

AKASHICNET

PSI RESEARCH ATLAS

VOLUME I

Foundations & Discernment



Open to wonder. Grounded in discernment.

COMPLETE MANUSCRIPT / REVIEW EDITION 1.1

22 September 2026 / Concept artwork, not scientific evidence

PUBLIC PREVIEW / EXCERPT / ORIGINAL PAGE NUMBERS RETAINED

What this edition is

Four completed volumes. Open research questions.

Publication status

This is a complete educational manuscript and illustrated research guide, not an independently peer-reviewed or comprehensive systematic review. The four books contain 128 pages in total, including covers, references and reading aids. No research question is declared resolved.

Who contributed

The user supplied the brief, scope, preferred visual direction and AkashicNET/N2N framing. AI produced the manuscript, original diagrams, synthesis and conceptual artwork. Cited researchers produced the underlying studies. No measured authorship percentages are asserted.

What was checked

Edition 1.1 adds targeted full-text checks of four sources to the metadata and abstract review (22 September 2026). Access notes distinguish these levels. Other full texts, supplements, raw data and independent review remain pending. Invented teaching examples are labelled.

Intended destination

Restricted sandbox review first. A paid Deep Inquiry edition requires a separate content and access-control review. This PDF is not password-protected. A restricted webpage alone does not protect a publicly reachable file.

Reader care

This guide offers no diagnosis, treatment, dosing or instructions for inducing unusual states. Personal meaning, factual accuracy and clinical decisions remain distinct. No institutional, researcher or community endorsement is implied.

Follow the question

How to ask an extraordinary question without deciding its answer in advance.

01 / READ

Each chapter introduces one question and its inference boundary. It distinguishes definitions, reported findings and original editorial guidance.

02 / EXAMINE

The companion page turns the question into an information map or comparison. Diagrams describe methods and reasoning, not invisible physical mechanisms.

03 / TRACE

Source labels link to DOI records. Bibliography pages identify what was actually consulted. A citation is not a claim of complete source verification.

04 / REVISIT

Use the closing checklist to identify missing observations or references. A useful revision changes a specific statement for a recorded reason.

A deliberate boundary

The atlas is an orientation and review companion. It does not assign a universal evidence score to whole traditions or to people. Its most important question is: what does this particular record justify?

Art is metaphor. Diagrams are editorial guides. Sources remain inspectable.

A map, not a verdict

The atlas begins by separating an experience from the explanation offered for it.

An unusual event can be worth documenting before anyone knows what caused it. Someone thinks of a friend just before a call arrives; a dream appears to match a later event; an impression feels as though it came from elsewhere. Each account contains several questions: what happened, how it was remembered, what information was available, and what interpretation followed.

This collection uses psi as a working umbrella for disputed claims about information or influence beyond currently identified ordinary routes. It does not use the word as a diagnosis, a demonstrated mechanism or a guarantee of ability. Channeling and dreams describe settings or experiences; telepathy and precognition describe proposed information relationships. Mixing these levels can make a collection look more coherent than its evidence permits.

A useful atlas therefore makes navigation easier while leaving conclusions open. Its boundaries are editorial choices, not laws of nature. A reader can value a testimony, reject its proposed explanation, and still support careful investigation. Equally, taking a hypothesis seriously means permitting a well-designed investigation to count against it.


THE INFERENCE BOUNDARY

A question becomes investigable when different answers would lead to different observations.

SOURCE NOTES: Original editorial method / no empirical result asserted.

Read the structure

A map, not a verdict



Conceptual reading guide. Numbering indicates reading order, not proof of a mechanism.

Start small

Replace "Is everything connected?" with one observable question. For example: can a recorded description identify a concealed target from a fixed set, under a procedure that prevents ordinary access?

Keep the person separate

Disagreement about an explanation is not a judgement of the experienter's honesty or dignity. A sincere account can contain errors; a mistaken theory can accompany a meaningful event.

Use the atlas in both directions

Read from a topic to its methods, then return from the methods to the original claim. A diagram can reveal a missing step, but it cannot supply missing observations.

SOURCE NOTES: Original editorial method / no empirical result asserted.

Source records

Selected references, not an exhaustive literature review.

[S23] Nosek BA, Ebersole CR, DeHaven AC, et al. (2018)

The preregistration revolution.

doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114

Indexed abstract inspected; full-text review pending.

[S19] Wagenmakers EJ, Wetzels R, Borsboom D, et al. (2011)

Why psychologists must change the way they analyze their data: the case of psi: comment on Bem (2011).

doi.org/10.1037/a0022790

Indexed abstract inspected; full-text review pending.

[S20] Simmons JP, Nelson LD, Simonsohn U. (2011)

False-positive psychology: undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant.

doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632

Indexed abstract inspected; full-text review pending.

Access boundary

Source links identify original publications. The indexed abstract is an access layer, not a substitute for full methods, supplements or raw data. Authors' interpretations are attributed in the chapters; this atlas has not independently reproduced their empirical analyses.

Sources & scope

Selected references, not an exhaustive literature review.

[S02] Ritchie SJ, Wiseman R, French CC. (2012)

Failing the future: three unsuccessful attempts to replicate Bem's 'retroactive facilitation of recall' effect.

doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0033423

Full-text sections checked; data not audited.

[S22] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. (2021)

The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews.

doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Metadata only; abstract unavailable.

[S21] Ioannidis JP. (2005)

Why most published research findings are false.

doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124

Indexed abstract inspected; full-text review pending.

Access boundary

Further review should examine full texts, corrections, replication and critical exchanges. PRISMA is listed as a reporting resource, not a claim of compliance. Topics without a cited empirical record are methodological introductions; no study result is invented to fill a source gap.

Project context

The existing [AkashicNET PSI gateway](#) informed the editorial taxonomy. It is a project resource, not independent evidence that psi exists.

What would improve this book?

A review edition should make its next corrections easy to identify.

Source depth

Which abstract-only summary most needs full-text inspection? Name the source label, chapter and claim rather than requesting a general rewrite.

Missing comparison

Which competing explanation, null finding or replication should be added? Supply a primary reference and explain the specific gap it addresses.

Clarity and scope

Where does the wording imply more than the underlying record supports? Suggest the smallest correction that restores the inference boundary.

Rights and access

Check every proposed quotation, contributed account and destination. Sandbox review, public preview and paid distribution are separate uses.

Independent review

Methodological and subject-matter review are still pending. Reader comments should be recorded honestly as feedback, not presented as completed peer review.

[Return to this volume's contents](#)