

THEORY OF MENTAL ASCENDANCY.

Jetsen et. al.

Herein is my life's work reduced to a simple paper. I wanted to reflect on my current and profound efforts within my explanation of the scientific variables because of the profundity connected to my current understanding of the subject. Should you give my efforts and research a chance, they should prove, and hopefully in accordance you will find them, in essence, conforming to your current preconceived notions of the area of inquiry. Delving into the field, we reference a number of precedential studies in elaboration and precession of our current state of affairs, being that this describes the state we find ourselves in today with regards to the research progress we have established in this field. The direction is promising to my perspective and the degree to which I believe we should find direct success in the future is in concordance with the projected required rates of continual success in order to receive continual funding for the project, which is naturally required. But I am proud to present our **Theory of Mental Ascendancy** as is what follows our preliminary discussion.

My contemporaries considered me under a certain affect or state of mind that they described along the lines of **depraved dedication** but if I were to do justice to the intended meaning, I would be forced to consider or infer the sense that they intend to place my objective view into question. Mind you, we don't have conflicts of interest to declare, as is attested twice over by the conclusion of the study, but they considered my spearheading of the project perhaps the direct cause of my evolving mental status quo. As I had, in previous trials before the beginning of the experiment, subjected myself to unstructured treatment, I understand their predilections or preferences to verify my integrity, but to assure the reader, who is no doubt held in suspense, I regard myself at the height of my faculties and capabilities, though I am forced to provide a concession on the behalf of their request, notwithstanding. This concession is that they had managed to shape the operational definitions they had employed to describe what is known as obsessive compulsive personality disorder with the intention to cram my current state

of mind into a lexical box. If they had to ascribe semantics to the prospects, their closest estimation would be to do me the indignity and disservice of slandering my name with the unflattering complicative title. Nevertheless, what might better describe my state, I cannot say or describe to you in the greatest detail since I do not possess at my disposal a current working definition from any existing work of psychological or institutional merit that provides the proper parameters to classify or quantify the neurological state of being that affects me, or as my contemporaries would label, *afflicts* me.

But they agree in the better part of this work, and for the majority of our conclusions, that the majority of this work and its importance outweighs the potential drawbacks that should have any ostensible effect on the authenticity of our data and our proceedings. With this preliminary out of our hair, I would continue only by impressing again the seriousness of our work. We study cognitive states employing methods that competitors in our field may call crude, but we do not find these comments to have an verifiable contribution, rather they belie the propensity of our work and our discoveries. In opposition of traditional or novel conventional values concerning neurological study, we neglect to employ machines such as the EEG, the CAT scan, or other instruments that could measure blood flow or monitor cerebral areas, and we have done this out of purpose, to inform our understanding, and our bankroll, with as little intervention as possible. And that strict form of observation is a rather untechnical applied behavioral flavor. Through a form of inner laboratorial observation, we have determined our analysis.

BACKGROUND

You may have, as part of your overview of the work at hand, invested yourself in the consumption of relevant publications regarding our subjects, the mental states that serve our forefront of study, and the theorems and journalistic recordings of one Simon J. S. Hetchins, the foundational figure of this specific area, and originator of the scientific definition of the term “precipital,” but likewise conceiver of the rationale that follows, known as the doctrine of

ascendant minds. “Once the mind gains a focused concentration on a subject of impossible conception, it can, provided the adequate level of stimulatory and pharmacological duress, achieve the conditions which we name the enigmatic state of ***Mental Ascendancy***,” which will serve as our subject, as aforementioned and likely a titular factor, (S. J. S. Hetchins et. al. 19671). In continuity to this doctrine, we resurface the works of Howard M. Kissinger in his search for the related factors. Notice, before we continue, that Hetchins mentions pharmacological influences as a potential informative influence, which is defined as a factor related to the establishment of the necessary conditions of the state of Mental Ascendancy to be constructed. We point out this wording “pharmacological influences,” because such influences operate on a similar modus operandi to the cerebral processes of neurotransmitters when binding to the receptacles in the synapse, they take on respective agonistic or antagonistic qualities dependant on the current active process at interplay. But Kissinger posited his expansion of the fundamental doctrine in his famous experiment utilizing children.²

As an initial recount to provide the foundation for the timeliness of our own experiment, we will, in brief, relate his own past constructions regarding the previous study. From a sample size of fifty-four children suffering from different states of mental disability, he selected ten to employ mental rotation, picturization, and conceptualization upon a conceivable subject in order to record self-reported mental states as a control basis. As a disclaimer, while self-reported measures are not most commonly considered a method of ABA procedures, we recognized the fact and ask the designated minds that do indulge this paper and relish the confirmation or defamation of our results not to dismiss these methodologies too quickly—as these were merely antecedents, and we should proceed promptly not to replicate only strictly psychological basis of study, after outlining these first preliminary trials (much of which are, and were at the time, intended to establish a relative baseline), and move onto more concrete measures. Concerning

¹ See S. J. S. Hutchins’ ***Notes on the Mental Molecularity Project and the Effects of Impossible Conception with Respect to Palliative Hallucinogens and Countercarginogens (1967)***.

² See Kissinger’s ***The Direct Conceptualization Conundrum (1972)***.

the aforementioned psychological experiment, of the subjects selected and subjected to the experimental process, five were provided a five milligram dosage of particle C to study their bodily states from external observation while the other five received no treatment. Kissinger then employed fourteen of the subjects for the direct experimental group, to subject themselves to mental rotation of the inconceivable concept while also under the influence of the substance in question. Because particle C retained at least three differentiated strains, each in separate stages of informed success (provided through the previous utilization on animal subjects), five of the subjects received particle C-1, five received C-2, and the remaining four received C-3 respectively. He selected another fifteen to endure the same treatment but to practice simple picturization of the counterintuitive concept, and the latter group, as a basis of comparison, worked on the more direct and untailored method for conceptualization of the incomprehensible subject under the same control conditions.

His experiment is known for the stark subversion of his hypothetical research questions. For one, he expected the mental rotation experimental group to suffer the greatest level of distress from the process, but he was surprised, and as were his contemporaries, when he was to discover that the minds of theirs remained intact, but were instead, when subjected to the report segment, forced to spinning themselves endlessly, without an end to the cyclical procession. They described a dizziness to the spinning of the mind, but an acceptance and understanding of the necessary and pressing conditions at hand; the prescience involved, for them the continuation for fear of losing memory of the subject, but also a kind of mental gravity or magnetism—that they underwent the sensation of being drawn toward the conception.

The caveat remained that, while this process was deemed to be a subsequent effect of having already conceived the subject, Kissinger was forced to conclude the likelihood that one could potentially practice mental rotation of the subject before having made an actual conception of it beforehand. The same could be said of the picturization group, though there was a more detrimental outcome in the case of the said group. They were expected to rejoin the

population and await further trials, but many were left in disorientated states that subjected them to hospital stays or to euthanization in the cases of those who exhibited hysteria. In the case of the mentally disabled patients who entered hospice care, a number of them later dropped into various comatose states before a few of those who fell under declined, and still a few of those who therefore received rehabilitative support succumbed entirely, this accounted to around two or three in total, as one of which was mentally declared brain dead while the others suffered strokes in quick succession.

For the conception group, he was met with widespread disaster in terms of vital and ethical integrity, although experimentally, promising results. He discovered that depending on the specific strain of particle C involved, that each respective patient would last longer with their endurance of the substance and likewise with their endurance of the attempts at conceiving the incomprehensible subject. He found that minds injected with strain #3 saw significantly longer survival periods before they too fell under with violent ramifications. The first group saw the worst of it, however, their heads bursting like bright ripe melons in an industrial microwave chamber activated for a number of hours. He was then able to perfect the substance and employ it to all three subsections of his experimental group for trial 2, but saw little additional success. He attempted adjustments before trial 3 but saw a reversal of his previous progress. He had to make temporary conclusions before he could reassess the experiment, write out a report, and form another experimental pitch, but by the time the second experiment came about, many contributors and contemporaries alike collectively deemed his work not only questionable in terms of ethical approvability, but also, an obsolete figment of the past, a dead field direction, and so the work went through with a fraction of the monetary support and manpower, all with little expectation. He continued with his questions and process but endured a skeleton crew of his previous research team before he could even establish a hold on the space required for the experiment or establish his necessary resources and gather the trial implements along with a new batch of participants and subjects, as well as a new conception. Ultimately, he intended to

run over one hundred trials, but his desires were far too ambitious. While he eliminated a number of possible molecular structures for the needed compound that could theoretically produce the results he desired, he never much improved upon his version of the C-3 chemical strain, and he also never discovered a key implement or a method of prolonging the integrity of the subjects. This saw an end to his research, which is why all his reports from this second experiment are unpublished documentations.

Having recovered the reports, however, we took from the named contemporary of his, Peyton N. Clarity, who worked with his partner and spouse Elaina L. Clarity, with research that they constructed from the plagiarized notes of Kissinger. Their advances likewise remarkably resemble Ishaki's famous ***Experiment with the Numericals of Conception-Drugs***, a translation of the original Japanese publication from 1981.³ Interestingly, their translation fails to account for the transitional period between the state of potential ascendancy back to resting, instead ascribing literary characteristics to the supposed operational definition that they employ in the experiment. Their definition differs from ours in one key degree, but we will elaborate in later segments of our discussion. It appears in full as follows.

The delineation of the essential isotope profilagates the essential effectualisms in essence of evanescent nascent quality dependent reproductions. The services that abnegate lexical disservices and abrogate proselytizationary statutes of lawful and willful indignationary residualisms in proportion to graphed platitudes and syllogistic neurological electrochemical aromatic arsenal pseudo-somatosensory cortical and fractal structures with regards to boisterous aspidoxitane and exogenetic phosphates.

This spells the abstract doom for the loss of estrogen in the human genome. When it applies to breakneck existential crises, we can recognize the natural and physiological pattern in the well of probabilities. It is unfortunate the degree to which the scientific method is here sacrificed for unverifiable, even somewhat poetic, indirect and subjective machinations for measurement procedures. So we are forced to begin our analysis after

³ This experiment saw the collection of what the Clarity couple refer to as “negative ideation reactants,” (1998).

the plagiarized account with the conclusion that it lasted a number of years without reprieve or recognition. We aim not to recreate the second experiment, but rather, to exacerbate the current issue at hand. To reproduce the necessary conditions but not the subjective or optional ones. Our chief horticulturist recently came by a substance that we have included in our various supplementary and mimicking compounds. We intend to have only the subjects of the conception group available to focus on progress in that area, intending to reach mental ascendancy. We are more than ready to achieve an answer where Kissinger could previously not on account of his withdrawn funding and in light of recent public political events that has likewise deemed the pursuit of this research as needed.

[UNDER ACTIVE CONSIDERATION]