

The Rong 3 R's

Remembering Essentials

Of course, the rason we say 3 'R's is to remember:

'readin' is a source of time-binding.

We don't all need to replicate the same explorations

or the same experiments, generation after generation.

We need to make some **new** mistakes!

'ritin' records the representations of our research.

'ritin' generates something to read.

'rithmetic is the acknowledged rudimentary skill

for reduction to bottom-line results.

3 R's or 7 C's

Of course, we need to **regard** and **respect** others, and our environment,

which partly consists of others.

We need to **communicate**, in order to **coordinate**,

in order to **combine** our efforts with the efforts of others, to **collaborate**.

This makes it possible to **create**, constructively,

conserving our common resources and energies.

Does that mean we need to **change** the r's to c's

and increase the number to the seven c's or even more?

To Respond and To Reproduce

We certainly need to be **responsible**!

Responsiveness is one of the fundamental characteristics of all **life**.

To be **responsive** is to be **responsible**.

We need to produce and / or to **reproduce**.

Reproduction is a foundational characteristic of all **life**.

To Relate with Regard

We must have a **regard** for **sense**, **truth** and **relevance**,

which we must **responsibly relay** through culture.

Is **life** or learning a pursuit of the right number of the right letters (r's or c's)

to represent our right use of the opportunity of **life**?

We certainly need to **relate** to one another

and to the other species of **life**, upon which we are totally dependent.

Data, Information, Knowledge, Disciplines

So, here we are **relating more**, to **more**, **more** extensively,

as we **represent** our accrued and accumulating **data**, **'ritin'**,

reporting our **discoveries**, our **understandings** and our **values**.

The Rong 3 R's

We **relate** our **data** to generate **information**.

We structure our **information** to embody **knowledge**.

We multiply and cross our fields of **knowledge** to derive **disciplines**,
interdisciplines and **multidisciplines**.

We apply discovered **values** to our **knowledge** to yield **wisdom**.

Augment Senses, Extend Awareness

We augment our **senses**, to extend our **awareness**, our perceptions,
our world view, or perhaps better, our **cosmology**, our view of the universe.

We attempt to heed or to acknowledge this ever enlarging **awareness**,
gained from augmented **sensing**, in what we do and in what we are.

We then augment the **mobility**, **motion** and the **forces** of the human **form**
with energy, with technology, with skills.

More Than

Yes, we must sense more, do more, be more,

more than we have sensed, **more** than others have sensed,

more than we have done, **more** than others have done,

more than we have been, **more** than others have been.

We must quantify in order to compare all of these "**more than's**".

That's what '**rithmetic** helps you do.

Isn't this all part of progress?

Don't we become able to **produce more**,

making it possible to **have more** and **do more**,

by augmenting the limited **movements** and **motions**,

forces and **actions** of the human **form**?

Do we confuse **doing more** and **having more** with **being more**?

Quantifiable More?

On such a basis, don't we want to genetically engineer

a higher I.Q. (intelligence quotient).

If we have three billion base pairs in our human genome

and one hundred thousand genes in our forty-six chromosomes,

should we genetically engineer or, at least, breed

for **more** base pairs in our genome, with **more** genes,

in **more** chromosomes?

Certainly so, unless **more** isn't twice as much of the same thing

(or some other multiplier, even greater than two).

The Rong 3 R's

We could even nominate **more** than five (5) base pairs
in our RNA (ribonucleic acid) or our DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid).
We could use **more than** twenty (20) amino acids
to generate our polymer proteins.

Oh, the gains, the progress, the quantitative improvement,
the stronger, the taller, the swifter, whatever . . .

How About Ratios

There are some significant **ratios** we could improve.
We could increase the diversity of our **sensing** and of our **awareness**,
by supplementing the inventory
of the technical augmentation of our **senses**,
the way we have done with X rays and telescopes,
infra-red and microscopes, radio-waves and giant antennae.
The **ratio** would then be expressed as:
how much increased or improved diversity of awareness
per unit of augmented sensing in our inventory.
We could call this diversity of awareness
per unit inventory of sensing **ratio**
nothing less than **elegance**.

Do we form some sort of a civilizational cult of technology
in our concepts of progress?

Do we fail to even consider some **possibilities**?

Augmented Sensing, Augmented Knowing

If we only **know** by means of our **senses**
and the accumulation of **knowledge** we use to supplement our **senses**,
in order to transform **sensing** into **perception**,
aren't we limited by what we can **sense** and what we can **know**?
So, isn't augmentation of our **sensing**
and augmentation of our ability to **know**,
the frontier of progress for our species?

The Consequences of Only Augmented Senses

Consider that the **senses**, howsoever augmented,
sustain the separateness and the obstruction of the separateness of the **self**,
as an observer, a participant observer, according to quantum mechanics.

The Rong 3 R's

There is a lag in the **communication**
of the nature, the state, the condition, the behaviour, etc.,
of whatever we observe.

Not only is there a lag in **communication**,
but the **senses** require that we configure the **data of communication**
into the codes able to be registered by the **senses**.

The **data** must be in the form of something **sensed**,
something we can see, or hear, or feel, or smell, etc.

Undeveloped Senses, Relationships or Connections

Perhaps, we have failed to even notice or to develop some of the **senses**,
some of the **relationships** or some of the **connections** we could have.

We have been so enchanted with the **senses** we augment
that we have ignored or dismissed
the **possibility** of developing latent **senses**.

Roger Wescott, in his book The Divine Animal,
points out that we have not five (5) **senses**, as commonly believed,
but as many as twenty three (23) **senses**, in the whole animal world
and as many as twenty (20) **senses** in the human species, in particular.

He points out that beetles have a hygroptic **sense**,
where humidity is sensed, using dorsal hairs.

There is the brithic **sense**, which responds to gravity.

The scallop has a statocyst, as a receptor for this **sense**.

There is a barotic **sense**, which detects pressure.

Fish use a lateral line, by means of which to **sense** pressure.

There are the palmotic, thermotic, magnestic, and electresic **senses**.

The palmotic **senses** vibration.

The thermotic **senses** heat.

The magnestic **senses** magnetic forces.

The electresic **senses** electricity.

Wescott points out that the cryotic **sense** or the **sense** of cold
is distinct from the **sense** of heat;
different nerve endings are involved.

Even the **senses** of pleasure and pain, the hedonic and algesic, are separate.

Some human beings have a radionic **sense**. They can **sense** radar directly.

There is a chronometric **sense** or **sense** of time, a biological clock.

There is a topometric **sense** or **sense** of place.

Another such **sense** is the orgonotic **sense**,
spoken about by such as Karl von Reichenbach and Wilhelm Reich,
the **sensing** of **life** energy.

The Rong 3 R's

To further the inventory of **possibilities**,
there is the cryptesthetic **sense** or group of **senses**.
This includes such as the **sense** of telepathy.

Avoidance and Evasion

Why do we augment the five (5) **senses**,
three (3) of which relate to surfaces and to form:
seeing reflected light from surfaces,
hearing sounds generated by moving surfaces and reflected from surfaces
and the tactile sense, **touching** surfaces
and yet we ignore or neglect the other **possibilities**.

Perhaps we mean to limit our **possibilities**.

Perhaps we limit the **possible relationships** or **connections** we could have,
if we developed some of these other **senses**,
in order to limit, diminish or eliminate an accountability
to part of the world or part of the universe.

Perhaps the choice is not one of limiting the **senses** we develop,
but limiting the **responsibilities** we accept.

Possibilities

We could investigate structuralism, **knowing** without learning,
the work of Claude Levi-Strauss,
the psychologist from the University of Geneva.

We could explore **knowing** by **connection**, **knowing** in what we observe,
rather than representational **knowing**, in the mind or in the brain.

This **knowing** by **connection** is offered
by both Zen and Tibetan meditational techniques.

First, we must cease the internal dialogue, the talking in our heads.

Next, we must regard that to which we direct our attention
as **movement** itself.

Just a few hints.

The Rong 3 R's

The Use of the Creature

Breath - swiftly blown
 from pursed lips
 propels a missile - like a feather
and a strange observer
 watching me blow a feather
 may quite well feel
 he knows the use
 of the creature he watches.

but then I leap from a bank
 into still water
and a great splash rises
 and a strange observer . .
 well -

And after that
 I shout in a canyon
and a strange observer
 may well feel
 he knows **the use of the creature** he watches.

But he never saw me tap my fingers
 scratch my head
 rub my eyes
 climb a mountain
 pat a dog
 eat an apple
 nor even more: feel or think
 pray or sleep
 be born or die.

What have I seen me do?
Do I know my use?
What yet will I see,
 or think, or feel
 watching me?

I am a strange observer
 who should not conclude my use
 before I watch long enough . .
 before I am less strange -
 to me.

The Rong 3 R's

References:

1. Ronald A. Finke
"Mental Imagery and the Visual System"
Scientific American, March 1986
2. Roger W. Wescott
The Divine Animal
____ Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1969
3. Eve Revere, 2011 (poem)