



Hacking the Akashic Records: The Next Domain for Military Intelligence Operations?

Jeff Levin

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a hypothetical six-dimension doctrine for military intelligence-gathering in the Akashic domain. The Akashic records are described by esotericists and mystics as a permanent record of all thoughts, feelings, and actions, stored in a kind of cosmic memory bank outside of space and time. Psychics, clairvoyants, and other intuitives purport to read the records, suggesting that development of an operational strategy for accessing such information may be possible. Command oversight, however, would present significant moral challenges, as “hacking” into this information would be a personally intrusive invasion of privacy with serious repercussions for the operators and state sponsors.

KEYWORDS

Hacking; military intelligence; military operations; parapsychology; remote viewing; warfare

In 1980, COL John B. Alexander published a provocative article entitled, “The New Mental Battlefield,” in *Military Review* (Alexander, 1980). Written during a period of heightened tensions amidst the Cold War, the article mentioned a long rumored Soviet program to develop military and intelligence applications of paranormal technologies (see Ostrander & Schroeder, 1970), specifically noting an existential fear among a cadre of U.S. military intelligence leadership of what was termed a “psi gap” (e.g., Kaiser, 2011, p. 90). In acknowledging the likely controversial nature of the subject and of his recommendations, Alexander subtitled his article, “Beam Me Up, Spock.” Indeed, a paper later published in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (Aftergood & Rosenberg, 1994) referred to Alexander’s work as “notorious” and was generally dismissive and derisive, but without offering any substantive critique of his ideas.

CONTACT Jeff Levin  jeff_levin@baylor.edu  Baylor University, One Bear Place # 97236, Waco, TX 76798, USA.

© 2020 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

In the 40 years since, several books and articles have gone into great depth on features of U.S. government and military operations which sought functional capabilities in the paranormal realm. These include projects involving the CIA, DIA, NSA, and military intelligence branches including INSCOM (e.g., Dames & Newman, 2010; Kress, 1999; Mandelbaum, 2000; Morehouse, 1996; Schnabel, 2011). Conspiracy magazines have weighed in with sensational claims about secretive projects involving remote viewing, or psychic spying (e.g., Bekkum, 2012; Dowbenko, 1997). More scholarly documentation confirms that, whatever their objectives and outcomes, such programs indeed existed (e.g., LoMeo, 2016; Srinivasan, 2002), part of a larger programmatic effort by the military to validate methods to enhance human performance, which formal evaluative research, such as undertaken by the National Research Council, later dismissed as mostly unproven (see Swets & Bjork, 1990).

Projects undertaken from the 1970s to 1990s, such as Star Gate (and its predecessors), were the subject of considerable controversy, and the literature is replete with critiques and counter-critiques (see, e.g., Hyman, 1995; May, 1996; Utts, 1995). Also published were books for popular audiences, such as a memoir of one noted U.S. Army “psychic spy” (McMoneagle, 2002; see review by Broughton, 2003) and an assessment of the reality of “psychic warfare” (White, 1988; see review by Jones, 1989). Subsequent to Congressionally mandated evaluation, conflicting results among validation studies were instrumental in the program’s shuttering in 1995 (see Kennedy, 2003). Detailed histories of these efforts can be found elsewhere (e.g., Benack, n.d.; Bremseth, 2001; Marrs, 2007; May, 2014; Puthoff, 1996). Notwithstanding the contentious, checkered, and disputed history of psychic spying in the U.S., notable intelligence failures in the war on terrorism (Lewis, 2004) coupled with the likelihood that such failures may be inevitable (Betts, 1978) argue against excluding any possibilities for information-gathering, no matter their perceived marginality, such as regarding psi. Accelerating challenges faced by current U.S. military cyber warriors, especially the unpredictability and diffuse threat posed by enemy combatants among both foreign governments and non-governmental players (Garamone, 2015), suggest that it may be worthwhile to revisit these controversial ideas.

Not so long ago, cyber/information was introduced as a new paradigm for a military accustomed to a four-dimension land-sea-air-space doctrine. Accordingly, cyber would seem to be the ultimate domain of warfare operations. After transitioning from the physical planet (land and sea) to the atmosphere (air) and beyond (space), the virtual information domain (cyber) must presumably be the final frontier. This five-dimension doctrine has been operational for a quarter of a century (see Fogelman, 1995), and is a cutting edge of the U.S. military’s strategic plans moving forward (Card & Rogers, 2012; Department of Defense,

2015). But, according to the publications cited above, perhaps it is time to consider a sixth domain of operations.

In the present paper, material is presented which cautiously reviews the possibility of a post-cyber domain for intelligence operations, founded on the esoteric concept of the Akashic records—a repository of information and sensory/thought impressions “located” in the nonphysical realms akin to Jung’s collective unconscious—thus moving quite beyond the present five-dimension doctrine. A new doctrine, made operational, would draw on human resources that would seem to surpass current consensus definitions of human capabilities, and would interface with (meta-)physical realities that would seem to surpass current consensus definitions of physical reality. An Akashic domain for military intelligence would thus represent a substantial expansion of the concept of battlespace to include a “dimension” that is located, apparently, outside of space—and time—as conventionally understood.

Former DIRNSA, Commander of USCYBERCOM, and Chief of the Central Security Service, ADM Michael S. Rogers, in advocating for a highly trained, innovative, multi-sector Cyber Mission Force, has stated:

Improving security for all and achieving cyber resilience takes a broad and coordinated effort with unprecedented degrees of joint, interagency, coalition, and public-private sector collaboration. We need sustained interaction, exchanges of ideas, and regular exercises that bring the military and civilian cyber communities together across government, industry, and academia to share information, coordinate planning, exercise, and brainstorm together. (Rogers, 2015)

The present paper endorses the same approach, but applied to a hypothetical next domain beyond cyber, the Akashic domain.

The Akashic Records

The Akashic records are defined by esotericists and mystics as a permanent record of all of the thoughts, feelings, and actions that have ever occurred in the history of the universe (Bacheman, 1973; Gaynor, 1953), stored in “a kind of cosmic memory bank” (Watson, 1991, p. 6) that exists outside of physical reality. This concept originates in the Sanskrit word *ākāśa* (“the ether”), and has been described as a “field” accessible psychically and via spiritual practice (Laszlo, 2007). First introduced to the West by 19th-century Theosophists, the concept of an Akashic records has become “part of the lingua franca of contemporary New-Age spirituality” (Levin, 2019).

According to contemporary descriptions, *ākāśa* has nonlocal characteristics, in the sense of Dossey’s (2009) descriptions of nonlocal consciousness (see also Takhmazyan, 2013). *The Secret Doctrine* states that it

“pervades all things” (Blavatsky, 1970, p. I.334), and Laszlo (2007, p. 76) describes it as “an all-encompassing medium that *underlies* all things and *becomes* all things.” It has also been described as “a kind of unified field of everything” (Levin, 2019). Most importantly, for the present paper, the Akashic records are also said to contain “information that comes from the external world without having been conveyed by the body’s exteroceptive senses” (Laszlo, 2009, p. 243). Information contained in the records is thus presumably accessible primarily (solely?) through employing a psychic channel or trance medium or through intuitive self-readings. Typically, the records are accessed for purposes of spiritual growth, self-actualization, or healing—of the self or of others (see Trine, 2010).

Operationally, the normative access point to the records tends to resemble a psychic reading session:

Akashic readings are typically one-on-one sessions like other psychic readings, and the channeler or medium may enter into a trance state or operate from waking consciousness. Some practitioners believe that reading the Akashic substrate can be taught for self-application, like other psi capabilities. Indeed, one could contend that psychic readings *are* readings of the *ākāśa* implicitly—that they are one and the same thing. (Levin, 2019)

Are the Akashic records real? This is a tricky question to answer, but one that ought to be addressed before we go any further. The answer to that question depends in part on one’s scientific perspective and on what one considers evidence of “reality.” Like other phenomena that are said to exist in the nonphysical realms (e.g., the paranormal, the spirit world), skeptics typically demur, often disparagingly (e.g., Berard, 2000). This is not unexpected, given the parameters of the materialist worldview (see, e.g., Sheldrake, 2012). On the other hand, numerous wisdom traditions do acknowledge the existence of the Akashic records, by that name or an equivalent, including Theosophy (Leadbeater, 1903), Anthroposophy (Steiner, 1911), Hinduism (Vivekananda, 1953), Buddhism (Sinnott, 1883), Rosicrucianism (AMORC, 1961), Western esotericism (Cicero & Cicero, 2004), shamanism (Combs, Arcari, & Krippner, 2006), and the works of Cayce (Todeschi, 1998) and Tesla (Pokazanyeva, 2016). These references cannot prove the existence of the Akashic records, of course, to everyone’s satisfaction. But the validation of psi phenomena and certain nonphysical realities by many scientists who have studied such things were instrumental, in part, in previous military- and intelligence-related explorations of similar subjects (see Kress, 1977). The revisiting of these efforts is advocated here, no matter the ethereal nature of such phenomena in the eyes of mainstream Western physical science and the “dilemmas” that they present to researchers (see Grof, 2006).

An article in *Cyber Defense Review* described cyberspace as “dynamic and uncertain” (Duggan, 2016, p. 78), recognizing that cyber is “both everywhere and nowhere at the same time” (p. 73). The same could be said of the Akashic domain, but even moreso. This is not to say that reliable and valid information-gathering from this domain is impossible—just that such readings may involve presumptions, skillsets, and technologies—and risks—uniquely distinct from engagement of the other five dimensions of the current doctrine. Empirical validation of prior psi-related projects in military and intelligence circles—notwithstanding their attendant controversies—coupled with findings from the scholarly literature on parapsychology together suggest that forays in the Akashic realm are not inconceivable. An organized effort would, however, require a distinctive set of operational parameters, including development of new protocols. A skeleton outline for such a hypothetical program is provided here.

Operational Parameters of an Akashic Intelligence Domain

Unlike much of conventional remote reviewing, Akashic readings may be more suited to reading the mind and consciousness of enemy targets and clairvoyantly viewing the future behavior and collective action of such individuals. The targets would not be military installations, geographic or geological features, or other natural or man-made structures, but rather the psyche and life course of persons of interest. The operational objectives would involve understanding targets’ presumptions and motivations and discerning their likely decision-making calculus and future (and past) actions. Engaging in such readings and tasking subordinates to do so would, for sure, be considerably more complex than conventional behavioral profiling, involving a much more invasive probe of the personal space of one’s targets. Such tasking may potentially present moral red flags cautioning against the use and misuse of information gleaned from Akashic readings that were intended for strategic and tactical purposes (more on this later).

The recommendations that follow are modeled, in part, after the DoD’s 2015 cyber strategy (Department of Defense, 2015). A few strategic goals are provided, followed by selected implementation objectives. It should be understood that this material is drafted in broad strokes, by an academic scientist outside of the loop. This template can be developed further, with details filled in by individuals with command authority and greater content expertise. With these caveats in mind, basic requirements of an Akashic intelligence-gathering program may be constructed around the following goals and objectives.

Strategic Goal I: Recruit and maintain a ready force and build capabilities to conduct Akashic-reading operations. This should include (a) recruiting and maintaining an Akashic workforce, through establishing a persistent training environment, creating job titles and/or career paths for personnel involved in performing and supporting operations, and identifying civilian technical personnel; (b) building technical capabilities for Akashic operations, through accelerating research and development, including with private-sector partners; and (c) testing and continually refining a command and control mechanism for Akashic operations, especially so that it functions efficiently and is practical.

Strategic Goal II: Defend Akashic operations, secure data, and mitigate risks to missions. This should include (a) developing various capabilities to mitigate all known and to-be-determined vulnerabilities that present a high risk to Akashic missions, operations, and “data” (derived from Akashic readings); (b) assessing existing forces and resources in order to maintain integrated, adaptive, and dynamic defenses of ongoing operations; (c) planning for defense and resilience of Akashic operations, through conducting mission assurance assessments, assessing mission protection capabilities, improving security, and building and exercising continuity plans in the event of disruption of operations or any degradation to the Akashic-reading environment; (d) mitigating the risk of insider threats, through technological and personnel solutions, before they can compromise operations or impact on U.S. national security (such as through methods for identifying, reporting, and tracking suspicious behavior, including in the inner planes); (e) improving accountability and responsibility for the protection of Akashic data, to the extent that this is (meta-)physically possible; and (f) developing counterintelligence capabilities to defend against intrusions or counter-efforts to block U.S. Akashic operations.

Strategic Goal III: Explore technologies to create an Akashic “firewall” and be prepared to defend U.S. vital interests from disruptive or destructive breaches. This should include (a) developing intelligence and warning capabilities that anticipate threats to U.S. assets and violations of U.S. Akashic content; (b) developing and exercising capabilities to defend the nation accordingly, both the physical/geographic nation and our identity in the Akashic domain, through partnerships with assets in other military agencies, among defense-sector contractors, in academia, and among civilians (e.g., sensitives), and through an annual comprehensive review of capabilities; and (c) developing innovative approaches to defend U.S. critical infrastructure required for Akashic operations, including evaluative research of new or existing psychotronic, paranormal, or extraterrestrial-originating technologies.

Strategic Goal IV: Build and maintain a viable plan of Akashic-reading operations. This should include: (a) developing Akashic operations protocols, including establishing requisite organization, staffing, and administration; (b) integrating Akashic-reading operations into ongoing defense and combatant command planning; (c) synchronizing and integrating Akashic operations requirements (e.g., regarding force alignment, allocation, assignment, and apportionment) into ongoing planning; and (d) determining fiscal requirements and sources of support (including black-budget and off-the-books funding).

Strategic Goal V: Build and maintain robust international and transdimensional alliances and partnerships to deter shared threats and increase global security and stability. This should include (a) building partner capacity in both the physical world and inner planes, with allies and partners from other nations and with contacts among extraterrestrial races or civilizations with whom the U.S. has worked closely with in the past; (b) developing solutions to countering the proliferation of destructive psychic forces that attack U.S. assets or attempt to breach the Akashic space of our citizens and assets; (c) working with capable international partners to plan and train for Akashic operations; and (d) strengthening the U.S. dialogue with extraterrestrial biological entities to enhance our strategic stability in Akashic operations.

To reiterate, this is a basic outline. More detailed information would need to be compiled in partnership with experts and representatives of diverse professions and constituencies in order to enable such a program to become operational. It is proposed only that this material serve as a starting point for more programmatic deliberations. At the same time, these idealized recommendations are offered gingerly, with full awareness that a more pollyannish attitude would be unjustified. The past history of military and intelligence explorations into the world of psi and psychotronic technologies suggests that restoration of R&D funds may be a tall order, especially in the present political environment, unless such funding would originate in off-the-books or black-budget sources. At one time, according to Charles Tart, “a lot of research money was spent . . . but it has all pretty much disappeared” (Tart, 2002, p. 33). The present author is not qualified to opine whether the odds of its restoration are growing higher or lower.

Moral Considerations

The first word in the title of this article is “hacking.” According to the latest edition of Oxford’s *A Dictionary of Computer Science*, hacking is defined, simply, as “Unauthorized access to computer material” (Butterfield & Ngondi, 2016, p. 244). A related term, referring to the dark

side of hacking, is “cracking”: “Gaining, or attempting to gain, unauthorized access to computers with malicious intent” (Butterfield & Ngondi, 2016, p. 126). Under whichever name, this activity has long been identified, in its conventional cyber-related sense, as a significant terrorism threat (e.g., Furnell & Warren, 1999), as it may result in the exposure of critical government or military secrets or compromise infrastructure systems such as public utilities. The prevention of hacking, or cracking, thus has long been recognized as a matter of national security (Lewis, 2002). But hacking itself, in the expanded sense of “immersing oneself in computer systems details to optimize their capabilities” (Schell & Martin, 2006, p. 148), also connotes proactive behavior in furtherance of intelligence or security goals and objectives.

In the context of the Akashic records, the word hacking is used metaphorically. It is not meant to be taken literally here—this has nothing to do with computers or the internet, after all—but, on second thought, maybe it should be. Hacking refers to unauthorized access being sought to an invisible domain, possibly with malicious intent, such as for purposes of espionage, or for prevention of or protection against such malicious actions. Insofar as strengthening the security of our nation against such unauthorized breaches is in the best interest of the citizenry, then indeed hacking—or reading—the Akashic records for defensive purposes would seem to be justifiable, for the same reasons that we take active measures to defend against cyber or conventional threats. But because the Akashic domain hypothetically contains all possible information about potential enemies, and allies, then by advocating Akashic hacking one may be condoning the most invasive violation of personal space imaginable, breaking into a realm presumed to be absolutely private from all eyes or ears except God’s.

Once engaged, hacking the Akashic domain would seem to cross a line that is sacrosanct, setting in motion retributive cosmic or spiritual forces from which there may be no turning back, in the sense of a karmic backlash. The latter concept may not be believed to exist by military or intelligence leaders interested in the Akashic records as an information domain, but it is almost certainly acknowledged by most of the people currently involved in offering Akashic readings as a professional service in civilian contexts, such as psychics, clairvoyants, sensitives, medical intuitives, spiritual healers, and the like. This presents a troubling paradox that must be confronted: actions may be possible that would serve to protect our country from significant security threats, but that, at the same time, could lead inexorably to ruinous consequences for the individuals engaged in these actions or for our nation as a whole. Still, is negotiating this dilemma all that different from the decision-making calculus required in assessing the strategic value of other once

novel capabilities originating in earlier versions of military doctrine, such as use of nuclear weapons?

An especially salient fear is of possible misuse of this technology as an offensive capability, for purposes of “mind control.” According to a noted physicist, “the mind/soul may be an information field” (Wolf, 2016, p. 277), and it may be this field that is “what the ancients called the Akashic record” (p. 277). Formal efforts to tap into this field may thus entail tapping into the very mind or soul of the target, and once this line is breached who is to say whether those tasking the operation would be content just to passively “read” information from the field? If it is possible to implant information, artificially, into the Akashic records or to control the mind or even soul of a target, this may be too tempting for operators to pass up. The moral red line with respect to conventional psyops was long ago crossed (U.S. Army, 2009). From psyops to psi-ops may be a short hop, methodologically, and of little consequence morally to those with command oversight.

The U.S. government’s history of covert activities in mind control has been at least partly unclassified and is now on the public record (see Marks, 1979; Moreno, 2006), including the controversial MKULTRA (U.S. Senate, 1977). This latter project involved use of control and interrogation methods “designed to see how far the human mind could be destroyed, altered, and rebuilt for purposes of covert operations” (Jones & Flaxman, 2015, p. 47), and is acknowledged as having been operational from 1953 to 1964 (see U.S. Senate, 1977). It was once easy to dismiss such claims as science fiction, but their official acknowledgment confirms that there is precedent for federal authorities to run ops targeting the mind—the cognition, affect, personality, behavior, even consciousness—of both enemy combatants and U.S. citizens, military and civilian. Akashic hacking suggests something even more intrusive, like having a camera and microphone that can peer into a target’s soul, not just his or her mind, including at any time in the past or future. As an article on psychotronic weapons in a publication of the U.S. Army War College reminds us, “The mind has no firewall” (Thomas, 1998).

This too may seem like something out of contemporary science fiction, such as “The Matrix” or “Black Mirror.” The “laws” of the Akashic realm are said to operate in “a deeper reality beyond space and time” (Laszlo, 2014, p. 113). There may indeed be no firewalls, that are known, although works of postmodern cyberpunk fiction do envision the possibility of “‘firewalls’ able to protect open holes between [the] Physical and Astral world” (Londero, 2012, p. 138). Because the Akashic realm is said to exist outside of the physical universe, ops that seek to breach the target space presumably cannot be prevented or defended against by naturalistic means, that is by any three-dimensional, physical, mechanical technology.

Akashic hacking thus would not require technology, strictly speaking, but rather a developed paranormal or spiritual gift that enables one to “read” this substrate of reality. Another consideration: the Akashic realm may be accessible through the dream state (Krippner, 2006). As noted, this does not really involve hacking, as the term is generally understood. Information is presumably available to anyone with the requisite skillset and karmic balance sheet to enable accessing the Akashic records, through whatever conscious, subconscious, or unconscious means.

For sure, these observations present both opportunity and challenge for intelligence agencies. National and personal secrecy may not be able to be preserved. Moreover, who is to say that no other nation, such as any of the former republics of the Soviet Union or any other of our enemies or allies, has not already breached U.S. national security through their own Akashic hacking operations?

Conclusions

Today, the five-dimension doctrine is the current warfare paradigm, USCYBERCOM has been at full operational capability for over a decade, and its mission is ongoing in protecting our nation. According to ADM Rogers, “‘Cyber war’ is not some future concept or cinematic spectacle, it is real and here to stay” (Rogers, 2017, p. 4). But there was a time, as recently as the 1980s, when the idea of cyber as a domain for military and intelligence operations must have seemed futuristic, like something out of science fiction. Accordingly, the idea of an Akashic domain as a component of a new doctrine of six-dimension operations may likewise seem bizarre, impractical, or other-worldly. Yet, as noted earlier, there is precedent for the work that would constitute the operations of intelligence-gathering in this domain.

The continued marginality or strangeness of this subject matter for the mainstream of physical science, engineering, and military intelligence ought not be so off-putting that it prevents exploration and operationalization of a functional asset that could benefit our nation greatly. This was recognized by the military decades ago, long before the cyber era (see, e.g., Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1979), including in a Research Report entitled, “Psychic Warfare: Exploring the Mind Frontier,” submitted to the Air War College:

Man’s greatest potential remains a prisoner of man. Vast untapped mental capabilities create *an entirely new battlefield dimension* which, if ignored, pose a threat to self and country more serious than nuclear weapons. This threat starts from within. Our fears and cynical attitudes towards psychic capabilities make us our own worst enemies [emphasis added]. (McKelvy, 1988, p. iii)

Fears, of course, are sometimes justified. As noted, there may be dangers inherent in exploring the Akashic realm, both moral and tangible, but it may be just as dangerous not to go there. Our national security, for one, may be compromised, especially if there is indeed a “psi gap” as has been conjectured. This argues against inaction.

In the four decades since COL Alexander’s article in *Military Review*, some things may have changed: for one, secret paranormal projects have come and gone, and with them their principals and leaders, and public controversies surrounding this subject have waxed and waned. But the threat of enemy operations in this domain is everpresent, and, if already operational, the strategic importance to the U.S. of cultivating a functional presence in this domain—if it is indeed real—is higher than it has ever been. Still, the moral considerations noted earlier are significant and troubling. The present author has no easy resolution to offer, except to recommend strongly that this subject not be cavalierly dismissed out of hand.

In closing, two additional observations should be made, both of which add to the urgency of this matter and to its complexity and potential hazard. First, much of what is described in this paper may already be operational among enemies of the U.S. Second, ultimately there are no absolute secrets. These observations alone provide reason enough to prioritize further exploration of this subject.

References

- Aftergood, S., & Rosenberg, B. H. (1994). The soft-kill fallacy. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 50(5), 40–45. doi:10.1080/00963402.1994.11456556
- Alexander, J. B. (1980). The new mental battlefield: “Beam me up, Spock”. *Military Review*, 60(12), 47–54.
- AMORC. (1961). *Rosicrucian glossary: A key to word meanings*. San Jose, CA: Supreme Grand Lodge of AMORC.
- Bacheman, W. (1973). *The Steinerbooks dictionary of the psychic, mystic, occult*. Blauvelt, NY: Rudolf Steiner Publications.
- Bekkum, G. S. (2012). Is NSA in the psychic spy business? *Eight Martinis*, 6, 18–23.
- Benack, R. (n.d). *Evaluating the use of remote viewing in the global war on terrorism* (Unpublished manuscript). Michigan State University. Retrieved from http://seancial.org/Remote_viewing_For_CT.pdf.
- Berard, M. (2000). Woo woo science. *Skeptic*, 8(3), 86–89.
- Betts, R. K. (1978). Analysis, war, and decision: Why intelligence failures are inevitable. *World Politics*, 31(1), 61–89. doi:10.2307/2009967
- Blavatsky, H. P. (1970). *The secret doctrine: The synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy* [1888]. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press.
- Bremseth, L. R. (2001). *Unconventional human intelligence support: Transcendent and asymmetric warfare implications of remote viewing* (Graduate thesis). Marine Corps War College, Marine Corps University, Marine Corps Combat

- Development Command, Quantico, VA. Retrieved from <https://www.irva.org/library/pdfs/bremseth2001unconventional.pdf>.
- Broughton, J. S. (2003). *The Stargate chronicles: Memoirs of a psychic spy* [Book Review]. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 67, 389–395.
- Butterfield, A., & Ngondi, G. E. (2016). *A dictionary of computer science* (7th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Card, K. L., & Rogers, M. S. (2012). *Navy Cyber Power 2020: Sustaining U.S. global leadership: Priorities for 21st century defense*. Retrieved from http://www.public.navy.mil/fcc-c10f/Strategies/Navy_Cyber_Power_2020.pdf.
- Cicero, C., & Cicero, S. T. (2004). *The essential Golden Dawn: An introduction to high magic*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn Publications.
- Combs, A., Arcari, T., & Krippner, S. (2006). All of the myriad worlds: Life in the Akashic plenum. *World Futures*, 62(1–2), 75–85. doi:10.1080/02604020500412709
- Dames, E. A., & Newman, J. H. (2010). *Tell me what you see: Remote viewing cases from the world's premier psychic spy*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Department of Defense. (2015). *The DoD cyber strategy*. Retrieved from https://archive.defense.gov/home/features/2015/0415_cyber-strategy/final_2015_dod_cyber_strategy_for_web.pdf.
- Dossey, L. (2009). Nonlocal mind, healing, and the Akashic experience. In E. Laszlo (Ed.), *The Akashic experience: Science and the cosmic memory field* (pp. 231–241). Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.
- Dowbenko, U. (1997). True adventures of a psychic spy—Part 1/2. *Nexus*, 4(5), 37–42.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1979). *The psychic boom: Flying beyond the thought barrier* (Research Report ORC 79-3). Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Bolling AFB, DC. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a071336.pdf>.
- Duggan, P. M. (2016). U.S. Special Operations Forces in cyberspace. *Cyber Defense Review*, 1(2), 73–79.
- Fogelman, R. R. (1995). *Information operations: The fifth dimension of warfare*. Presentation to the Armed Forces Communications-Electronics Association, Washington, DC, April 25. Published in *Defense Issues*, 10(47). Retrieved from <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=439942>.
- Furnell, S. M., & Warren, M. J. (1999). Computer hacking and cyber terrorism: The real threats in the new millennium? *Computers & Security*, 18, 28–34. doi:10.1016/S0167-4048(99)80006-6
- Garamone, J. (2015). Intelligence chief describes “pervasive uncertainty” of worldwide threats. *DoD News, Defense Media Activity*. Retrieved from <https://www.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/604190/intelligence-chief-describes-pervasive-uncertainty-of-worldwide-threats/>.
- Gaynor, F. (Ed.). (1953). *Dictionary of mysticism*. New York, NY: Philosophical Library.
- Grof, S. (2006). Ervin Laszlo’s Akashic field and the dilemmas of modern consciousness research. *World Futures*, 62(1–2), 86–102. doi:10.1080/02604020500412717
- Hyman, R. (1995). Evaluation of the program on anomalous mental phenomena. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 59, 321–351.

- Jones, M. D., & Flaxman, L. (2015). *Mind wars: A history of mind control, surveillance, and social engineering by the government, media, and secret societies*. Pompton Plains, NJ: New Page Books.
- Jones, S. C. B. (1989). *Psychic warfare: Fact or fiction?* [Book Review]. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 53, 141–150.
- Kaiser, D. (2011). *How the hippies saved physics: Science, counterculture, and the quantum revival*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Kennedy, J. E. (2003). The capricious, actively evasive, unsustainable nature of psi: A summary and hypothesis. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 67, 53–74.
- Kress, K. A. (1977). Parapsychology in intelligence: A personal review and conclusions. *Studies in Intelligence*, 21(4), 7–17.
- Kress, K. A. (1999). Parapsychology in intelligence: A personal review and conclusions (Revised version). *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 13, 69–85.
- Krippner, S. (2006). Geomagnetic field effects in anomalous dreams and the Akashic field. *World Futures*, 62(1–2), 103–113. doi:10.1080/02604020500412741
- Laszlo, E. (2007). *Science and the Akashic field: An integral theory of everything* (2nd ed.). Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.
- Laszlo, E. (2014). *The immortal mind: Science and the continuity of consciousness beyond the brain*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.
- Laszlo, E. (Ed.). (2009). *The Akashic experience: Science and the cosmic memory field*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.
- Leadbeater, C. W. (1903). *Clairvoyance*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society.
- Levin, J. (2019). Western esoteric healing II: A taxonomy and sources of therapeutic knowledge. *EXPLORE*. doi:10.1016/j.explore.2019.10.003
- Lewis, J. A. (2002). *Assessing the risks of cyber terrorism, cyber war and other cyber threats*. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.steptoe.com/assets/attachments/2170.pdf>.
- Lewis, R. C. (2004). Espionage and the war on terrorism: Investigating U.S. efforts. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 11, 175–182.
- LoMeo, G. M. (2016). *Rationality, parapsychology, and artificial intelligence in military and intelligence research by the United States government in the Cold War* (M.A. thesis). CUNY Academic Works, CUNY Hunter College, New York, NY. Retrieved from http://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1140&context=hc_sas_etds.
- Londero, R. R. (2012). We see cyborgs differently: A comparative study between North American and Latin American cyberpunk. In A. M. Alves (Ed.), *Unveiling the posthuman* (pp. 133–143). Oxford, UK: Inter-Disciplinary Press.
- Mandelbaum, W. A. (2000). *The psychic battlefield: A history of the military-occult complex*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Marks, J. (1979). *The search for the "Manchurian candidate": The CIA and mind control*. New York, NY: Times Books.
- Marrs, J. (2007). *Psi spies: The true story of America's psychic warfare program*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: New Page Books.
- May, E. C. (1996). The American Institutes for Research review of the Department of Defense's Star Gate program: A commentary. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 60, 3–23.
- May, E. C. (2014). Star Gate: The U.S. government's psychic spying program. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 78, 5–18.

- McKelvy, D. M. (1988). *Psychic warfare: Exploring the mind frontier* (Research Report). Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a202099.pdf>.
- McMoneagle, J. (2002). *The Stargate chronicles: Memoirs of a psychic spy*. Charlottesville, VA: Hampton Roads Publishing Co.
- Morehouse, D. (1996). *Psychic warrior: Inside the CIA's Stargate program: The true story of a soldier's espionage and awakening*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Moreno, J. D. (2006). *Mind wars: Brain research and national defense*. New York, NY: Dana Press.
- Ostrander, S., & Schroeder, L. (1970). *Psychic discoveries behind the Iron Curtain*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pokazanyeva, A. (2016). Mind within matter: Science, the occult, and the (meta)-physics of ether and Akasha. *Zygon*, 51(2), 318–346. doi:10.1111/zygo.12259
- Puthoff, H. E. (1996). CIA-initiated remote viewing program at Stanford Research Institute. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 10, 63–76.
- Rogers, M. S. (2015). A challenge for the military cyber workforce. *Military Cyber Affairs*, 1(1), Article 2. doi:10.5038/2378-0789.1.1.1012
- Rogers, M. S. (2017). Statement of Admiral Michael S. Rogers, Commander, United States Cyber Command, Before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, 9 May 2017. Retrieved from https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Rogers_05-09-17.pdf.
- Schell, B., & Martin, C. (2006). *Webster's new world hacker dictionary*. Indianapolis, IN: Wiley Publishing.
- Schnabel, J. (2011). *Remote viewers: The secret history of America's psychic spies*. New York, NY: Dell.
- Sheldrake, R. (2012). *The science delusion: Freeing the spirit of enquiry*. London: Coronet.
- Sinnett, A. P. (1883). *Esoteric Buddhism*. London, UK: Trübner & Co.
- Srinivasan, M. (2002). Clairvoyant remote viewing: The US sponsored psychic spying. *Strategic Analysis*, 26(1), 131–139. doi:10.1080/09700160208450029
- Steiner, R. (1911). *The submerged continents of Atlantis and Lemuria, their history and civilization: Being chapters from the Akashic records*. Chicago: Rajput Press.
- Swets, J. A., & Bjork, R. A. (1990). Enhancing human performance: An evaluation of “New Age” techniques considered by the U.S. Army. *Psychological Science*, 1(2), 85–96. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1990.tb00074.x
- Takhmazyan, H. (2013). *Nonlocal consciousness: Transcending material-based sensory perception* (Ph.D. dissertation). Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Barbara, CA. Retrieved from <https://pqdtpopen.proquest.com/doc/1333031134.html?FMT=AI>.
- Tart, C. T. (2002). Parapsychology and transpersonal psychology: “Anomalies” to be explained away or spirit to manifest. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 66, 31–47.
- Thomas, T. L. (1998). The mind has no firewall. *Parameters*, 28(1), 84–92.
- Todeschi, K. (1998). *Edgar Cayce on the Akashic records*. Virginia Beach, VA: ARE Press.
- Trine, C. (2010). *The new Akashic records: Knowing, healing & spiritual practice*. Portland, OR: Essential Knowing Press.
- U.S. Army. (2009). *Psyop: Military psychological operations*. Field Manual No. 3-05.30, MCRP 3-40.6, Headquarters, Department of the Army, 15 April 2005. [U.S.]: Mind Control Publishing.

- U.S. Senate. (1977). Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification. Joint Hearing Before the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-Fifth Congress, First Session, August 3, 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <https://info.publicintelligence.net/SSCI-MKULTRA-1977.pdf>.
- Utts, J. (1995). An assessment of the evidence for psychic functioning. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 59, 289–320. doi:10.30891/jopar.2018S.01.10
- Vivekananda, S. (1953). *The yogas and other works*. New York, NY: Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center.
- Watson, D. (Comp.). (1991). *The dictionary of mind and spirit*. New York, NY: Avon Books.
- White, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Psychic warfare: Fact or fiction?* Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press.
- Wolf, F. A. (2016). Is the mind/soul a Platonic Akashic Tachyonic Holographic quantum field? *Cosmos and History*, 12, 276–300.