

Communal Blind Spots / Intuitive Iteration

Richard Moody Jr.

777 Treadlemire Road, Berne, NY 12023

e-mail: slmrea@aol.com

Although paranormal activity is speculative, supranormal behavior is demonstrable. I define supranormal activities as any activity beyond any known level of intellectual proficiency. Using a process called Intuitive Iteration (II) it has been for me to document intellectual levels of proficiency that may require a rethinking of some accepted concepts. First of all we must reject Einstein's classic observation, "Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results." This is a failure on the part of Einstein to understand the best way to create paradigm shifts.

In chess in the span of two tournaments I lost 20 games in a row against weak opponents, yet using Intuitive Iteration, I have been able to write three critically acclaimed chess books on chess theory. Also, when my game is "on", I can routinely get winning positions against the strongest computers in the world, winning four games and drawing dozens of games. Against human opponents I have gotten my games published in top professional journals, and, in the only game against a Grandmaster, one of the strongest players in the country, I got a winning attack only to accept a draw in a superior position.

To achieve this level of activity I use intuitive iteration, a process I described in the Mensa Bulletin March 1995 [1]. The article is called, "Communal Blind Spot Theory". Think of this as the ultimate in reliance on intuition as a research tool fully equal to facts and logic. Intuition is a separate and distinct way we view reality from facts and logic. For true wisdom to occur we must integrate intuition with facts, logic and experience. It is my belief that if my methodology of intuitive iteration could be understood and utilized by as few as one scientist out of a hundred, we would see a return to American Exceptionalism as these techniques, if implemented correctly, would result in the doubling of the number of paradigm shifts within 10 years over and above that which would occur in the absence of these methods.

American Exceptionalism needs to be revamped. We must first, and foremost, reject the teachings of Albert Einstein that the sign of insanity is doing, "the same thing over and over and expecting different results." What he didn't recognize is that it is also a great way to create paradigm shifts. An example of what my research methodology permits me to do is to find wildflowers on the most heavily traveled paths in Central Park in New York City that no one has seen before. The paper on this topic was called, "Communal Blind Spot Theory" [1]. These are the precursors to paradigm shifts. "Is creativity nothing more complicated than getting a powerful intuitive reaction and sticking with it through adversity, i.e. logical and factual rejection?" *ibid*.

Intuition is a separate and distinct way we view reality from facts and logic. It is a "knowing" without "knowing" how or why. Thus a scientific "gut" reaction is just as valid as facts and logic. Using a procedure I have perfected called Intuitive Iteration, (II), I have trained myself to discover and publish paradigm shifts in geology, physics, astronomy, chess, etc.

Suppose as a cancer researcher I think that a particular amino acid may impact on the ability of the body to recognize and attack a cancer virus with the help of a particular gene therapy. I try several experiments and get a null result; most researchers would abandon the research thinking it is a dead end. Using II this is only a minor setback. If my "gut" tells me I am missing something, I tweak the experimental design and repeat it six months later. Six months later after another negative result, I will iterate and try another tweaking and another experiment; I continue doing this until either the facts and logic change (from my experience this is always the case) or my intuition changes.

Guaranteed I will find that the amino acid does indeed do exactly what my gut told me it would do, which I never would have discovered without II.

If as few as one scientist out of 100 could use my research methodology of intuitive iteration effectively, within ten years, I predict that we would see a doubling of the rate at which paradigm shifts occurred over and above that which would occur in the absence of these methods.

A second example is what I call supranormal behavior is what we often call prodigies. These are intellectual accomplishments that are so much beyond normal accomplishments that we must invoke some unknown process. They commonly occur in chess and music. What is the connection?

While I am not familiar with prodigies in music, I have experienced what could be called supranormal behavior, which is the capacity to see the "obvious" when no one else can see it. My talent in chess varies from incredibly weak to World Championship level in the middlegame. The only reason I don't win more games against world class computers is because I don't know how to win "won" positions. I.e. I am lousy at the final stage of the game, the endgame. When my game is on, I literally do not think and just put the pieces and pawns on the squares where they belong. When this happens it is not all uncommon for the computer to use over an hour when I might use just two to three minutes.

In one odds game I gave a stronger computer nine moves in a row at the start of the game and a minimum of one hour per move. I checkmated the computer using a totally new approach in the opening unlike anything that has ever existed before. My

intuition told me the starting position nine moves down was playable for me because I knew the limitations of the computer. Simply put I "tortured" the computer by rendering its program useless. The computer might have assumed I was playing checkers, because it took the computer a good ten moves to realize I was playing chess.

One example of a communal blind spot that I discovered is one in what is called the, "Berliner Gambit". It was studied exhaustively by Dr. Berliner Correspondence World Champion, with analysis by Hitech, then the strongest computer in the world, by World Champion Garry Kasparov and tens of thousands of weaker players. I found three different wins for White on just one move and the computer Fritz 12 in just one second. How could two world champions miss four winning strategies for decades?

IM Sophia Polgar had one of the top five performances in chess ever recorded, in one tournament. The only thing different about her behavior was that she consumed an enormous amount of food without gaining weight. I would suggest that her brain was consuming as much energy as full-sized woman would con-

sumer for her entire body. I experienced a similar event when I was highly creative.

GM Judit Polgar beat a Master in blind fold chess at age 5 and Sammy Reshevsky was giving simultaneous events at age 7, where he would take on and beat as many as 20 strong players all at the same time.

A weak computer I had also exhibited supranormal behavior over the span of an entire game. It played the entire game beyond World Championship level, based on the fact that it gave me a yardstick into its thought process, where I simply had to count moves without needing an analysis. The cause is unclear.

Why supranormal conduct in chess is so common is unclear. I can only suggest that it is an entirely different way that the human brain processes information.

References

- [1] Richard Moody, "Communal Blind Spot Theory", *Mensa Bulletin* (Mar 1995).