Part I: Models of Synthetic Telepathy

Allen Barker, July 31, 2002

This article, the first of a series, deals with *models* of the mind control network. It is an elaboration and summary of some of the ideas expressed in my earlier essay "The Autopig." See also "Mental Firewalls" and "Special Powers and ESP.". For a list of some of the basic abbreviations used in the current series, see the document outlining abbreviations used in the essays. The later articles in this current series are listed at the end.

Please bear with the intro, even if the ideas seem unfamiliar at first. The sections near the end should make sense even without a complete grasp of the early sections, and will tend to clarify the ideas and make them more concrete. I do not cover the mental illness possibility and cover lie here because I have discussed it elsewhere, but remember that torture is not called torture because it is a picnic in the park. It leaves scars and sequelae.

Model independent reasoning

In the context we are working in, a model is an assumed framework for what facts hold. There are various possible models. *Multiple model reasoning* involves considering various models simultaneously. *Model independent reasoning* involves making decisions or coming to conclusions that hold in all models -- or at least in all tangibly likely models or in some collection of models. As a brief example, consider this binary tree split: Either the government is involved directly (CIA, etc.) or it is not (and non-government people are the perpetrators, with government at most indirectly involved). These are two models (or classes of models). It can be useful to evaluate the facts and the data with respect to each of these models. In some cases the government *is* directly involved and in others it is not, so this is an individual, victim-based model system. What model independent conclusion can be drawn?

The government is culpable and is the responsible party to petition for redress in both cases. So this conclusion is model independent with respect to those models.   In the first case the culpability is obvious. In the second, it is clear that one of the main functions of government is to protect the citizens, especially their fundamental rights. The most fundamental right, underlying all others, is the freedom of thought. By refusing to fairly consider victims' claims and implicitly supporting such repression the government is also indirectly at best supporting a system of repression. These "psychic lynchings," -- under any model -- are very much in line with the long US history of civil rights abuses which the government has long turned a blind eye to. Note also that most victims still undergo criminal stalking and harassment in addition to the mind violations -- whatever the model.

The standard model

I refer to the assumption that technological mind control techniques are the underlying mechanism for most mind control abuses as *the standard model*. This model also includes

techniques such as drugging and hypnosis -- which are known to have been applied in projects like MKULTRA and Bluebird -- as well as the combinations of these techniques with recent technology like voice-to-skull transmission devices.

As an example of an alternative model, consider what I call *the natural model*. This model assumes that what is occurring with many mind control victims is the abuse of natural psychic abilities. For example, it might be originating from a hostile remote viewing/harassment unit. Or it may be some other group of evil people with assumed real "psychic powers" sufficiently strong to cause the reported effects. I call the model where *both* technological methods and natural psychic methods are employed *the mixed model* because it is a mixture of both the standard model and the natural model.

This brings up the main split that will be considered as an example in this article. Is it technology or some natural psychic phenomenon? As I have pointed out in the above links, for many purposes it does not matter and the conclusions are model independent. The standard model is pure technology. We know that it exists. Psychic phenomena strong enough for the voice-to-skull phenomena reported by victims, if it exists, must have been kept secret by a conspiracy lasting millennia. There are various other incongruities with the natural model, including "facts" which are missing their logical consequences and thus are suspect. (This is especially true where those consequences are subject to arbitrage or profit -- though that can also be a motive for secrecy.) The natural psychic model would require a "psychic mafia" holding for generations, including for children, adolescents, and old people on deathbeds. It would require some enforcement mechanism so that even the disaffected members would not reveal a conspiracy that was not there to help them at all.

As I have also pointed out, though, the standard model of pure technology exists right now. Thus, in the current world, the *pure* natural model is obsolete (if it ever held). Could you tell the difference? So we have either the standard model or a mixed model with both natural psychic effects and technological ones.

Exposing the technology helps to bring out the the *concepts* and the violations even in the unlikely case that the natural model holds and a weaponized "psychic space" is the source of some people's harassment. Thus the decision or conclusion to bring out the existence of the technology and its known history of abuses follows in both the standard model (directly) and the natural model (indirectly). [And is the right thing to do regardless, because of the victims still suffering and denied redress. Human rights are axiomatically model independent with regard to any model.]

Why consider the natural model?

Although it provides a very good example of multiple model reasoning, there are some good reasons for victims to avoid the psychic model altogether. It may be used as a psyop to distract from the technology -- even that which is known openly to exist. It may be used to deceive technology victims into thinking they are "just psychic" and that the torture is "natural" (which it is not in either model). It is hard to take a natural psychic model to court, and so justice would have to proceed on other channels. The very association may be (and at times has been) used to connotationally tar mind control victims and their human rights plight with the "kookiness" that psychic phenomena tend to be regarded with in our society.

The reasons I consider the natural model -- even though I think the evidence supports the standard model -- are as follows:

- It is how the technology would *seem* to unwitting victims. There could well be a standard model with a psyop of a natural psychic model *built on top of it*. That is, many people with MC technology used on them unwittingly may be fooled into thinking they are psychic and know nothing of "the man in the middle" or the

technology.

- The concepts of "telepathy," etc., are very familiar to many people from books and movies. Many people are even familiar with thinking about things like *nonconsensual* psychic attacks on their minds. In this sense it provides a natural introduction to some elements of the *subjective* mind control experience, i.e., how it *feels* to a victim. (This empathy may then extend to real, technological victims of similar horrors.) Of course the differences also need to be sharply highlighted.

- If we assume the natural model is not "magic," then there is a physics and a brain mechanism involved. If so, then this biological system can be and almost surely has been reverse engineered. This actually *increases* the likelihood of the standard model (or mixed model under this assumption) in many ways.

- Taking a multiple model approach generally minimizes the chances of being surprised should things turn out differently than you supposed originally.

- Many people believe the natural model already, whether it corresponds to ground truth or not. Such people are potentially attractive victims to those testing the technology, so they should be alerted to that possibility.

- Some people may psychologically prefer the natural model and be unable to cope with the standard model because they cannot deal with the idea that other humans would essentially put them in a technological cow pasture to exploit and manipulate them.

Please do not forget that the technology *does* exist and whatever the status of the "natural model" there *are* technological MC victims. Finally, there is something I call algorithm generica. This algorithm allows you to generalize or reason by analogy across models. It is amazing how much reasoning -- if you do the real, hard reasoning -- carries over to other models from thinking about a particular model. Whole subtrees remain essentially intact, to use the tree analogy. Generica is a bitch, as I say.

Reasoning around uncertainties

In reasoning it is important to know as much as you can, but also to keep in mind what you do not know. Many people know a little that some others do not, but think they know much more than they actually do. Model independent reasoning allows you to take uncertainties into account and find that, for some conclusions, what you do not know does not matter. What you know is enough. Of course this depends on your choosing the models correctly and covering all the possibilities. Bad data or deceptive data can be worse than no data: set a reasonable threshold and toss the garbage.

This ends the introductory part of the article. The remainder is a less structured collection of ideas and questions. If fully developed the above ideas would lead to a whole book, at least. These paragraphs hint at what that might look like. Victims in such situations probably do not need it all spelled out. And as the saying goes also, some horses start at the shadow of a whip. The main purpose of this article is to get the information out to those it may help. I mainly deal with "telepathy," natural or synthetic, by which voices and other audio productions are sent to victims in a voice-to-skull manner and whereby the victims' inner subvocal speech is transmitted out to others.

General Concepts in Synthetic Telepathy Models

Recall that an RTI is a realtime idiot, and is like a DJ at a radio station you are forced to listen to constantly and cannot turn down. They can access your private thoughts and harass you with this fact in their "broadcast." An AP is an autopig, which is an AI-like machine or expert system doing the job of an RTI. The combination is similar to a DJ playing taped segments between live segments.

Model neutral decisions. Rather than being completely model independent, some decisions are model neutral. This means that they hold in some models but for the other models they do not make any difference one way or another.

The third ear. This is a useful way of considering auditory phenomena not coming from the ears (or coming to the ears in a disguised way, where such a send is not apparent; certain known devices are capable of doing this). It is nothing but a sixth sense, whether it is natural or artificial. Even if it is a brain implant, it is essentially just like an additional sense organ. If you would not believe something sent to your real ears, why would you believe it if it were sent to your third ear without your consent? Partly this is because of denial of the phenomenon and the fact that people tend to confuse such signals with their own inner verbal thought processes. The modulation of such speech signals is typically pathological lies meant to harass, distract, and manipulate victims. Some such applications are subtle, while others are the blunt Chinese water torture of constant harassment. In the nonconsensual case, it is just like if Ewen Cameron forcibly strapped headphones onto your real ears and forced you to listen to harassing or manipulating audio 24 hours a day.

New term. The Cameron number of an autopig phrase (or RTI phrase) is the number of times it has been repeated. When a phrase has a large Cameron number it tends to become a strongly conditioned phrase (SCP). This essentially causes a form of brain damage to the victim. There is a tendency to hear such a phrase even when only vaguely similar phrases are heard, both on the third ear and through the actual ears.

Network structure of the communications channel. What we are dealing with in an abstract sense is a communications channel. The fact that it is often nonconsensual does not change this. The nodes of such a network are people, both perpetrators and victims. Some nodes might also be machines with AI-types of monitoring or harassment software. There is such a network structure in all models, though the exact details will vary. Considering questions of network details helps in fitting the data you gather to a particular model, though beware that psyops are intended to purposely conceal the real, underlying structure. These are some things to consider:

- *Local vs. regional vs. global.* Is there a spatial component? I.e. do people nearby tend to send or receive more strongly than those far away? Note that local interactions tend to be more noticeable than larger-scale ones because you have more direct feedback from individuals. More distant realtime spatial feedback might come from live radio or TV, for example, or a long-distance phone call. I have noticed a strong non-local component in my situation, but there may be a local component also that is partially masked by this. Of course a global or regional effect also tends to be local.

- *Send power vs. receive power.* Do some on the network send more strongly than they receive (i.e. more volume)? Do some receive more strongly than they send (i.e. more sensitive to weak signals)?

- *"Control" or "consent" status.* Do some nodes on the network have more control over the data they send or receive than others, such as an on-off switch or volume control? Are some witting versus others that are unwitting?

- *Spatial distribution of senders and receivers.* If there is a spatial component, what is the geographic distribution of people with the various send vs. receive parameters?

- *Audience model.* Is there a silent "audience" larger than the direct participants, the equivalent of Usenet lurkers? In the case of harassment, do they enjoy the "rape show," just tolerate it, or work to help the victims?

- *Subnetworks.* If there are localized subnetworks (or spatial regions, assuming a spatial component), are there different "cultures" within such subnetworks? Might harassment occur on one subnetwork, silent monitoring occur on another, and maybe even something useful and consensual on another?

On the notion of subnetworks, there are several ways such can arise. Note that they need not be completely isolated from each other, just clusters of higher connectivity. As an example, if the effect had a spatial component then spatial subnetworks would arise. They might also arise even within a spatial region. For example, if a frequency-specific nonthermal EM effect were responsible and people varied with respect to what frequencies they "sent" and responded to most strongly (according to their physiology and perhaps learning effects).

Psychic suppression units. If you assume a mixed model -- or even a weaponized pure natural model -- might there be the psychic equivalent of cointelpro? Control freaks seek out any channel for control and manipulation of individuals and groups. How might a "groupmind" be affected by manipulating or torturing a few select individuals? How might political murders or discrediting campaigns be carried out? What sort of economic exploitation would be possible?

Ground truth is the correct model. Keep in mind that the real "audience" and "perpetrators" are *only* those specified by the correct model (which is unknown). In *conditionally* evaluating any model, keep in mind what assumptions are *assumed* true within the model. This can avoid some fuzzy confusions across models which can tend to occur.

Ultimately internal, though also work on the external. Your reactions and response to mind control of this sort is ultimately internal. In some models you cannot ever "turn off" the signal without externally turning off or blowing up the machine responsible. (Shielding is another possibility, but there has been no reported long-term success in blocking the signals.) This is like if Ewen Cameron forcibly put earphones on your real ears that you could not remove. You would *have* to hear the sound. In other models such as certain EM models you might be able to modify your brain's response to "tune out" the sounds. In either case, you need to internally adjust your own response to understand and either tune out or ignore the incoming assault. With the Cameron earphone sorts of models this is difficult, and the conditioning will take its toll, but that is what you have to work with until external actions can change the external situation. It may help some victims to work on their ability to focus their attention on two or more places at once, though of course such divided attention tends to cause performance degradation.

Psychosexual torture. Torturers very often tend to focus on sex. This is the equivalent of torturers in a Central American country attaching electrodes to victims' genitals and shocking them. This is a very common sort of thing among torturers. Why is that? Here are a few possible reasons:

- Violating the victims' sexual organs is intended to demean the victims. The torturer displays the power to strip the victim of the ordinary sorts of societal expectations of privacy. Because the genitals are typically private, exposing and assaulting them may cause a real (though undeserved) sense of shame in the

victims. The torturer makes clear that the victim is a 2nd class citizen at best, not deserving of the cultural norms, social mores, and social compact of "real" citizens. The sadistic violator wants to also be a prude, and exploit such societal expectations while violating them at an almost unthinkable level. They'll harass people until they destroy their private sex lives, while the culture peddles Viagra to the public to sell people a sex life again.

- Torturers, at least the lowest-level lackey torturers who carry out the actual physical deeds, tend to be sadists. (Those at higher levels tend to be amoral and conscienceless, treating people as worthless fodder, but tend not to want to get their hands dirty or have anything to do with the victims directly.) Sadists focus on genitals because it increases the terror and trauma to the victim, but also because it increases their thrill with the act of torture.

- People are infatuated with sex, and love to titter and gossip about it. Thus sexual gossip and smears put out in a whispering campaign will tend to spread.

Similar sorts of reasoning hold for other sorts of privacy violations flaunted to the victim, including the violation of the privacy of the victim's mind (which also is the primary sexual organ, or so sex therapists would tell us).

In all models: Adult torturers teach children or young adults how to torture and thus perpetuate the cycle of atrocities and repression.

General Observations

The following are more of my observations of the techniques that certain mind control torturers employ.

As I wrote in my essay "Excuses and Manipulations in Mind Control," torturers will first torture a victim for whatever reason. Usually because they thought a victim was vulnerable or they could get away with it. They will later concoct various "reasons" and "rationalizations" for why they did it. These often tend not to be even sensical on the surface level, but are employed in the subtext and on the trigger level. This both keeps the conspiracy informed of how to "rationalize" the atrocities and keeps the victims traumatized and in "dismay fatigue."

It is systematic, brutal as hell, and organized. There are large numbers of people who run the operations in what can only be described as a supremacist sense. A bunch of lilliputians who conspire and use their secret torture conspiracy to keep others down. Something like the conspiracy that tried to keep men like Paul Robeson down even though the people involved were several orders of magnitude his lessers.

How large a population is conditioned and propagandized *unwittingly* by the same people involved in the mind control operations? Either by widespread or wide-field mind control methods or by the standard propaganda and cointelpro methods?

In the space of the third ear there may be multiple voices. These might all be one machine programmed to distract and manipulate. They may be some bunker RTIs, often "enhanced" with autopig machines like radio DJs running taped announcements between live segments. In a model containing the natural psychic model as a submodel, or in a standard model with interconnected groups (perhaps deceived by a psychic psyop), these voices may represent individual, real people. Some are overtly machinelike, repeating Cameron phrases with numbing, annoying, and damaging regularity. Others actually say new things from time to time -- though one that can string together two sentences in succession is rare. Occasionally you

even get one that can "converse." Thus far they invariably refuse to respond to the protocol authentication challenge of "what is the cosine of xxxx in radians to six digits after the decimal." (That allows a hard confirm of a true external and a rough authentication.) Note that even in the standard model there can be different groups -- perhaps different intelligence agencies -- on the same channel and accessing the same victims. Whatever the ground truth, the voices are not all pushing the same agenda and some argue with others. How to interpret this is model-dependent, but in a mixed model or certain "psychic psyop" standard models there may be some halfway semi-decent people on the channel (who still maintain the conspiracy used to torture). Or it may all be a good Nazi, bad Nazi act.

One game that voices in collusion play is the "false defender" game, a variant of good Nazi, bad Nazi. The bad Nazi will harass and goad and a good Nazi will seem to defend the victim. But the "defense" assumes all the phony premises of the bad Nazi and treats an illogical, harassing pig as a regular "person" whose idiotic babble is worth serious consideration.

In the space of autopigs and RTIs there are several sorts of processes I have not listed before. They are:

- *Distraction autopig*. Like a cointelpro agent they want to distract from any thought they deem "subversive." They also just generally distract like a Bergeron pulse, interfering with anyone trying to seriously think. They often tend to use sex-type distractions such as "sex with an underage girlfriend" or the more graphically repugnant "sex with a 10 year old." These distractions seem to occur more frequently if the voice-space "conversation" tends toward any dissent... They mainly just distract victims trying to think or get any work done.

- *Platitude boy* is a new named AP-RTI which repeatedly spews some common cliche or platitude.

- *Logical negation boy* just parrots the logical negation of anything you think. Sort of like a 5-year old: "It is x," "No, it is not x."

- *The echo* repeats your thoughts, for whatever reason or motive or intention.

- *Timid boy* always tries to induce anxiety or doubt in something you think or say. "You made a big mistake." "I warned you."

- *Beavis and Butthead* are two babbling morons who think they are the Marv Alberts of the rape show. They provide their running commentary of anything you think (or even dream) as filtered through their idiotic awareness. They were actually named by some other "voices" who also seemed annoyed by their incessant babble. They constantly harass and attempt to demean. If any of the "underground bunker" sorts of models hold, these two sound like they are sitting in a booth down there with microphones and headsets, harassing.

- A *babbler* is a process that just babbles seemingly random, non-connected words -- usually at a level just perceptible. It may be part of a trigger search algorithm, looking for what you react to. It is similar to the techniques used in technologies like the Russian acoustic psycho-correction devices now owned by a Richmond company.

- The usual tiresome processes "listen" to whatever you are thinking about and

babble about them. If your thought included the word "Volkswagen," for example, the AP-RTI would then essentially let x="Volkswagen" and plug that value into several of the AP phrases of one variable. It is really syntax-level stuff, often not even making sense. They also repeat the AP phrases without variables constantly.

The ugly distorting mirror. You think a fraction of some thought. Before you can even finish the thought train, it is telemetered out to some filthy rapist. This rapist first interprets your half-thought in terms of his or her own idiot awareness. This distorted, ugly reflection is then sent back at you as if it somehow represents your whole thought. Besides the basic miscomprehension of the raped thought, the return signal also reflects the purposeful, sadistic intention to harm you and cause trauma. This external kneejerk can derail your normal thought train easily if you let it. If you think like a moron you'll be a moron. (Your internal kneejerks and conditioned thought habits can be hard enough to deal with without some external idiot's hateful reflection also imposed on you.)

Garbage in. If you have a filth channel coming in, you will have some filth associations. That is just the nature of the brain. That specifically refers to the third ear, but also applies to newspapers, TV, etc. Understand how the thought arises. Observe. It does not reflect on you. The best and most useful brain circuits, when fed trash and filth, will tend to produce trash and filth. Don't spin your wheels on worrying about this crap. Observe and stay aware and unperturbed. The pigs, if they are real people, are revealing their own filthy selves and minds. Point that out to any "audience" in whatever model you are assuming. I change models like I change a pair of pants. You do not have to explain. I am wearing blue jeans now.

Kick you in the leg till you limp, then blame you for limping. They'll torture you for a year and then "blame" you for thinking like a torture victim. Similarly for all years thereafter. They'll autopig you with a phrase 100,000 times and then blame you for tending to think that phrase. They also rush to both reinforce and ridicule any such tendencies. After a phrase becomes strongly conditioned, even a snippet of it or a similar rhythm can tend to set it off. The victim will *anticipate* hearing it, because he or she has been conditioned to expect it after so many occurrences.

One common thought occurrence is for a random noise on any ear to trigger a strongly conditioned phrase (SCP). Even just the anticipation of such an event is seized upon by an RTI-AP to mock, goad, and reinforce the SCP. The mind rapists also seem to be able to access the "pre-subvocal area" and see you forming an idea there. Even if you choose not to subvocalize it, they will often pick up pieces of it for their harassment. You can test this by barely thinking something but not even subvocalizing it, and quietly observe what happens. You can sometimes even "lead" the voices that way. Triggers and SCPs tend to work two ways even between torturer and torture victim, and barely thinking an SCP is more likely to set off the particular RTI or AP whose phrase it is. In an AI sense it seems something like a blackboard system running off of your brain data. (Keep in mind the effect of conditioned internals here, though.)

Stockholm syndrome is induced by forced intimacy plus abuse and torture. With third ear Cameron harassment directly into the brain this can happen if you are not careful. After years of abuse, they'll pretend to be your "friends." Like the bait and babble and bait and trigger, this is only to get you to pay attention and open up to the next traumatic brain insult.

The trigger search algorithm. This algorithm repeats with mind numbing regularity. The RTI-APs are not called idiots for nothing, but one thing they are good at is spotting any sort of reaction to their goading and babbling. This is especially true of any sort of trauma or distress reaction. They notice this like a pack of jackals sensing a wounded animal. They home in on it instantly. Any sort of perceived weakness quickly draws their attentions. Anything they notice you responding to is likely to be sent to the trigger search algorithm for "testing." They also repeat the trigger search algorithm at periods of, say, 30 minutes, 1 hour, and often 1 day and

several days later. If the test "succeeds" then you get a new autopig phrase goading you long-term. They also watch as you read things and go about your daily life for anything that might get a reaction or be associated with a traumatic situation. Some of these paths like newspapers and radio are also employed deliberately as feedback pathways in trying to trigger or goad the victim.

Professional triggerers. The RTIs and their AP machines are the lowest-level sorts of Brownshirt harassers and goaders. They are the useful idiots for others behind the scenes. They constantly harass to annoy and weaken the victim. They drip, drip, drip, like water torture. In the background there are also what I call professional triggerers. They will lurk in the background or be called up when the victim needs extra suppressing. They trigger based on a long history and profile of the victim, and quite pointedly. You can even sometimes hear them directing the lower-level harassers as to the "theme" of the next harassment skit. I call one of these "Major Mengele Psych Degree."

Why are spies called spooks? They are called spooks because they are spooky, or at least try to be. That is their first line of operation. They want to intimidate with a bare, deniable hint of blackmail, for example. They want to scare you, intimidate you, or confuse you in a way they can deny and that others will not pick up on -- "you must be crazy." They also bluff and lie constantly, and create various deceptions which they then try to market to their targets. They want to induce anxiety and uncertainty in their targets, and alter their courses of action from what the spooks at least imagined it would otherwise be.

In anything you read there tends to be the text, the subtext, and the subsubtext. Like with harassing audio, harassing and smearing subtext tends toward playground level stuff -- though applied and implied by supposed adults. The subsubtext represents the underlying intention of the subtext and the deeper implied message. It tends to be picked up by those used to "reading the tea leaves" as opposed to only picking up bits of the basic smears directly between the lines. Keep in mind that all the subtexts tend to be BS; people can lie between the lines more deniably than on them.

An Example Model

The remainder of this article presents a particular hypothetical model scenario as an extended example.

As an exercise, assume the unlikely case of the *purely* natural model. Assume that some subset of people are born with some natural ability as "hearers." Assume they have managed to keep this situation secret for centuries via a strong taboo and mafia-like omerta. Assume that even children with such abilities somehow know not to talk about it, and that attempts to write about it or tell people meet with suppression. Assume also that there are some people who are naturally strong "senders." Assume that strong "senders" in many cases do not even know that they have this somewhat rarer gift/curse. How would they know, if they do not "hear" and the hearers keep it a secret? The "hearers" participate in a conspiracy which is used to keep the unwitting "senders" vulnerable and exploitable. Suppose that, besides just listening, exploiting, raping, and peeping at these "senders," some of the "hearers" decide to have sadistic fun with them. These "senders" are harassed and driven crazy if even a few "hearers" decide for whatever reason they do not like them or just want to. They may be driven to suicide or may be driven to the waiting arms of psychiatry where they are drugged into being zombies.

Perhaps these "senders" are even just like the "hearers" except that they are the equivalent of deaf people exploited worse than any freak show "entertainers." Suppose this mafia-like conspiracy is widespread and uses triggers and other such techniques to maintain control of those not in on the secret -- as well as to police its own members. These triggers would develop over the years until they were almost stylized caricatures of the "best" triggers that the harassing jackals finally homed in on. Like a pathetic word or symbol representing how to put

down any particular person and which even children could use -- never mind if it is stupid or reveals atrocities on actual inspection. The victims tend to be dismayed at the stupidity and the evidence of widespread conspiracy against them, more than the actual pathetic triggers. Not all such "hearers" would actually be Nazis in this model -- though collaborator is close. In fact the majority might even be like the "good people" who did nothing even as they heard the cries from the death camp down the street.

If a "sender" also had some "hearing" ability, or developed it over the course of time, he or she might not know how to interpret it. If harassment had already started, this would be just one more harassment feedback path to the victim. A way to manipulate and goad the victim. The victim might think it was technology because such technology does indeed exist. Alternately, technology might be used for a "send" *to* the victim, while the victim's natural "send" ability would be used for the return "hearing" feedback path *from* the victim. The victim would be traumatized, angry, suspicious, and confused, not knowing what was happening.

How does this model meet with the facts? What inconsistencies and unlikelihoods does it have? How well does it explain what mind control victims report experiencing, such as going into a library and having people snickering at them and goading them with their own "private" thoughts? If the "senders" *knew* that they tended to send more strongly, wouldn't they be in an interesting position. How could "senders" ever learn to control and use their abilities if they never got any feedback but harassment? What psyops could create the illusion that this model holds? What "experiments" could a victim or other person conduct to support this model over another one, in the face of psyops and deception ops? What if a "sender" gradually became a "hearer" too, even under harassment? Could it be distinguished from a technological "send" to the victim? *Assuming* this model holds, how could a victim knowing this ground truth best deal with the harassment and come to uncondition himself or herself from the pathetic triggers and ongoing harassment?

If the natural model is not magic, how does the advance of technology play into things? Are there any curves crossing or about to cross? How does the new mixed model, with the standard model thrown in, change things? Everyone has a cell phone these days, and soon they'll be so tiny people will mount them on their heads or affix them to their bodies (neurophone-phone?). That is a consensual sort of network essentially like the ones discussed in this article. Even the open, non-secret technology related to synthetic telepathy is advancing rapidly.

Consider the above model, in both its strong points and weak points. Think about the supporting data and possible experimental design. This is a useful exercise in any case, both to practice thinking in terms of conditional models and because parts will generalize to the mixed models and standard models. Generica is a bitch.