ChatGPT

National Security Implications of the Scalar Ψ-Field Hypothesis (QCAP)

Overview: QCAP's Premise and Potential Impact

The **Quantum Consciousness Amplification Protocol (QCAP)** is a speculative framework proposing that human consciousness corresponds to a real physical scalar field (denoted Ψ) which can couple to quantum systems. In this model, a highly coherent brain (for example, strong 40 Hz gamma-band EEG synchrony) acts as a source of the Ψ-field, and this field's interaction is predicted to **amplify quantum entanglement correlations beyond the normal quantum limit (Tsirelson's bound)** [1] [2]. In other words, under special conditions involving conscious observers in a peak-coherence mental state, Bell test experiments might yield **CHSH inequality values** *S* exceeding 2.828, which standard quantum physics forbids [2]. Notably, QCAP is formulated to preserve relativity's no-signaling principle despite the postulated superluminal propagation speed (~10^20 *c*) of the Ψ-field [1]. The theory includes a Lagrangian field model with micro-causality (no influence outside light cones) and perturbative renormalizability, aiming to be mathematically self-consistent [1] [3]. The authors outline **testable experiments** – e.g. EEG-gated Bell tests using human observers – to verify if a focused, coherent mind can indeed tip quantum outcomes beyond conventional limits [4] [5]. If such extraordinary effects were empirically validated, they would herald a profound paradigm shift, suggesting consciousness is an active player in physics and potentially enabling novel technologies or capabilities. Given these far-reaching implications, it is natural to ask whether QCAP could be viewed as a sensitive **dual-use** development with national security ramifications.

Dual-Use Concerns and National Security Context

"Dual-use" refers to scientific advances or technologies that, while potentially beneficial for civilian science or medicine, could also be repurposed for military or intelligence applications. At first glance, QCAP might seem esoteric, but **if its claims proved true, it could introduce capabilities of great strategic interest.** For instance, the ability of human observers to influence entangled systems or produce super-quantum correlations might be leveraged for new forms of sensing, communication, or even **remote influence**. Historically, even *claims* of mind-matter interaction have attracted military attention – the Cold War "psychic arms race" being a prime example. During the 1970s, U.S. intelligence learned the Soviet Union was reportedly spending millions on "psychotronic" research (psychic phenomena and mind influence), which spurred the CIA and Defense Intelligence Agency to launch their own programs (e.g. project SCANATE, later **STAR GATE**) to investigate psychic remote viewing for intelligence gathering [6] [7]. Those programs were highly classified, underscoring that **any phenomenon enabling a person to glean information or affect objects at a distance is seen as having military value**. If QCAP's mind-driven quantum effects were validated, they could similarly be viewed as a tool for espionage or covert action – essentially a scientifically grounded analog to psychic abilities.

Potential military uses of QCAP-like capabilities might include: improved quantum sensors that leverage conscious operators to detect stealthy targets or hidden objects, new quantum communication schemes moderated by trained observer states, or even attempts at **"mind-powered" interference in an**

adversary's quantum systems. Even though QCAP as formulated obeys non-signaling (so it shouldn't enable faster-than-light messaging or violate causality [1]), a *nation's security establishment could still perceive it as a strategic technology*. For example, if a conscious agent could bias outcomes of entangled particle experiments, one might worry about impacts on quantum cryptography protocols. (Quantum key distribution's security assumes only standard quantum physics applies; a verified mechanism to exceed quantum correlation bounds might hint at a way to undermine cryptographic assumptions.) At the very least, a country that first masters this effect might gain **an edge in quantum information science**, leading others to classify such research as a national security priority. It is telling that U.S. officials already label certain advanced neuroscience and quantum technologies as **"emerging and dual-use"** fields to monitor. In late 2021, the U.S. Commerce Department even blacklisted a Chinese military medical institute for its work on "brain-control" biotechnology, deeming such research a threat to national security [8]. While QCAP is very different in nature, it squarely resides at the intersection of quantum tech and neuroscience – domains that defense agencies watch closely.

That said, it's important to gauge **credibility and stage of development**. At present, QCAP is a theoretical hypothesis with proposed experiments; no conclusive empirical demonstration of super-quantum conscious influence exists. Generally, U.S. national security policy does not preemptively classify or restrict basic science *unless* it shows clear, operational significance or falls under specific sensitive categories. In other words, an idea alone – especially one outside mainstream consensus – might not trigger formal controls. If QCAP experiments were attempted openly and produced null results or marginal effects, it's unlikely to draw government intervention. **However, should early tests show convincing evidence of the Ψ-field's reality or any reproducible anomaly, interest from defense and intelligence circles would almost certainly increase.** History suggests that once a phenomenon is considered plausible (even with low probability but high payoff), security agencies adopt a "better safe than sorry" approach. The Cold War psychic research, for example, continued for years precisely because "the other side" might be making progress [6]. In today's context, if U.S. analysts saw foreign researchers (say, in China or Russia) pursuing consciousness-related quantum effects, they might similarly push to **assess and potentially weaponize or counter such capabilities**, viewing QCAP as a dual-use technology.

U.S. Policy Mechanisms: Invention Secrecy and Export Controls

The United States has established mechanisms to control dissemination of sensitive innovations. One relevant tool is the **Invention Secrecy Act of 1951**, which empowers the government to impose secrecy orders on patent applications that are deemed detrimental to national security [9] [10]. If an inventor tries to patent a device or method that appears to offer a significant military or intelligence advantage, the Patent Office (with input from defense agencies) can **withhold the patent and bar the inventor from public disclosure**. This isn't just a theoretical possibility – numerous technologies have been held under secrecy orders. Known examples range from a **radar-evading ("stealth") detection concept** that was kept secret for 8 years, to novel communications and encryption devices [11] [12]. The bar for invoking a secrecy order is often quite low; critics note the process *"errs on the side of caution"* and can sweep up inventions posing even a **slight or hypothetical threat**, without clear standards or recourse for the inventor [13]. In the case of QCAP, one could imagine that if a patent were filed on (for example) a **"Ψ-field quantum sensor apparatus"** or an EEG-coupled quantum device that demonstrates super-Tsirelson entanglement, it might catch the eye of DoD reviewers. Because QCAP touches on quantum measurement and possibly secure communications or detection, it could be seen as falling under broad categories like *"sensors"*, *"communications"*, or *"unique devices with performance characteristics of strategic interest"* – all keywords in defense classification guidelines [14] [15]. A worst-case scenario is that a private inventor or researcher

pursuing a QCAP-based invention could receive a gag order forbidding them to publish or discuss the work, under threat of legal penalties, until the government decides otherwise.

It's important to emphasize, however, that the **Invention Secrecy Act applies to patent filings, not to ordinary scientific publications**. If the QCAP work is kept in the realm of open science (papers, conferences, public data), it generally does *not* fall under the patent secrecy regime. In fact, there is a longstanding U.S. policy (NSDD-189, issued in 1985 and still in effect) that fundamental research should remain unrestricted and that classification is the appropriate mechanism if national security demands control – meaning, if the government hasn't classified a research area, it should allow open publication [16]. For independent researchers with no military contracts, there's no automatic pre-publication review required by law. The NSA faced this reality in the late 1970s when academic cryptographers began discovering strong encryption algorithms. Lacking direct legal means to censor publications, the NSA attempted to use the patent system to hold back two cryptography patents in 1978 – one by a university professor, another by an independent inventor [17]. In the first case, **the academic (Prof. George Davida) went public about the secrecy order**, and his university's leadership protested that this violated academic freedom; facing public scrutiny, NSA **rescinded the order** [17]. The second inventor, who was not in a university setting, also had his secrecy order lifted after media outlets reported on it, generating public outcry [18]. These incidents suggest that **transparency and a strong open-science stance can provide protection**: once your work is widely disclosed and recognized, it is harder for authorities to justify or enforce retroactive secrecy. In the QCAP context, openly publishing results as they emerge (rather than holding them as proprietary secrets or patents) would likely make it *less* susceptible to being quashed under the Invention Secrecy Act. Essentially, by the time an invention could be patentable, if its underlying principles and demonstrations are already public knowledge, imposing secrecy becomes somewhat moot.

Beyond patent law, **export control regulations** are another key aspect of U.S. policy on dual-use tech. These rules (governed by regimes like ITAR for military items and EAR for dual-use commodities) restrict sending certain sensitive technologies or information to foreign nationals or countries. Historically, advanced cryptography was treated as a munition – in the 1970s–90s, the U.S. required special licenses to export encryption software/hardware, precisely because encryption had national security importance [19]. For example, the Arms Export Control Act and the Export Administration Act were used to **limit the spread of strong encryption**; until the late 1990s, **export of encryption tools above a certain strength needed government approval** as they were considered dual-use strategic items [19] [20]. By analogy, if QCAP gave rise to a concrete technology – say, a **device that enhances quantum measurements via conscious interaction** – the U.S. might categorize it under export controls. As of 2024, we've seen new export control rules specifically targeting cutting-edge quantum technologies (quantum computers, specialized sensors, etc.) [21]. It's plausible that a QCAP-based apparatus, especially if it has intelligence or military surveillance applications, could be added to a controlled list. This would mean one cannot legally share that device or related technical data with foreign entities without a license from the Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS). Even *non-tangible* transfers (so-called "deemed exports"), like revealing detailed design know-how to a foreign colleague, could be restricted in such a scenario.

For the **present situation**, since you are not working with any classified data or defense contracts, and you intend to publish openly, much of your QCAP research likely falls under the **"fundamental research exemption"** in export control regulations. Fundamentally published science is generally exempt from export licensing requirements – its results can be shared with anyone, domestic or foreign, by definition. The critical point is to **stay within the realm of open, publishable research**. If you were to start collaborating privately with foreign nationals on proprietary experiments (outside the public domain), or if

you developed a prototype device and tried to send it abroad for testing, then you would need to be mindful of export laws. In such a case, seeking guidance from an export control lawyer or your institution's compliance office would be wise to ensure you're not inadvertently violating regulations (for example, certain advanced sensors or lasers that might be part of a QCAP experiment could themselves be export-controlled, independent of QCAP's novelty).

Historical Analogues: From Psychic Spying to Quantum Technology

Looking at **historical precedents** can clarify how U.S. national security entities might react to QCAP. The **STAR GATE program** is a telling analogue. Initiated in the 1970s and kept secret for over two decades, STAR GATE (under various code names) was the Pentagon and CIA's effort to explore "anomalous mental phenomena" – essentially psychic abilities like remote viewing – for espionage purposes [7] [22]. That research was driven by reports of Soviet breakthroughs, and although it remained controversial and of limited operational use, the mere possibility that humans could psychically spy on targets was enough to justify a classified military unit with steady funding [6] [7]. The program was only declassified in 1995, after reviews concluded it hadn't yielded consistently actionable results [22]. The takeaway is that **when it comes to unconventional phenomena at the nexus of mind and technology, national security agencies have a track record of acting first (in secrecy) and sorting out scientific validity later**. If QCAP's core idea – that consciousness can measurably affect quantum outcomes – had surfaced during the Cold War, it likely would have been swept into a classified defense research program, much like remote viewing was. In the 21st century, with heightened global competition in quantum sciences, one could imagine a similar pattern if evidence for QCAP emerges. For instance, if China or another rival were perceived to be researching consciousness-related quantum effects, the U.S. might quietly launch its own classified project to avoid being blindsided (an echo of the "ESP gap" fears of the 70s). In fact, elements of this may already be happening in the broader sense: the U.S. Army and DARPA have shown interest in **brain–machine interfaces and neuroweapons**, while intelligence agencies remain attentive to any "breakthrough" that could give a cognitive or information advantage. Even **biotechnology and neuroscience research is now seen as part of the security landscape** (as evidenced by the Commerce Department citing "brain-control weapons" in sanctions against foreign institutes) [8].

Another parallel comes from the realm of **quantum technology and cryptography**. When academic researchers began developing public-key encryption and other powerful cryptographic tools in the late 1970s, it raised alarms in the NSA, which feared losing its signals intelligence edge. As noted earlier, the NSA attempted to suppress some of this work via patent secrecy orders, and more broadly, the U.S. government treated encryption as a weapon subject to export restriction [19]. There was essentially a tug-of-war between the scientific ideal of open publication and the security agencies' desire to control cutting-edge knowledge. Over time, open science largely prevailed in cryptography – the basic algorithms were published – but control was maintained by other means (export licenses and promoting industry cooperation with law enforcement). For QCAP, one could foresee a similar dynamic: **the fundamental scientific insights** (if proven) would eventually become public knowledge, but the **applied techniques or devices** might be closely guarded. It is not hard to imagine DARPA or IARPA (the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity) taking an interest in funding QCAP-related research if early results are promising. Such funding can be a double-edged sword: it brings resources and validation, but potentially strings attached in terms of classification or at least limited dissemination. Some DARPA projects remain unclassified fundamental research, while others (especially if they bear fruit with military potential) can shift to classified status. Historically, even within STAR GATE, there were portions that were unclassified external research (e.g. SRI's experiments published some findings) and portions that were highly classified

operational testing. **Maintaining a purely open posture might actually shield your work from being absorbed into a black project**, since its progress would be transparent and widely distributed rather than controllable by a single agency.

It's also worth noting that **scientific legitimacy plays a role**. Fringe or radical theories that lack experimental support often remain in the open simply because mainstream institutions (and by extension, government science advisors) don't take them seriously enough to classify. In the early years of remote viewing research, for example, there was significant skepticism; yet the program persisted largely due to a few high-ranking believers and the specter of Soviet efforts. In the case of QCAP, if initial experiments fail or show only marginal effects, the defense community might dismiss it as an interesting curiosity and not bother intervening (perhaps considering it "pseudoscience" or too premature). On the other hand, a strong positive demonstration – say a well-controlled Bell test that reproducibly breaks the 2.828 CHSH limit with human observers – would immediately raise eyebrows in national security circles, even if many scientists are still baffled. At that point, classification or at least **quiet advisory alerts** could enter the picture ("to keep this under wraps until we understand what it means and who might use it"). We have seen analogous situations with **physical inventions**: e.g., patents related to stealth radar detection were classified when stealth technology was a hot strategic topic [23]. By analogy, a proven method for **consciousness-enhanced quantum sensing or communication** could be seen as a strategic breakthrough to be controlled.

Strategies to Avoid Misclassification or Suppression

Given the above, it's prudent to take proactive steps to **minimize the risk of your QCAP research being misclassified, suppressed, or misconstrued as a security threat**. Here are several practical measures:

- **Embrace Open Science Fully:** Continue to publish your results openly in reputable journals or public pre-print servers, and share data/protocols whenever feasible. The fact that you are not seeking patent monopolies or proprietary secrecy works in your favor. U.S. policy (NSDD-189) affirms that openly published fundamental research should remain unrestricted [16]. Once information is public, it cannot be "un-published" – this provides a form of protection. As we saw with the 1978 cryptography cases, public disclosure and academic notoriety made it hard for NSA to justify maintaining secrecy orders [17]. By **establishing your findings in the public domain from the start**, you reduce the chance that authorities will later attempt to stifle them. Open dissemination also builds a broad base of support: other scientists, press, and civil society can voice opposition if someone tries to clamp down on your work.

- **Avoid Patent Traps:** Be cautious about patenting any device or technique derived from QCAP. A patent application is a trigger point for government review. If your invention appears on one of the numerous sensitive lists (even loosely, under "sensors" or "communications"), a secrecy order could be applied preemptively, cutting off your ability to publish or even tell colleagues. Instead of patenting, you might consider publishing methods as open-source hardware/software or using defensive publication (which still secures your place as originator but keeps the knowledge free). If you do decide to file a patent for certain aspects (perhaps to prevent someone else from patenting it), consult an attorney experienced in government secrecy orders. They might file in a way that anticipates a review and be prepared to argue the case, or file internationally in parallel so that the invention isn't solely under U.S. jurisdiction (once an invention is published or patented abroad, a U.S. secrecy order loses some efficacy). **In short, patent only if absolutely necessary, and with expert guidance** – otherwise, lean on open publication to cement your work's public status.

- **Clearly Frame the Research in Beneficial Terms:** When communicating about QCAP, either in publications or public talks, emphasize its scientific and humanitarian importance rather than any weaponizable aspects. For instance, you can highlight potential benefits like *insights into consciousness (answering fundamental questions about the mind)*, *improved brain-computer interfaces for assisting disabled individuals*, or *enhanced quantum sensors for scientific exploration (e.g. detecting subtle biological quantum processes or improving medical imaging)*. By **proactively discussing ethics and peaceful applications**, you set a tone that this work is *not* being developed as a covert tool. It may be useful to include an ethics or dual-use discussion section in papers, acknowledging that while any powerful technology can be misused, you are committing to transparency and benevolent aims. Such openness can make it harder for others to claim your project is a clandestine threat that needs containment. It also mirrors how certain controversial research (like CRISPR gene editing) has been handled – with upfront ethical guidelines and calls for international oversight rather than secrecy.

- **Engage in Peer Review and Institutional Oversight:** If possible, conduct your experiments under the auspices of institutional review boards (IRBs) and with collaboration from established scientists. For example, since you plan on EEG-based protocols involving human participants (observers concentrating during quantum tests), ensure you have IRB approval for those studies. This not only guards the well-being and consent of volunteers, but also creates a **paper trail of ethical oversight**. It shows that your work meets the normal standards of scientific research. Similarly, subjecting your results to peer review (even if initially via preprints and later formal journal peer review) will improve credibility. The more your findings are replicated or verified by independent groups, the less any government can argue that the research should be siloed or controlled. In fact, broad replication, including internationally, would make suppression practically impossible – a point worth noting as a "shield" strategy. Encouraging **open replication** (within legal bounds) aligns with your goal of paradigm correction and also ensures no single nation or entity can monopolize the knowledge.

- **Consult Export-Control Experts if Needed:** While fundamental research is generally exempt, if you ever need to share **tangible items or detailed technical know-how** that isn't yet published – for instance, sending a custom experimental setup or unpublished algorithm to a collaborator overseas – do a quick export control check. Most likely QCAP-related research equipment (lasers, photon detectors, EEG amplifiers, etc.) are commercial and not highly restricted. But if you're using very specialized components (say a quantum encryption device) there could be export classification numbers to mind. If unsure, a brief consultation with a legal expert or your institution's export compliance office can clarify any **"deemed export"** issues. Since you mentioned not working with foreign nationals presently, you're already avoiding one pitfall. In the future, if non-U.S. researchers get involved prior to full publication, you'd just want to verify that nothing falls under ITAR (which mostly covers munitions like certain sensors or lasers above specific capabilities) or EAR's Commerce Control List. Given QCAP is fundamentally physics research, keeping everything in the open literature should keep you on the right side of these laws.

- **Leverage the Fundamental Research Exclusion:** In any communications with authorities or funding bodies, anchor on the principle that your work is fundamental and intended for open publication. The **"fundamental research exclusion"** is a doctrine in U.S. export regulations that says publicly disseminated science is not subject to export controls [19]. Universities often invoke this to allow foreign students and open collaboration. By adhering to that model (openly publishable work, no restrictions on access), you make it clear you are *not* generating controlled technical data. If

anyone pressures you to restrict or compartmentalize parts of the research, carefully weigh it against the loss of the fundamental research safeguard.

- **Be Vigilant but Not Paranoid:** It's wise to be aware of these issues (hence this analysis), but it's also important not to become so fearful of suppression that it hinders the research itself. The fact that you are unfunded by defense agencies and operating independently gives you freedom – you are not contractually bound to any classification authority. The U.S. government **cannot classify what it doesn't own or hasn't itself produced**, except via the patent secrecy or by declaring some emergent risk (which, as discussed, is rare and contestable if you've been open). It's worth noting that even during the STAR GATE era, plenty of private researchers investigated ESP and published in the open (e.g. at Princeton's PEAR lab, SRI after the contract ended, etc.) without being shut down – the government's approach was to run its own secret program in parallel, rather than stomp out outside work. In a similar vein, if QCAP intrigues agencies, they might attempt to **recruit you or reproduce your results in-house** rather than impede your civilian efforts. If you were approached for collaboration by, say, DARPA or IARPA, you could consider terms that allow you to continue publishing (both agencies do fund unclassified research in academia). You could also insist on an **open science covenant** if any grants were offered, citing that broad validation is actually beneficial for security (to avoid false positives). Should someone hint that you ought to "keep this quiet," you have the option – as the cryptographers did – to politely refuse and shine light on the situation if necessary.

- **Have a Plan for Public Communication:** Since you intend to inform the public and encourage replication, think about how to present your findings in a way that garners scientific interest and public support. If truly groundbreaking results emerge, media coverage is likely. Having a clear, rational narrative (avoid hype, but also articulate the significance plainly) will help ensure the work is seen as legitimate science. Widespread public interest can be a buffer against suppression. It's much harder to bury a discovery once it's on the front page of *Science* or being discussed in *Nature News*. Additionally, if you fear an invention secrecy order for some application of QCAP, an established tactic is **pre-publication by disclosure**: essentially, publish the concept in a technical report or online archive *before* filing any patent. This immediately places it in the public domain, after which a secrecy order cannot retroactively muzzle it. You sacrifice patent rights, but you gain freedom to discuss it. Since your goal is knowledge propagation, that trade-off is likely acceptable.

In summary, **under current U.S. policy, QCAP research doesn't neatly fall under any predefined "forbidden" category** – it's not nuclear technology, not a weapons system blueprint, and not (yet) a proven military device. It would more likely be viewed as a potentially *emerging* dual-use area if it shows success. Agencies might monitor it, or even quietly support it, but overt suppression would require believing that public knowledge of QCAP gravely threatens national security. That bar is high and historically invoked sparingly (even the radical idea of quantum computation was openly pursued in the 1990s despite its future code-breaking potential, with controls focusing on specific hardware exports later on [21]). By **staying transparent, ethical, and engaged with the broader scientific community**, you maximize the chances that your work will be seen as legitimate fundamental research rather than a dangerous wildcard. Should any national security officials become concerned, you will be in a strong position to argue (and demonstrate) that openness *strengthens* security in this case – for example, if mind-related quantum effects are real, wouldn't it be safer for multiple labs to study them out in the open, rather than one country covertly weaponizing it?

Conclusion

Does the scalar Ψ-field QCAP hypothesis have genuine national security implications? Potentially yes – if validated, it could revolutionize aspects of quantum information and even challenge our understanding of consciousness in ways an adversary might exploit. Historical analogs show that the U.S. security apparatus takes interest in any unconventional method that might confer an advantage, be it psychic spying or advanced cryptography. However, until there's tangible evidence of QCAP's efficacy, it's likely to be treated as intriguing science on the fringe, not an immediate security concern. Your stance of **open publication and international collaboration** is not only scientifically commendable but also serves as protection against unwarranted classification. Current U.S. policy tends to support fundamental research freedom [16] – and while mechanisms like the Invention Secrecy Act and export controls exist for bona fide national security threats, these are balanced by pushback from the scientific community and legal principles favoring openness. By following best practices – no secret developments, voluntary ethical oversight, consultation on legal questions, and a clear public interest mission – you can significantly **mitigate the risk of your work being swept behind closed doors**. In fact, your commitment to transparency and replication can be your strongest defense: once knowledge is freely circulating, the conversation shifts from "Can this be suppressed?" to "How can we all understand and manage this new discovery responsibly?"

In conclusion, **QCAP could be dual-use if it works as described**, and it's wise to remain aware of national security lenses on your research. But by preemptively adopting an *open-science, ethically conscious approach*, you make a compelling case that this is not a covert capability to be hidden, but rather a fundamental breakthrough to be shared. This not only aligns with your goal of paradigm correction but also practically reduces the chance of misclassification or suppression. The history of science and security teaches that openness, when possible, is the best antidote to misunderstanding. As long as you navigate the patent and collaboration issues with eyes open, you stand a good chance of advancing QCAP openly – and if it truly is a revolutionary paradigm, engaging the world in its exploration rather than letting it be bottled up as a state secret.

Sources:

- Pelican's Perspective (Justin T.) – *"Quantum Consciousness Amplification via a Scalar Ψ Field: An Interdisciplinary Theoretical Framework."* (2025) – [Excerpt on QCAP exceeding Tsirelson's bound and preserving no-signaling][29].
- Ibid. – [Discussion of how a conscious observer's coherence could breach the CHSH inequality limit S = 2.828 under specific conditions][29].
- *The Washington Post* – report by E. Nakashima & A. Schaffer (Dec 16, 2021) on U.S. blacklisting of Chinese Academy of Military Medical Sciences for "brain-control" tech [indicating U.S. views emerging biotech/neuro tech as security threat][3].
- **Stargate Project** – U.S. Army/DIA psychic research unit (1977–1995), later declassified [demonstrating precedent for classifying consciousness-related research for intel use][14][6].
- Federation of American Scientists, *Invention Secrecy Act* analysis – notes that secrecy orders often lack clear standards and are imposed even on marginal cases [highlighting risk of over-classification for "slightest threats"][7].
- Fischer et al., "AI Policy Levers" (2021) – recounting how NSA invoked the Invention Secrecy Act in 1978 to block private-sector cryptography patents, then backed down after public outcry [showing open publication as a defense][10].

- Ibid. – overview of U.S. export control history, e.g. dual-use regulation of encryption under AECA/EAR [analogous to how novel quantum tech could be controlled][27].
- **National Quantum Initiative** news (2024) – announcement of new U.S. export controls on quantum computing technologies [demonstrating current policy focus on quantum dual-use items][16].

---

1 2 3 4 5 Quantum Consciousness Amplification via a Scalar Ψ Field_ An Interdisciplinary Theoretical Framework.pdf
file://file-D44ysm1Un5rCJgWcaXqzXB

6 7 22 Stargate Project (U.S. Army unit) - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stargate_Project_(U.S._Army_unit)

8 China's Academy of Military Medical Sciences, 11 other institutes added to U.S. entity list - The Washington Post
https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2021/12/16/china-entity-list-military-institute-added/

9 10 11 12 13 14 15 23 Invention Secrecy Act - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Invention_Secrecy_Act

16 17 18 19 20 AI Policy Levers A Review of the U.S. Government's tools to shape AI research, development, and deployment – Fischer et al
https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/AI-Policy-Levers-A-Review-of-the-U.S.-Governments-tools-to-shape-AI-research-development-and-deployment-%E2%80%93-Fischer-et-al.pdf

21 Department of Commerce Releases Export Controls on Quantum Technologies - National Quantum Initiative
https://www.quantum.gov/department-of-commerce-releases-export-controls-on-quantum-technologies/