal view unlikely.

One such aspect is the indeterminacy of what are the causes and what are the effects. For example, who caused the driver to crash his car? Maybe it was me hoping for a way to be able to talk to Amy, or maybe it was Amy wondering why I'm not answering the phone. A second aspect is the peculiarity of the qualia that each involved consciousness had. In a classical telepathy, the unification between consciousnesses happen through shared qualia. Even if the telepathy is something not that obvious, like for example me dreaming being in an airport and waiting for the plane, and my partner dreaming of being on a snowy mountain and being rescued by a helicopter, the pair airplane-helicopter is still a set of shared qualia.

But in event 4, the only shared qualia could have only been Amy thinking about me and me thinking about her. In no way the driver when crashed the car had any qualia shared with me. He only had qualia related to driving his car and qualia regarding his turning the wheel in the wrong direction. Whatever made him act in the direction of crashing his car had not a direct experiential connection to the qualia of the other consciousnesses involved in the event. Therefore, if the telepathy didn't happen on an experiential level (by shared qualia), then something meta-experiential must have been involved. Or, as I express in my previous paper, something unformal

or formless. But for this paper I will use the term "meta", because it captures better what is going on.

Having thus established that the connection didn't happen through qualia or through classical causality, what properties can we deduce for the assumed meta-experiential dimension through which all the consciousnesses involved in the event got connected? One first property is that event 4 was a synchronicity. But this property can only tell us that all the events happened at the same time. It doesn't get to the core of the phenomenon. The most revealing property of the meta-experiential dimension is deduced by looking first at the experiential level. At the experiential level we have the conditions for meaning generation that we talked at the beginning of the paper, namely the potential for suffering to be created in my consciousness and the consciousnesses of Amy and Emma.

Therefore, the situation for meaning generation being instantiated, a solution was searched for by the principles that govern reality. That solution was to make the driver crash the car, the neighbor to be around at that moment, such that Emma could go outside and I could call Amy. Therefore, what we see the meta-experiential dimension to be is a source of meaning generation. Thus, we can call it meta-meaning.

We also can see that by its very necessary nature, meta-meaning cannot be experiential. Experience is something localized in particular consciousnesses. But meta-meaning is a non-local situation over and above the individual consciousnesses, it is a situation that encompasses within itself multiple consciousnesses, such that each consciousness is like a puzzle piece that fits together perfectly with other consciousnesses in an orchestrated play in which each consciousness has specific experiences such that the overall play is a coherent choreography. Note that this is not necessarily causal. From the point of view of the driver, he just made a wrong turn of the wheel and crushed the car. From the point of view of the neighbor, he just saw the accident on the window.

From the point of view of Emma, she just had her car crashed. From the point of view of Amy, she just received my call back. From the point of view of each consciousness, they each attended an own causal chain, having no idea whatsoever of their part in the non-local meta-meaning that generated the local meanings for each of them. Even for me, if I wasn't interested in such phenomena, it would have been just a lucky occasion to call Amy.

If my interpretation of event 4 is on the right track, there are some implications steaming from the nature of meta-meaning and some problems that it raises. One is the implications upon free will.

As we can see, the situation that I put myself into in order to generate meaning in my consciousness "got out of control" and generated all sorts of far-fetched meanings in other

consciousnesses in order to fulfill the meaning generation in my own consciousness, going as far as making an innocent consciousness having an accident. This creates a scary possibility that our lives are partly out of our control and they are directed by forces with purposes beyond our own. At any moment we might be puppets fulfilling actions in order to satisfy the generation of meaning in some other consciousnesses that have no direct relations to us in any way. But on the other hand, even if this is the case, this offers us some explanatory tool for the order that we see in the universe. It might even go as far as to provide the tools needed to explain the origin of life.

It appears that the origin of life requires so many coincidences that it couldn't have possibly arisen out of pure chemical interactions. If such coincidences cannot be explained by normal localized chemical reactions, they might be explained by non-local meta-meanings that somehow orchestrated the primitive consciousnesses that might have existed at the beginning of the universe, such as to synchronize them in meaningful ways as to fulfill the extremely improbable coincidences needed for the origin of life. So even though from a point of view it might take partial control over our own will, it offers us much more in return, it offers us an ordered world in which we can then act the rest of our will in more meaningful ways. Thus, if meta-meaning really exists and really acts in the way that my interpretation of event 4 suggests, then this should open up the doors towards more elaborated experiments in these directions in order first to establish its validity and second to determine its more exact properties and ways of acting.

Another point to highlight about meta-meaning is that it is not a thing itself in the way qualia are things, namely well-defined entities with specific characters, i.e. red is red, sweet is sweet, etc. No such specification can be given for the meta-meaning. Rather, it can be described only as a sum of the localized meanings that it generates. Being non-local/formless, meta-meaning has contradictory characters, it is at the same time an interplay between all the individual meanings that exist in the individual consciousnesses, and also an overall holistic character that orchestrates those meanings.

Meta-meaning can also be taken to be synonymous with context. If we take this equivalence, then context itself becomes spread between consciousnesses. Usually, contexts are viewed only as part of a particular consciousness. When I say "I've been to a rock concert." and "I took a rock from the ground.", the quale "rock" obtains its meaning relative to the context of the sentence. Even here we can spot that context is not something that we can clearly define in the way in which we can clearly define meaning. Even if we say that the context is the entire sentence, that sentence already includes the meaning which is supposed to frame. So somehow, the context is both the entire sentence as such and at the same time also the meaning itself that it frames. So even in such cases we see how contexts are rather non-local/formless entities. Given this character of context, then it is a natural generalization to spread it between consciousnesses such that it then generates its meanings in individual localized consciousnesses.

We thus see that the conclusions derived from event 4 are consistent with the functioning of individual consciousnesses in which meanings are generated relative to contexts. What event 4 offers us is the possibility to generalize the interplay between contexts and meanings that we find inside individual consciousnesses and make it global across consciousnesses. Meaning will still remain localized form because that's what meaning is, thus it will still take place inside individual consciousnesses. At the same time, though context might appear now as spread between consciousnesses, it actually has always been non-local formless even when appearing inside an individual consciousness. The trick was that as part of an individual consciousness, context risked to be considered localized, (i.e. confused with the sentence that framed a certain word, like the word "rock"). But context was all along non-local. Thus, extending it between consciousnesses changes none of its character as a non-local formless entity.

In the end, the ontological view that we uncover as a result of the real-world experiment that I undertook is that ***reality is an interplay between non-local formless meta-meanings/contexts and localized form meanings***. This view, as we saw, is also consistent with the functioning of individual consciousness in day-by-day life. Thus, the conclusion is a natural generalization of the workings of individual consciousness. How about classical telepathy? It also can be viewed in the same way as meanings being generated in individual consciousnesses based on some meta-meaning that encompasses both. However, the fact that the meanings are also shared, and are not obscured like the meanings between me and the driver in event 4, might have to do with the relation between the two persons taking part in classical telepathy. Note also that for classical telepathy, one of the persons is also telling the dream to the other person next morning, this being what informs them that a telepathy took place. Probably this sharing of meanings has to do with bonding the two persons even more. If they know that they shared a certain experience, this might contribute to them feeling closer to one another, as opposed to the relation between me and the driver that didn't have as purpose bringing us together.

Discussions

Let's reflect now a little on the importance of consciousness experiments of the type that I undertook here. In a completely rational world, such experiments will be viewed directly at their value. Unfortunately, human psyche is influenced by perceived value rather than by true value. Usually people tend to value more whatever has social status at a certain historical point rather than what actually has value. Thus, in our current materialistic world-view that is dominant in academia, people tend to give more value to experiments that contain concepts of the type "atoms", "matter", "space-time", "energy", etc. Parapsychology experiments, though time and time again obtain results with the same statistical significance as materialistic experiments, they tend to be rejected solely on an emotional basis. This clearly is not a healthy atmosphere that

unfortunately is present nowadays in academia. Thus, such experiments must be judged using the same standards as all the other scientific experiments.

Getting to my present experiment here, some extra points need to be raised. The reason is that even if parapsychology experiments will get the same status as other scientific experiments, my experiment might still not qualify for the standards required in order to give us any reliable new knowledge about reality. This, of course, has to do with the extremely small number of data points. Thus, is this paper worthy of being considered? I will argue that it actually has few strong points for which it actually brings value both for our knowledge about reality and for informing us of how to proceed further. Thus, as I also mentioned from the beginning, this is a real-world experiment. This automatically strips it of the controlling environment that can be constructed in a laboratory.

Nevertheless, by its very stripping of that environment, it exposes itself to conditions that can only be found in the real world and that cannot be simulated in laboratory, like the genuine relations needed to be developed with other people and the real dangers of suffering if certain events happen, like getting caught cheating. Given this stated purpose of the experiment, it automatically puts it in a situation in which the number of data points is greatly reduced. And this involves not only the number of people that you can humanly engage in building genuine relations, but also the numbers of interactions that you can have with them. You can only do that much in 24 hours per day, given also the conditions of each person having jobs to attend and various other activities. Such interactions being genuine, you cannot force people to meet you more often in order for you to gather more data points. They meet you only when they want and when they can, this imposing great limits on the number of situations to arise that are needed for the experiment to generate telepathy, like being at Emma place while Amy was out of town. This is the nature of such a real-world experiment.

Thus, what are the values that such a paper might bring to literature? For once, it should be viewed as a reminder that, as well designed laboratory experiments might be, at the end of the day we live in the real-world and the real-world has principles that cannot always be reproduced in laboratory, and if we really desire to understand reality, we have to bow by its will, thus recognizing its phenomena that can only appear by real-world interactions. Secondly, by describing what it took for me to obtain the results that I obtained, the experiment can be viewed as a proof-of-concept for future researchers to design better such real-world experiments. By acknowledging the difficulties in obtaining any relevant number of data points, they might imagine future experiments in which to maximize as much as possible this important short-coming of this type of experiment. Thirdly, assuming that I correctly identified the results obtained and then I correctly interpreted them, this offers new theoretical understanding about consciousness and reality that can later be confirmed or dismissed by future real-world experiments. Having already a theoretical framework deduced from the small number of data

points that I obtained, this can guide to some extent future experiments by allowing them to calibrate their own data against at least this one possible theoretical framework that this paper provides. It is better when performing an experiment, especially in such a field as parapsychology, to have some theory behind than to have no interpretation at all for the potential results.

Thus, offering these arguments, I think this experiment is of real value and has real potential of guiding future similar experiments and offering us more understanding about consciousness than can possible be obtained through other means. Philosophy itself must be guided by such experiments, and no amount of rational thinking alone can reveal us the truth about reality if crucial phenomena are lacking and are not revealed by carefully designed experiments.

References

[1] Hoffman, D., Prakash, C., Objects of consciousness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2014.

[2] Vişan, C., Is Qualia Meaning or Understanding?. *Journal of Consciousness Exploration & Research*, 5(8): pp. 729-745.

[3] Vişan, C., On the Phenomenon of Unification. *Journal of Consciousness Exploration & Research*, 11(3): pp. 263-280.