



AKASHICPSI

TSC2026 + IONS

INDEPENDENT SPECIAL EDITION



AKASHICPSI

Consciousness, Connection & Discernment

Meta-intelligence guided by metta.

Research • Imaginal art • Psytrance • Possibility



AkashicNET five-star house motif

24 PAGES • PRE-CONFERENCE EDITION • 21 SEPTEMBER 2026

Independent coverage. No TSC, IONS or speaker endorsement.

A catalyst for inquiry.

This special edition brings our AkashicPSI Part 2 feature into a wider conversation with The Science of Consciousness 2026, IONS research, music and imaginative public learning. It is an invitation to investigate together.

A catalyst, not a cure: the proposed contribution is clearer questions, accessible evidence and more compassionate dialogue. This magazine is not a treatment, a promise of healing or a certification of paranormal ability.

Meta-intelligence asks how we know, which explanations compete and what might change our minds. Metta asks how we can examine those questions without stripping people of dignity. Both matter.

TSC2026 takes place in San Diego, 11-16 October 2026, according to the official programme checked on 21 September. This is a pre-conference companion, not a report of events already attended.

The five gold stars are an AkashicNET design motif. The imagined reviews and interface mockup later in this edition are explicitly fictional. No ISBN has been assigned.

Follow a thread.

04-13

The illustrated AkashicPSI feature: channeling, archive matching, telepathy, healing and discernment.

14-16

IONS statistics and the TSC2026 programme: what is counted, what is missing and what can be explored.

17-18

Psytrance listening links and the imaginal art gallery.

19

What could we develop together? Benefits and a bounded collaboration proposal.

20-21

Fictional reviews and an imagined digital reading-room screenshot.


22-24

Questions to take forward, source trail, colophon and back cover.

[Read the online article ↗](#)

[Read the ten-image Reddit post ↗](#)

Wonder, with room for questions.



Mayim Bialik and Jonathan Cohen's Part 2 conversation with Dr. Helané Wahbeh brings channeling, telepathy and energy medicine into discussion. The useful question is what each kind of evidence can establish.

This adaptation uses the published AkashicNET feature and its corrections. Coverage is partial: supplied episode notes, publication summaries and IONS commentary. It is not a full-transcript, full-paper or raw-data audit.

Begin with the right question.

The screenshot shows a video player with a dark, ethereal background. On the left, a list of four research questions is displayed in white text on dark blue rectangular backgrounds. The questions are: **PREVALENCE** (Who reports the experience? How was the sample recruited?), **EXPERIENCE** (What do people describe? How does it affect their lives?), **PERFORMANCE** (Can specific information be checked under controlled conditions?), and **MECHANISM** (Which explanation survives comparison with alternatives?). The top left of the player shows 'AKASHICPSI' and 'CONSCIOUSNESS / RESEARCH / CULTURE'. The top right features a large '02' with 'PART TWO' below it. The bottom left has 'AKASHICNET.ORG' and a disclaimer: 'Artwork is metaphorical. Diagrams support inquiry, not proof.' The bottom right shows '02 / 10'. The background of the player is a complex, golden, architectural structure resembling a cathedral or observatory, set against a cosmic, starry sky.

AKASHICPSI CONSCIOUSNESS / RESEARCH / CULTURE

Four Research Questions

PREVALENCE
Who reports the experience? How was the sample recruited?

EXPERIENCE
What do people describe? How does it affect their lives?

PERFORMANCE
Can specific information be checked under controlled conditions?

MECHANISM
Which explanation survives comparison with alternatives?

AKASHICNET.ORG
Artwork is metaphorical. Diagrams support inquiry, not proof.

02
PART TWO

02 / 10

A reported experience, a useful insight and verified information are different research targets.

The episode describes a program organized around prevalence, who reports channeling, how it might work and whether its content can be useful or checked. This is a valuable starting point: make a broad claim small enough to investigate.

The supplied episode summary reports a figure near eight in ten under a broad definition that includes intuition. The exact survey, sampling frame and question wording remain unverified here. It should not become a claim that 80% of all people have demonstrated channeling ability.

Likewise, reports of generally non-clinical screening scores in sampled experiencers should stay tied to those samples. A self-report survey cannot establish either a paranormal mechanism or the mental-health profile of everyone who has an unusual experience.

What did “matched” mean?



Semantic overlap describes similarities in language and concepts. It is not a factual-accuracy percentage.


A retrospective study compared a curated channeling collection with UFODex, a large ufological archive containing books, periodicals and archival documents. Some materials concern military or disclosure topics; the archive as a whole is not verified military evidence. [2]

The reported semantic-similarity range was 0.66-0.88 on selected questions. Topics including disclosure, psi and time showed overlap. The corpora also differed in emphasis: consciousness and ethics on one side; secrecy, technology and geopolitics on the other. [2]

The headline compresses all of this into “military files matched.” That wording encourages a stronger reading than the method supports. Matching ideas is not the same as identifying a previously unknown fact, documenting it before disclosure and then verifying it independently.

A stronger follow-up would report misses, include unrelated comparison texts, disclose selection rules and test whether specific predictions outperform shared cultural narratives.

Shared themes. How specific?




The prospective work used three experienced channelers and standardized interviews. Its abstract reports measurable organization in the resulting text. High similarity also persisted when a single channeler described different purported ETI groups. [3]

That second finding deserves equal prominence. Repeated themes might reflect a channeler's style, familiar narratives or the shared prompts. Group-specific information would require a more discriminating test: can independent judges identify the claimed group from a response when identifying labels and generic themes are removed?

Our interpretation: this is a useful feasibility and content-structure study. It does not establish a source outside the participants. Statistical claims about "non-randomness" would need the full model, baselines and analysis decisions.

Where verification remains open.




IONS reports that requests for independently checkable details were consistently declined, with trust framed in terms of inner discernment. [4]

That does not prove fabrication. It does leave the decisive external check unmet. Confidence in the sincerity of an experience is different from evidence about its source.

Useful tests would specify a target in advance, conceal relevant information, record the response before feedback and score successes and failures under the same rules. Shared culture, expectation, common prompts and information leakage belong among the competing explanations.

Telepathy: separate the studies.




The study used triads and two selection timings. Pre-selected trials exceeded chance; post-selected trials did not. Emotional closeness was not significant at .05; communication frequency was associated with accuracy. Recruitment difficulties led to protocol changes, and conventional explanations were not fully excluded. [5]

The telephone chart shows completer-trial accuracy: 50.0% across 210 pre-selected trials ($p < .001$), and 31.9% across 630 post-selected trials ($p = .61$), against 33.3% chance. [5]

The separate Zoom task is episode-reported: 100 bonded pairs and an above-chance claim. Effect size, blinding and leakage controls remain unverified here.

Experience. Outcome. Cause.




These are related questions, but they are not interchangeable.

The supplied episode summary describes Reiki and energy-medicine pilots with well-being changes and unexpected reports of guides or other beings. The exact trials, controls and outcome tables have not been independently matched in this edition.

Attention, expectation, relaxation and natural fluctuation can contribute to a change after a session. A causal treatment claim requires an appropriate comparison. An objective measurement still needs sound controls; a guide report remains a report unless independently tested.

The episode's parenting reflections, spirit-attachment discussion and intergenerational-trauma questions add personal and interpretive material. They do not, on this record, establish a clinical benefit or a verified explanation involving external beings.

Four questions. No automatic leap.



The channeling papers offer material about coherence and possible specificity. The high similarity across different claimed groups complicates specificity. Independently verified accuracy and source identity remain open. A compelling story, or a strong feeling of resonance, cannot supply a missing test.

Coherence asks whether the story hangs together; specificity asks whether it distinguishes the target; accuracy requires an independent check; source identity requires an explanation that survives comparison with alternatives.

Integration with uncertainty intact.



AKASHICPSI CONSCIOUSNESS / RESEARCH / CULTURE

AkashicNET: An Integration Note

DISCERN
Identify the claim, source and missing information.

DEEPEN
Explore alternatives, contradictions, consequences and time.

KEEP CATEGORIES CLEAR
Lived meaning, interpretation and independently checked findings are different.

STATUS
Editorial application of the magazine's framework snapshot.
BQ001 remains UNRESOLVED; no truth-status change.

AKASHICNET.ORG
Artwork is metaphorical. Diagrams support inquiry, not proof.

09 / 10

HOMESENSE818's Living Network is an editorial bridge: relationships and interdependence invite investigation. Ecological networks are not, by analogy alone, evidence of a universal information field. AkashicPSI can explore that distinction explicitly.

EXPAND² v0.1 adds two moves: Discern the claim, sources and missing information; Deepen through alternatives, contradictions, consequences and time. Outcome signals express assessments, not truth scores.

The framework baseline is the magazine's dated v0.4.3 PRE-ALPHA snapshot, not a statement about the latest release. This is an editorial integration note, not a completed assessment. BQ001 remains UNRESOLVED.

Make the next test more informative.



Priority leads: obtain the bonded-pairs methods; inspect the prospective channeling matrices and residualization; test archive matching against cultural baselines; replicate telephone protocols; identify the exact healing trials before drawing clinical conclusions.

A useful research agenda specifies targets in advance, restricts leakage, blinds assessors, tests generic comparison material, reports uncertainty and publishes misses. Independent replication makes a claim more informative.

Keep the denominator.

0.66-0.88

Retrospective semantic-similarity range on selected questions. Thematic overlap, not factual accuracy. [2]

3 channelers / 10 groups / 30 sessions

Prospective collection described in the presentation. Sessions are not independent participants. [3,7]

0.65-0.79 and 0.75-0.88

Across-channeler similarity for the same group, and within-channeler similarity across groups after residualization. Different comparisons; no direct effect-size comparison. [3]

50.0% / 31.9% / 33.3% chance

Telephone completer trials, positive under pre-selection and non-significant under post-selection. Distinct from the Zoom task. [5]


About eight in ten / 100 pairs

Prevalence and Zoom sample claims from supplied episode notes. Exact primary-source matching remains open.

This is a selected evidence notebook, not a census of all IONS publications or an assessment of institutional impact.

The programme in words.

TSC 2026 / THE PROGRAMME IN WORDS



305 listed title records • 21. September 2026 snapshot • Size = title frequency, not evidence strength

305 listed title records: 37 plenary contributions, 119 concurrent talks, 138 posters and 11 workshops. All enter the title corpus; the graphic displays the 65 most frequent retained tokens.

Size represents the number of title records containing a word, not scientific strength or importance. Speaker names and abstracts are excluded. Workshop parts are counted once; separately listed panel contributions each count once.

The preliminary programme still contains TBA and unnamed poster-winner slots. Social and experiential activities are outside this research-title corpus.

Questions for San Diego.

The official programme places neuroscience, quantum biology, AI, contemplative approaches and psi research in the same conference. Shared space does not imply shared evidence standards or agreement.

The IONS connection includes Helané Wahbeh and Dean Radin in the non-local consciousness and psi plenary. A planned presentation is a lead for inquiry, not an independently verified result.

For every talk, ask: What is the claim? What was measured? What alternative explanation is strongest? Are the methods and data accessible? What would an independent replication look like?

Do not infer results from a title. “Hypothesis,” “theory,” “framework” and “experimental test” describe different research activities. The word cloud is an orientation tool, not a summary of findings.

[Official programme and updates ↗](#)

[AkashicNET conference journal ↗](#)

Rhythm, resonance, reflection.

Two Psytrance listening choices from the creative context of this project. These links point to artist releases; they do not imply artist affiliation, therapeutic benefit or evidence for the research claims.

[Ace Ventura & Astrix - Pranava ↗](#)

A personal invitation to listen for repetition, variation and the way attention moves. Let the music be music; keep scientific inference separate.

[Electric Universe & Ace Ventura - Ancient Aum ↗](#)

An optional companion for a break between reading sessions. Listening preferences vary: silence is also a valid soundtrack.



The symbol is an invitation.



AKASHICPSI



The new AkashicPsi sigil combines Psi, an infinity-heart and five gold stars. Alongside the existing Buddhafly, it gives the special edition a recognisable visual language.

All imagery is conceptual. A lotus, luminous filament or apparent connection between figures is not a depiction of a verified mechanism.

A catalyst, not a cure.

Build an accessible evidence atlas

Link claims to publications, sample sizes, methods, uncertainty and useful counter-evidence. Benefit: less time hunting for the missing context.

Run a small reproducibility pilot

Choose a few claims with public methods and compare interpretations. Benefit: clearer agreement about what was actually tested.

Convene researchers and experiencers

Use consent, respectful listening and explicit evidence categories. Benefit: meaningful experiences can be discussed without requiring agreement about their cause.

Turn learning into public culture

Create readable articles, visual explainers and reflective art. Benefit: a wider audience can participate in informed inquiry.

A global paradigm shift? A long-term aspiration, not a promised outcome. A useful first milestone is a public pilot that improves understanding and survives critical review. No collaboration with TSC, IONS or named researchers has been agreed.

Voices from a possible readership.

The following reviews are invented editorial exercises. They are not testimonials, survey results or endorsements from real people.

FICTIONAL READER: THE CURIOUS SCEPTIC

“I could enjoy the wonder without losing track of what had actually been tested.”

FICTIONAL READER: THE EXPERIENCER

“The questions left room for meaning without telling me what my experience must have been.”

FICTIONAL READER: THE RESEARCH APPRENTICE

“The most useful part was knowing what to check next.”



Five-star design motif. No reader rating claimed.

The reading room we could build.

AKASHICNET / RESEARCH ROOM

FICTIONAL INTERFACE MOCKUP

01 Source trail

Publication → method → limitation

02 Competing explanations

Compare interpretations before scoring

03 Open questions

What would change the assessment?

A designed screenshot-like concept, not a capture of a working product. It illustrates a possible claim-review interface; these controls and workflows are not being claimed as implemented.

Bring one better question.

The claim I want to understand

The strongest alternative explanation

The source or method I need to inspect

A result that would change my interpretation

One useful next action

The trail stays visible.

1. Part 2 episode ↗
2. Retrospective semantic comparison ↗
3. Prospective semantic analysis ↗
4. IONS commentary and verification limits ↗
5. Telephone experiment ↗
6. Qualitative companion ↗
7. IONS presentation companion ↗

TSC plenary titles ↗

TSC concurrent presentations ↗

TSC posters ↗

TSC workshops ↗

Prepared by AkashicNET with AI-assisted research, writing, image generation and design.
Programme checked 21 September 2026. The research feature retains its partial-access limits.
Original paper verification and independent review are not implied.

ISBN: not assigned. Internal edition identifier: AKPSI-2026-SPECIAL-01. The barcode on the back cover encodes that internal identifier and is not an ISBN barcode.



AKASHICPSI

OPEN TO WONDER. GROUNDED IN DISCERNMENT.

A catalyst for inquiry, compassionate dialogue and better questions. The future of consciousness research is a conversation to participate in, not a conclusion to purchase.

akashicnet.org/tsc2026



INTERNAL EDITION CODE · NOT AN ISBN

ISBN: not assigned