

Jacobo Grinberg Zylberbaum

~ Collection of Interviews ~

VIDEO TRANSCRIPT – PART 1

First interview (00:00 – 15:27)

Our second guest for discussion - Jacobo Grinberg. Mexican born in 1946, with a PhD in Physiological Sciences from the Autonomous University of Mexico, a professor of psychology at the same university, Chief Executive/ Managing Director of the National Institute for the Study of Consciousness in Mexico, and the author of 36 books almost. We should almost say 37 because “Pachita” (TLN: Jacobo Grinberg's "Pachita" refers to Bárbara Guerrero, a Mexican shaman and psychic surgeon whom Grinberg studied extensively. She was known for performing what appeared to be miraculous surgeries using only her hands and a rusty knife, often creating organs from thin air and placing them inside the patient's body), a book on Mexican shamanism, is about to be published. We have the cover of it right there. Jacobo Grinberg was here on the program dedicated to shamanism and was almost unable to speak because of good old André Malby (TLN: André Malby Gómiz, was a Spanish and French writer and researcher of Algerian origin, specializing in philosophy and herbal medicine. He participated as a guest in various radio and television programs dedicated to the debate of esoteric topics), the mutant sage of the “El Mundo por Montero” (TLN: Spanish television program), who monopolized the conversation that day and left almost no one to open their mouths. Let's see if you have better luck today, Jacobo.

This program was born from a meal, you know that as well as I do. It was a meal during which you told me, Félix Gracia, Luis Maggi, José Antonio Campoy, Isidro Palacios, and some other members of the editorial staff of the magazine “Más Allá” (TLN: further over) and also the “El Mundo por Montero” discussion group. You told us, I was saying, about the experiment, a successfully completed experiment, that a short time before, regarding the modes and ways of direct communication, without the intervention of language between brains, you had carried out as an experiment and its consequences for the rest of the guests and all our viewers? Of course. Well, the experiment, what it attempted was to see if direct brain-to-brain interactions existed, as you said, without the use of words, without the use of movements, without the use of sounds. So, what we did was build a sound-damped chamber, that is, a

chamber that dampens the entry of outside sound, a chamber that is also visually opaque—we work in complete darkness—and electromagnetically isolated, in such a way that it prevents the entry of electromagnetic waves.

In this chamber, we invited a series of couples—we always worked with couples—to sit comfortably, close their eyes, not speak, not touch each other. In this situation of absence of stimulation, the only thing that existed was the presence of one and the other. Sooner or later, what these two people began to feel was precisely this, the presence of one and the other, until a moment came when most of them felt that were in direct contact. For most of them, it was a bit difficult to define. What direct contact they would be, they felt each other without needing to use language. At that moment, one of the two was invited to go to another chamber, which we had also built beforehand, with the same characteristics. This is an isolated, damped area, and electromagnetically shielded from the first, in such a way—and this is very important—that there was no possibility of electromagnetic waves passing from one chamber to the other, at least not at certain frequencies.

In this situation, we invite them to remain in communication, to feel, to continue feeling the presence of the other. The one who remained in the original chamber was stimulated, a series of flashes were applied to him, and his activity provoked by the flashes was recorded, what we call a provoked potential. A provoked potential, then, is the response of the cortex to the stimulus; it's a very well-known response. And simultaneously, we were recording the brain activity of the other person, who was not stimulated, who didn't know that their partner was being stimulated, and what we observed is that when a provoked potential appeared in the stimulated person, a potential also appeared in the other person, also stimulated, which was synchronous with the appearance of the stimulus. We call this transferred potential or transference potential, and what it indicates is that one brain, one brain, one brain, one brain, in some way, established contact with the other brain directly, and what happened to the first brain had repercussions in the second brain, without necessarily mediating consciousness.

At least in our subjects, when we asked them, for example, those who had their potential transferred, "Did you feel anything or know what happened to your partner?" They said, "Well, I think something happened, but I'm not sure." I mean, there was no need for the event to be conscious for it to happen, for the brain to register it. Now, what are the consequences? What are the consequences? They're enormous, aren't they?

Because, first of all, it's telling us that the limit of brain activity is not the skull, not even the brain structure, but that there is a level of brain activity that, so to speak, transcends the structure itself, and this can be explained in many ways, as Professor Delgado said before, the important thing in the brain are the intraneuronal

interactions, this is what gives, well, intelligence, intraneuronal interactions, this is what gives, well, intelligence, what gives cognitive capacity, etc., etc. It can be assumed that as a result of an enormous series of interactions between neuronal elements, interaction fields are created, and these interaction fields that we call neuronal fields, may not be, and according to our experiment, limited by brain structure, but rather affect the structure of space and be means of transmission from brain to brain. Now, this indicates that each of us is interacting all the time without us knowing it, without us necessarily being aware of it, there are interactions between us, in such a way that, just as there is a network of intraneuronal interactions, we can assume the existence of an organism that arises from these interbrain interactions.

An organism, what does an organism mean? A level of activity that transcends us as individuals, of which we are a part, and very likely the one that is affecting us and that we are affecting, which could perhaps be the basis of consciousness that includes us, that we are continually feeding and that is definitely affecting us, because we could say, well, this network of interbrain interactions, in some way, as the experiment shows, is affecting our brain activity, therefore we are receiving information from this network. I call it the hyperfield, to give a name to this interaction network. Very, very interesting to hear, and I agree with Dominique, don't you? The important thing is the synergy, and I would like to tell you about an experiment we did in Mexico, which is closely linked to some of the things that have been discussed. For several years we were recording the activity of the right hemisphere and the left hemisphere, and what we did was a program with a computer, a computer, where the computer received the information from both hemispheres, compared it with each other, and depending on the result of the comparison, gave a series of signals to the subjects.

For example, if the waveforms from the two hemispheres were very similar, the computer would generate a very low tone, a low-pitched sound. If the waveforms began to differ, the electroencephalographic waveforms would generate a high-pitched sound. This allowed the subject to learn, through a sound feedback system, the state of their interhemispheric unification and, in addition, learn to modify interhemispheric relationships. They could, for example, decide to increase the interhemispheric correlation by shifting toward low-pitched sounds, or decide to increase the difference, the lateralization, by shifting toward high-pitched sounds. We repeated this with more than 30 subjects over a period of three or four years, because what we wanted to know was what the experience of unification was, that is, what happened to the subject's psychology when their two hemispheres began to work in a correlative manner. And what the subjects reported in all cases is that as the interhemispheric correlation increased, and the two hemispheres began to work in a coherent manner, their sensation was that of reaching or touching an ego centre, a unity, an internal state of stillness, of peace, of interhemispheric correlation.

On the other hand, the less interhemispheric correlation there was, the subjects reported a feeling of dispersion, they felt bad, they felt they were not in unity. Very interestingly, the most trained subjects reported decreasing it at will, they left their body and saw their body, but they felt that their experience was localized in a place that was no longer right or left, but included both. In a second experiment, we had people interact who normally remain in a state of high interhemispheric correlation. We all have oscillations in our interhemispheric interaction; unless we are veteran meditators, there is no state of continuity in the interhemispheric correlation. We oscillate sometimes; there is more correlation, sometimes there is less correlation. We have patterns of interhemispheric correlation that are surely associated with those states of identity or non-identity, of unification or non-unification.

So, what we did was have subjects interact who were at different levels of correlation, and what we observed, similar to the transferred potential experiment, is that the subject with the highest interhemispheric correlation always attracted the other subject to their level. This is in preverbal interaction, not without verbalization, simply through the feeling of mutual presence. The subject with the low correlation began to increase it, and the one with the high correlation slightly decreased their correlation until they reached an equilibrium. I think this lasts until they reached an equilibrium. I think this is very interesting to think about in terms of the relationships between us humans, how we feel about each other, and the extent to which someone's state of unification changes the environment. Definitely, someone's state of unification changes the environment. I'd like you to give me a definition of consciousness, to see what consciousness means to you. Then, because we're going to talk a lot about it in this colloquium, we're going to define that word. Jacobo, do you want to start? It can't be defined. I mean, it's beyond definition.

If it could be defined, it would be limited or something less than the definition. Keep in mind, forgive me for interrupting you, that here in Europe we have, I don't know, a very marked definition, I don't know if you do too, we have, I don't know, a very marked definition, I don't know if you do too, as a definition of conscience, something related to morality, which is why I wanted you to clarify. Do you understand? I want to tell you to make that distinction. I mean, no, the term conscience has a section, yes, like ethics, becoming aware of certain norms or norms, but I don't really think that's what we're referring to when we talk about conscience, and it's at that other level that can't be defined.

We could say, for example, that the quality of experience is consciousness. When you see a light, behind or in the actual object, in the luminous quality, there is consciousness. Light doesn't exist either outside or inside; that is, it doesn't exist as a physical phenomenon, as such and as light. In space, what exists are a series of electromagnetic waves, photonic changes. Nor does brain activity exist as light; as light in that perceptual quality is consciousness. In the same way, sound, that is, sound at a

slow, physical level, there is no sound; that is, there is nothing in the physical universe similar to sound.

What we call sound is a quality of consciousness, as we experience it. That is, if you analyse at the physical level what we call what we perceive as sound, well, it's a set of vibrational changes of air molecules, but there's no sound there, just as there's no sound at the physical, physiological level—that is, if you penetrate the brain and try to find sound there, it doesn't exist either. So it's also a quality of consciousness. So, at this level, not one of ethical norms, consciousness could be conceptualized as that which lies behind any perceptual act, that which sustains the very quality of experience. This could be it.

And there are many levels of consciousness. I've mentioned two, let's say, the visual perceptual quality, the sound quality, they are two levels of consciousness, but there is the visual ritual, the sound quality, they are two levels of consciousness, but there are many other levels of consciousness, and two have in common the belonging to that something that is below everything, but it cannot be defined? Or not?

Second interview (15:28 – 28:46)

Well, the meditation technique that I like the most is observation, because the observer can observe everything, that is, the entire set of changes that occur, all the modifications, all the, well, the infinite variety of experiences, all of them can be observed and therefore the observer is the one who unifies, in such a way that when you learn to observe and when you observe any of these changes from that reference, the very fact of being able to observe them begins to integrate you. For example, I may feel very confused or very nervous at a certain moment. Well, I if he remembered that he can observe the state of confusion, the very instant in which I observes the confusion he places himself at the point of integration outside of the confusion, because who is the one who observes the confusion?

Well, it can't be anyone within the confusion, so at that moment, one remembers that one's own nature is beyond that confusion. That doesn't mean that the confusion doesn't exist or that it isn't happening; it is happening. It's a phenomenon that is occurring. But the observer is always one step ahead, so to speak, of the entire experience that is taking place. That is, of non-identification with the circumstance. I think it's a little more complex than non-identification, because at a certain moment, one realizes that everything that happens is part of identity. That is, there it would seem as if there's an intermediate process of non-identification, the clear, irrefutable evidence that something transcendent always exists within us, without ideology. That

is, you don't need to resort to any ideology; it's always there. You can observe everything, and you can always observe everything, and there's always something observing with whom you can connect, and here I put it in semantic quotes, this thing about who you can connect with.

The simple fact is that you can observe it, and the observer places himself outside the event, but after integrating all the events, that is, when you accompany your daily life with observation, something begins to happen, you begin to find yourself. It's a technique, it's simply a tool that helps you unify, because by definition the observer is what unifies, so by using observation you increase the possibility of unification within yourself, and there comes a moment when you simply connect with reality, you are in reality, and at that moment, the whole discussion about identification or non-identification no longer exists. You are beyond identities or non-identities, but you had to go through an intermediate period of de-identification through observation, to then arrive at something that is so... It's very difficult to define what that contact with reality is, because there is no longer outside or inside, there is not even observer or observed, there is no observer or observed, you are simply you, you are yourself and everything that happens, happens, I mean, it happens and it doesn't matter, everything is equally important. Yes, I would like to talk. Well, I think that, I don't know how to say what I'm feeling or what I'm thinking, I think that you have to find yourself and in that I totally agree with Don Rodolfo and in this finding yourself, everything acquires meaning, and then both what happens in the world and what happens within us, is integrated, it is already part of an encounter, it is seen from there.

It's a delicious moment when one loses all concept and all preconception. At that moment, as Tony said, it happens. But there's something that's behind this perception and that I can't think of as not existing, and it's this same self, which is not the ego. That is, the cynicism that Ibn al Arabi (TLN - Sufi mystic) or these mystics would say. Which is beyond all changing events, it's something that one has to find and no, and it's also very difficult to define it, but there has to be that because if there isn't that, then there's no meaning, and I think that meaning is very important, and I'm not referring to a linear or restricted meaning either. But I was indiscreetly asking you how you do it, what technique you use. That's what I wanted to know about those of you who were missing now for...

Look, the technique I use consists of a first phase: you sit down, close your eyes, and begin to observe your breathing. You begin to observe your breathing, and thoughts and sensations will appear; you don't repress them. For example, if a thought appears, you let it pass and return to your breathing. Another thought appears, you let it pass, observe how it is born and dies, and return to your breathing. This, by the way, is a common technique in Buddhism; it's exactly what is done in the first level of Buddhism.

This sort of prepares you, prepares you, prepares you because in the first phase you have to learn to concentrate, you have to learn to focus your attention, you have to clear your mind, and the way to clear your mind is not by fighting against it, nor is it that you can't get rid of it, there's no way to get rid of it, and if you fight against it, it's the worst thing you can do. With yourself and those you don't think about, man. You strengthen it, but I also don't think it's bad to have a mind. Man, it's necessary to have an understanding; it's wonderful because it would be disastrous to be left without this part, but to transcend a level. Of course, but this mind that bothers us, these repetitive thoughts, I think that we do have to clear them, and the way to clear them is to accept them. Paradoxically, it's to accept them and let them pass, and let them surface and surface and surface until a moment comes when they begin to calm down, and then one can direct oneself with breathing, to be at that point. At that point. Well, that's the first phase of the technique.

A second phase consists of beginning, for example, to observe your thoughts, your body, your sensations, unifying your body, exploring your body, observing part by part, feeling, accepting, without fighting against your body, without judging it, without analysing it, but simply, for example, after you are in this already concentrated breathing, you begin to feel the top of your head. The tactile sensations, the sensations of the surface, then you begin to feel each part, each part of your body, as if bathing it, exploring it little by little, until you reach a moment when you can observe your body as a whole, it's like recovering your body image. Then you observe your body, you are a witness to your body while simultaneously feeling it. When you manage to do this—this is Buddhism, because it's a Buddhist technique—it is a very extraordinary way of healing, of cleansing. In addition to placing yourself at the point of observation where you can perceive your entire body as a whole, you are accepting everything that happens there, but you are in a transcendent position with respect to it. Exactly.

The next step is to begin, in the technique I practice, by starting to activate simultaneous perception, so that you perceive your entire body with all its bodily sensations and simultaneously your breathing. Exactly. The next step involves, for example, paying attention to your thoughts. Then you perceive your thoughts. What thoughts are there? What relationships are there between one thought and another?

What networks of thoughts occur, and do you perceive them with the same attitude you perceived your breathing and your body: without judgment, without analysis, accepting all the thoughts that occur, but placing yourself as a witness to them. You are simultaneously feeling and experiencing your thoughts, but at the point of transcendence regarding them. The next phase involves simultaneously observing your body, your breathing, and all your mental processes—a simultaneous observation.

Well, once you finish this, and you can perform this simultaneous observation, you begin to pay attention to your emotions. What emotional changes occur?

What are emotional tones? Emotional luminosity, the qualities of emotion, and you observe your emotions with the same attitude with which you observed your thoughts, your body, and your breathing. When you achieve this observation of your emotions, you simultaneously observe your breathing, your body, your thoughts, and your emotions. Then you begin to observe your internal images in the same way, until you achieve perception, an observation just like you observed the other, without judgment, without analysis of your internal images, and you simultaneously observe your breathing, your body, your thoughts, your emotions, and your internal images. The next step—sorry, the next step—is to observe the sounds of the environment and observe them in the same way you observed your thoughts, your emotions, your body, and simultaneously observe the environment, your body, emotions, thoughts, etc.

Then, observe the visual world. There comes a point where, when you can simultaneously observe all the components of your experience, something very strange happens. There's a kind of threshold that is crossed, and you connect with yourself. But who is the self you're connecting with? It can't be described because it's unifying everything. In a way, the technique of incorporating observation into observation and making it simultaneous allows you to reach a threshold where all the conceptions you had of yourself disappear, and you connect with something that is beyond those conceptions, but much closer to yourself than ever before. And you also realize that this self is inseparable from the whole.

And what is it? I'd like to say something.

I was referring to a threshold, in this simultaneous observation. This threshold has a physiological basis or explanation, and it's something very, very physiological, and reaching it is something very, very spectacular, because when you reach it, there is a change in the sense that you no longer want to. From here, I differ a little from what my colleagues just said. You no longer want to help or not help. The consciousness of love is no longer accompanied, but it becomes the same. But this is already a very evolved vessel. There is neither consciousness nor love; there is simply this reality. The being is all loving; there is no added quality of love, but it is the same.

Third interview (28:47 – 38:50)

Several clarifications before starting.

You mentioned the shamanic conception of existence, and I do want to clarify a little bit what this shamanic thing is, or what shamans are. They are the wise indigenous people from many places around the world. We have studied these wise men in Mexico, and one of the lineages of these people is found in the state of Sonora, the Yaquis of Sonora, and they have those of Carlos Castaneda. Oh, yes. And they have a conception about how perception is created.

They are fundamentally interested in explaining, or attempting to explain, how images appear, how sounds appear, how the different levels of reality appear. So, in this sense, synergistic theory is related to this shamanic conception, but it doesn't arise from it; it is related, because this theory is also a theoretical attempt to try to explain how perception is created. But the nomenclature it uses is different from that used by shamans, although the conclusions are very similar. Synergistic theory asserts that there is a basic organization of space. This basic organization would be like a matrix, a lattice (TLN: the fundamental, energetic structure of the universe, a continuous space-time-energy matrix that underlies all of reality), a trellis.

A matrix, a lattice, a grid, whose fundamental state is one of total coherence and symmetry. Contemporary physics also agrees on this. Any instrument detects that something appears against a stable background of total coherence, and physicists, and people who understand what the instrument's measurement means, speak of appearance. Synergistic theory states that the human brain is capable of distorting the structure of the lattice in the most complex way known in the universe, and this complex distortion of the lattice constitutes perceptual reality. Such that each of the neuronal activities constitutes a micro distortion of the lattice, and since the human brain contains around 10,000 to 12,000,000,000 neuronal elements, each micro distortion, each alteration of this basic structure of space interacts with each other, forming a complex macro distortion, which the theory calls the synergistic field. Perception arises as a result of the interaction of the neuronal field with the lattice of space. There are different levels of interaction between the neuronal field and the lattice, and each of these levels constitutes or is associated with or perceived as a different level of consciousness.

For example, there is auditory consciousness, visual consciousness, they are different types of consciousness, and the theory states that each of them is related to the parameters of this interaction between the neuronal field and the lattice. Well, first, first, I mean, it's very strange. Second, in any creation of a theory, for the creator of the theory, the experience of creation is an extraordinarily interesting event. When the theory is created and given as a final result, the listener of the theory may consider

it as a product of intellectualization outside of experience, but any creation of a theory, when this theory is profound, comes from experience. For example, I mentioned these indigenous sages who are interested in explaining perception.

They have a theory of perception, but this theory of perception arises from their experience. They perceive the world in a certain way, which is different from the perception of other people, simply because they were born in a different culture, and then, based on this perception, they create a conception. The interesting thing about conception, and about any specific attempt to understand perception, is that, in some way, the attempt to understand perception places us at the foundation of any reality. It places us at the foundation of any reality. In our time, one of the great dangers and one of the great pains we are experiencing is the loss of meaning and dispersion.

That is, we often find ourselves trying to understand each other and reach their centre, a unification, ourselves. So, the attempt, for example, to explain perception is an attempt to achieve this unification, because we will be at the basis of the creation of any reality, and understanding how reality is created helps us, well, to unify ourselves. So, it's not a no, it's not intellectualism, especially in the creation process, because fine theory, deep theory always arises from experience. I'd like to give two pieces of advice, but first, something very interesting. Salvador and I witnessed an extraordinary event. And, well, I'm a scientist, I have a laboratory, I study brain activity, brain physiology, and I was invited to meet this woman, Pachita, and her operations.

And what I saw there, in principle, contradicted every concept and every knowledge I had about reality, and what it taught me, what I saw, was that human capacity. I can't say what the limit of human capacity is. Based on that experience, I don't dare say, human beings can't do this; the brain has such a limit to its potential. Instead, it seems we're within a vast continuum, and we don't know the extremes of this conflict. Now, the two pieces of advice. The two pieces of advice.

One is laughter, one is laughter. Laughter is excellent; it's an extraordinary therapeutic measure. There's even a Taoist meditation technique where the person—and it's very simple to do—sits and smiles. Try it, try it, smile with your eyes and mouth, I mean, really raise the corners of your mouth, right? And when you put yourself in this situation, there's immediately a series of messages that our body receives, that our brain receives. First of all, everything is fine.

There are hormonal secretions brought about by the change in physiognomy that produce an extraordinary improvement in all physiological systems. That's one of the tips: laugh. The more we laugh, the more we give ourselves positive signals, the healthier we'll be. And the second is observation, which perhaps, in combination with

laughter, can be an excellent therapeutic measure. We are capable of observing even that which we think cannot be observed.

For example, initially, we think we can't observe our brain activity. However, there's a Buddhist technique, Vipassana, that teaches practitioners to observe their own brain activity. And this is an extraordinary experience, especially for a neurophysiologist, isn't it? The realization that they have an observation mechanism that allows them, for example, to see their own brain. Not just their own brain, but their glandular activity, which allows them to sense their body part by part until they achieve a unified body image. And what we know, based on these techniques, is that observing, for example, diseased tissue, pain, and observing it with equanimity, with calm, has a healing effect. So, this is the second piece of advice.