Here are the projects which I want to undertake, some of which will require little money, and some of which will require a lot of money:

1) I want to write a book offering up what amounts to a cultural template for the survival of the human race. As I have argued, human culture solves four basic problems: those of meaning formation, truth formation, the distribution of power, and the distribution of wealth. In each of these areas progress is both possible and necessary, and I have what I believe to be original ideas in each area.

As an example, Goodness is my proposed solution to the modern dissolution of meaning.

The conception of paradigmatic flanking (not on the site, but to be explicated at some point) is my contribution to the philosophy of science. To that I will append some reminders on what does and does not constitute philosophically rigorous scientific thinking, and some thoughts on epistemology. I believe my conception of Motology (my word to create an alternative to ontology) is quite useful here in helping avoid perceptual errors.

Liberalism is my proposed political system. We have it, of course, but both the system in the United States and more obviously around the world need a lot of work.

Finally, in economics my argument will be that monetary policy needs to be ended. That series--to which I will append commentaries on the Great Depression, the crisis of 2008, and thoughts on the IMF and World Bank--is already more or less fleshed out here.

This is my first project, one already in progress.

2) I want to develop a system to consistently get Electronic Voice

Phenomenon. Functionally, this amounts to a desire to prove the existence of the after-life to any and all skeptics. This is of course an old project, to which Edison and others devoted a lot of time.

Technology has developed quite a bit, and I have a talent for problem solving. Once I focus on a topic, it expands, and I quickly develop skill.

As I see the topic currently, people get garbled sounds all the time, but it is never clear if they could not have arisen in the environment, at least not to me. This is particularly the case when people use radios to provide static. Many of these alleged transmissions are also so indistinct that they are arguably not voices at all.

What we need to do is eliminate alternative explanations. We need to approach this thing scientifically. I am not looking for neat effects, but consistency across time and space.

As I see it, we need a sealed environment, from which external noises are eliminated, and we need speech clarity. Optimally, we also need real time processing, such that non-random alterations in the recording devices are instantly noted and displayed. If that were possible, then one could literally have a conversation with a ghost.

My provisional design for such a device is a wooden box with two chambers. In one chamber I place a white noise unit. To dampen the sound, that chamber is covered in acoustical foam, and there is a small opening to the other chamber, where the recording device will be. My thought is to create truly random noise in the frequencies used for speech as a sort of raw material for spirits, to dampen that sound so that a voice can be heard over it, and then to hook the microphone up to GUI-based software that is calibrated to tag and note any and all deviations from the white noise baseline.

I have not built or tested this device, but I do understand acoustics quite well, and believe that something like this will work.

3) I want to cure cancer. In my studied view, the eradication of field based theories from explanations of what constitutes life is both empirically indefensible, and practically devastating to clarity with respect to systemic biological "errors" like cancer. We've been "fighting" it for many decades, and have made little progress. Surgery is still the most effective treatment by far, and would be equally effective with no cancer research whatever.

As I see it, and has been shown by under-funded and often criticized researchers in places like China, Japan, Germany, and Russia, the human body is constantly reconstituted by a field which is at least in part characterized by coherent light. Cancer is a part of the body which has lost contact with the field. It has lost its identity, and rather than growing intelligently, grows without purpose. We can drop virtual chemical or radioactive bombs on it, but they are imprecise, and more importantly still amount to surgically removing the now-stupid flesh.

What ought to happen is a renewal of transparency to light. The darkness needs to be filled with light. There are several ways I can see this happening.

My initial thought was to use biofeedback, such that some form of loop is established between the patient and their light field, such that they can learn to consciously control and direct light. You put them in an absolutely dark room--a booth, in my conception--that has receptors capable of capturing the photons in the frequencies in which they are emitted. You could put earphones on the person, and have a click every time a photon is received. The task is to visualize shining, and seeing if the field is effected. I have no idea if this will work, but to the extent of my awareness, has not been tried.

It is also empirically the case that when people are bombarded with light, the body continues to emit that light for some time in a non-linear way (this factual finding is one of the primary arguments for viewing the light emissions as coherent; no one denies the existence of the light emission, and argue rather about their significance or lack thereof). People could be bombarded with light that goes beyond the visible spectrum, well into the ultraviolet frequencies where biophotons seem to cohere. This could be done for some time. We could figure out what frequencies healthy tissues emit on, then target them. We could shine the light, then use the biofeedback system. You could alternate back and forth between shining the light, and the patient trying to reemit it more skillfully.

Again, I am quick on the uptake, and adapt to situations with skill once I focus on them. This project is by far the most expensive, since it will require both specialized lights and specialized receptors.

I will add that since I believe our consciousness survives death that cancer is for me not that big a problem. The larger issue that this research is intended to address is the nature of life and health.

It is my considered view that Intelligent Design happens a hundred times a second in every lifeform in existence anywhere in the universe. Your life, who you are, is like a television screen that appears continuous, but which is really reconstituted (or used to be, in older projection systems; I don't know how flat screens work) continually, based upon a non-local signal. There is intelligence in our very existence, now, as I view the matter. Understanding this will enable us not just to cure cancer, but likely many other diseases.

4) I want to start what will amount to a church, but one with limitless potential variations. My thought is to encourage people to create places for social communion, learning, and support, and to do so without the traditional supports of orthodox religion. The orienting theme will be

Goodness, and as such the only non-negotiable principles will be the rejection of self pity, the cultivation of perserverance, and a love of learning of all sorts, from introspection to foreign languages.

So many people are lonely. So many people are lost, and confused and in despair. This is because our Meaning systems have failed us. We have been led by stupid, weak, and wicked people. I always picture Jean-Paul Sartre when looking at the large failures we saw in the 20th Century, that continue now, but he of course had many competitors.

I propose we can use as a symbol the Telearchic Cross (described in my introductory essay on Goodness). My intention is to have my first meeting in a bar, since I have found people tell the truth there. I can literally envision "church" services consisting in groups singing and drinking together into the wee hours of the night. If it's innocent and happy, then it's Good. Goodness is the point, so this fits neatly.

I also envision "debates" on various issues of political and social importance. The essence of a good society is that it is self-organizing on a local level. Structured interactions between people of differing views is essential. I don't like debate, per se, since it has the appearance--and generally the reality--of agonistic combat.

My vision is something like Edward de Bono's Six Thinking Hats method, but a bit more organic. I see truth formation as a sort of artistic creation, and visualize "debate" as a sort of communal performance. I'll have to work out the details, but see people writing their thoughts on paper walls, and literally comparing notes.