

INDEX of www.optofron.com

PROPOSAL FOR SPECTACULAR BREAKTHROUGHS IN YOUR BUSINESS.....	2
A READER OF THIS PROPOSAL WROTE:.....	4
Answer:.....	4
My objective.....	4
My original plan for giving my knowledge of these answers to humanity.....	5
Forces which can influence the growth of the acceptance by people in society, that these answers describe reality.....	7
My current plan for giving my knowledge of these answers to humanity.....	8
THE DISCOVERY OF THE ROLE THE “Phenomenon Objective” PLAYS IN THE FUNCTIONING OF THE HUMAN BRAIN.....	10
FORSEEABLE BENEFITS.....	13
Leadership.....	13
Psychiatry.....	13
Brain Research.....	14
History.....	15
Future.....	16
Artificial Intelligence.....	17
History.....	17
Future.....	18
Replacing a human by a robot.....	19
ABOUT.....	21
Background A: What is meant by “resistance to change”?.....	22
Background B: Making a “concrete” objective out of an “abstract” objective.....	24
Background C: What is an “objective”?.....	26
Background D: The “ Phenomenon Objective”.....	27

PROPOSAL FOR SPECTACULAR BREAKTHROUGHS IN YOUR BUSINESS

Real breakthroughs do seldom occur.

Over the course of my (Hans Damen) 40 years' experience of consulting on innovation and policymaking for a wide range of enterprises, I often achieved spectacular results.

Spectacular because all parties were satisfied, little effort had been required and the results had been achieved within a short time.

I decided that it would be beneficial to humanity when I would enable many people to bring about such spectacular results. It therefore had to find out why I could achieve such spectacular results.

I discovered **why**.

That what I discovered **is a breakthrough**. (= the top of a hierarchy of future discoveries).

Following I give some insight in the character of possible breakthroughs and the approach I propose.

The discovery of "electricity" was a breakthrough. This discovery was the mother of many new discoveries.

Entrepreneurs used knowledge of electricity to establish multimillion businesses producing

- light bulbs
- telephones
- radios
- television sets

The discovery of "semiconductors" was a breakthrough. This discovery was the mother of many new discoveries.

Entrepreneurs used knowledge of semiconductors to establish multibillion businesses producing

- personal computers
- internet services
- smartphones
- tablets

My (Hans Damen) discovery of

“the role the phenomenon **objective** plays in the functioning of the human brain”

is a breakthrough. This discovery will be the mother of many new discoveries.

Entrepreneurs will use the knowledge of

“the role the phenomenon **objective** plays in the functioning of the human brain”

to establish multimillion businesses producing applications of this knowledge.

That what I discovered is in fact knowledge on that what is called “**thinking**” and represents a **quantum leap** compared to the current knowledge on that what is called “**thinking**”.

Obviously, this knowledge will play a major role in many discoveries and applications of these discoveries for many years to come.

My answers to the questions

- What is “consciousness”?
- Which role plays the phenomenon “consciousness” in the functioning of the human (animal) brain?
- What is “paying attention to something”?
- Which role plays the phenomenon “paying attention to something” in the functioning of the human brain?
- What is “language”?

have for example been deduced from this knowledge.

In many fields of life such as

- leadership
- psychiatry
- neuroscience
- artificial intelligence

one can actually observe that the absence of this knowledge stands in the way of sometimes spectacular breakthroughs.

I have reasons to believe that some of the many future applications of this knowledge might become the basis of a multibillion business.

I have created this website to bring the existence of this knowledge under the attention of any commercial enterprise

- which can sense in advance that this knowledge could well deliver a breakthrough for its own operations and

- which is able and willing to organise multidisciplinary workshops through which my knowledge can be transferred to its organisation and later to humanity.

I offer such a commercial enterprise the exclusive right to use this knowledge for developing an application of that knowledge within an agreed period of time.

This period will be long enough to give that enterprise a head start on its competitors.

After this period this knowledge will be given to humanity.

A READER OF THIS PROPOSAL WROTE:

“ It is not clear to me what you really want.

Do you want to sell your knowledge or do you want to give this knowledge for free to humanity?

In your website you write that you want to get this knowledge out via “multidisciplinary workshops”.

Why not simply find a prominent writer who is willing to help you to put your knowledge into a book and publish this book?”

Answer:

My objective

My objective is to enable as many people as possible to benefit from

- my knowledge of the answers to the “**basic** questions”:
 - “What is the phenomenon objective?” and
 - “What is the role the phenomenon objective is playing in the functioning of the human brain?”
- from my knowledge of the answers to the “**other** questions”:
 - What is the phenomenon consciousness?
 - Which role plays the phenomenon consciousness in the functioning of the human brain?
 - What is the phenomenon “paying attention to something”?
 - Which role plays the phenomenon paying attention to something in the functioning of the human brain?
 - What is “the phenomenon language”?

which have been deduced from my answers to the “**basic** questions”.
- from my answers to “**new** questions”.

My answers to

- the “**basic** questions” and
- the “**other** questions”

have given me new insights, which have raised “**new** questions”.

Tentative answers to these “**new** questions” have been found.

Answers such as:

“language is based on the way the nerve system in the human eye is constructed”

My original plan for giving my knowledge of these answers to humanity.

This plan consists of the following steps

1. The transfer of my knowledge of the answers to the “**basic** questions” to the members of a workshop.

In the past I have demonstrated many times, that

- I can force each of the members of a workshop to
 - observe a key-aspect of the functioning of his own brain, and
 - to realise that that what he observes is beyond any doubt reality.
- that I can subsequently make him to discover the role the phenomenon objective plays in the functioning of his own brain.

within a few days.

I did this via experiments and Socratic question-and-answer sessions in the setting of a small theatre with a stage, an auditorium and an audience (the members of the workshop) of about 12 people.

They’ll never forget this.

I will do this again and I will ask a professional writer to become a member of that workshop and to make a **booklet** in which he describes his observations on

- that what happened in this workshop and
- on that what happened in his own brain during these question-and-answer sessions.

2. The transfer of my knowledge of the answers to the “**other** questions” and the “**new** questions” to the members of that workshop.

During this second session of that workshop I will show how the answers to

- the “**other** questions” and
- to the “**new** questions”

can be deduced from the answers to the “**basic** questions”.

I will ask the members of that workshop to

- improve,
- complete or
- falsify

the way I deduced

- the “**other** questions” and
- the “**new** questions”

from the answers to the “**basic** questions”.

Seeing

- the content of my answers to
 - the “**other** questions” and
 - the “**new** questions”
 and

- my demand for scrutinizing these answers

the members of that workshop should be specialists from disciplines such as

- Mathematics
- Psychology
- Eye-nerve-specialist
- Philosophy
- Language
- Physics
- Neurology

I will ask the writer

- to describe his observations on that what happened during this second part of the workshop.
- to describe the answers to
 - the “**other** questions” and
 - the “**new** questions”

the members of that workshop agreed upon and

- to combine the answers found during the first and the second session of the workshop into a **book**.

I predict that this part of my plan for giving my knowledge to humanity can be realised in practise.

3. The transfer of the answers to

- the “**basic** questions”,
- the “other questions” and
- the “new questions”

from that workshop to humanity via publishing that book.

That book should get a wide circulation to enable many potential entrepreneurs to read it. Thus enabling some of these entrepreneurs to discover an application of these answers; an application which could benefit many people.

The publishing of that book is not likely to lead to the transfer of the answers to these questions from that workshop to humanity in any near future however.

Simply because

- the answers to the “**basic** questions”
 - describe a particular part of reality and
 - because these answers **contravene the current views** of most people in society on this part of reality **in such an extreme way**, that these answers will incite people in society to start a massif “**resistance to change**” (see also: Background A: Resistance to change) as soon as that book gets out, and
- because history teaches that such a “**resistance to change**” is likely to **delay** the coming into existence of a wide circulation of that book by **many years**

I therefore have abandoned this plan for giving my knowledge to humanity via publishing a book.

Forces which can influence the growth of the acceptance by people in society, that these answers describe reality.

People who want to have my knowledge of the answers to

- the “**basic** questions”
- the “other questions” and
- the “new questions”

must hurry , because my age is 83 (in 2018).

“Resistance to change” by people in society will manifest itself in society as soon as these answers to

- the “**basic** questions”
- the “other questions” and
- the “new questions”

are published.

“Resistance to change” is a force, which will **drastically curb the growth of the acceptance** by people in society, that these answers describe reality.

The “**urge of an entrepreneur to earn a lot of money**” is a force which can be used to **stimulate the growth of the acceptance** by people in society, that these answers describe reality.

This force can be unleashed by **selling** these answers to a commercial enterprise, which believes that it can discover, develop, produce and sell applications of these answers.

The commercial enterprise which bought these answers will **boost** the growth of the acceptance of these answers

- by trying as hard as it can to get a return on its investment in
 - the purchase of these answers, and
 - in the costs for discovering, developing, producing and selling applications of these answers.**as soon as possible**, and
- by showing to people in society, that these answers describe reality, by showing that it can earn a lot of money with applications of these answers.

While considering the effects of these forces it becomes clear, that the transfer of my knowledge of these answers to humanity has the greatest chance of success when this transfer is done **via selling this knowledge to a commercial enterprise**.

My current plan for giving my knowledge of these answers to humanity.

This plan consists of five steps.

1. The sale of the answers to
 - the “**basic** questions”,
 - the “other questions” and
 - the “new questions”**to a commercial enterprise**, which
 - can sense in advance that this knowledge is likely to deliver a breakthrough for its own operations and
 - which is able and willing to organise multidisciplinary workshops through which my knowledge can be transferred to its organisation and later to humanity
 - which intends to
 - discover, develop and produce applications of these answers and

- to sell these applications in world markets.
 - which will allow the publication of the book, presenting the answers transferred to these workshops, as soon as it has established a commercially viable application of these answers.
2. The transfer of my knowledge of the answers to the “**basic** questions” to the members of a workshop, organised by that commercial enterprise, will be conducted as described in the “original plan”.
- A prominent writer – who should be a member of that workshop – will be asked to put the answers transferred to the members of that workshop into a **booklet**.
3. The transfer of my knowledge of the answers to
- the “**other** questions” and
 - the “**new** questions”
- to the members of that workshop will be conducted as described in the “original plan”.
- The writer will be asked to combine the answers found during the first and this second session of that workshop into a **book**.
4. The commercial enterprise will discover, develop, produce and sell an application of the knowledge of the answers to these questions.
- It will have the exclusive right to use this knowledge for an agreed period of time. This period will be long enough to give that enterprise a head start on its competitors.
5. After that period the enterprise will allow the transfer of
- the “**basic** questions”,
 - the “other questions” and
 - the “new questions”
- to humanity via publishing that book.
- The growth of the acceptance by people in society, that this book describes reality, will be helped by
- **the reputation of the commercial success** of the application, discovered, produced and sold by that commercial enterprise and
 - by **the content of that book**.

The growth of the circulation of that book will hardly be hampered by the “resistance to change” mentioned before, because

- the commercial success of these applications will demonstrate that these answers describe reality and not some theory and
- because the “**resistance to change – lobby**” in society will have few arguments against the existence of reality.

THE DISCOVERY OF THE ROLE THE “Phenomenon Objective” PLAYS IN THE FUNCTIONING OF THE HUMAN BRAIN.

In more than a thousand individual cases I tried to guide a person to discover:

- the objective, or
- the aim, or
- the design, or
- the purpose or
- the object, or
- the end, or
- the cause, or
- the goal, or
- the target, or
- the policy, or
- the intention, or
- the intent, or
- the mission, or
- et cetera

... which he wanted to adopt as:

- his objective, or
- his aim, or
- his design, or
- his purpose or
- et cetera

Many (though not all) individuals discovered what they really wanted, and they gave my efforts on average a rating of more than 9 out of 10.

In an industrial setting, and many times, I lead a multidisciplinary team to [make a new concrete objective for an organisation out of an existing abstract objective \(Background B\)](#). Indeed this process was so powerful that several times a whole group had a EUREKA moment.

The new concrete objective was usually adopted as **the new** objective for that organisation.

These organisations gave no ratings but often recommended me to other organisations.

I have been successful in this work and many people have told me that they believe my success was due to a special talent

However I believed that this success was not in fact due to any special talent, but that I was “on to something” that would enable many other people to achieve similar successes.

So I decided to focus my attention on:

- finding out why (...!) I was so successful in helping organisations to find a **new concrete** objective on the basis of an existing abstract objective, and
- on ultimately publishing my findings so as to enable many other people to reap similar success in future.

To understand why I was so successful I had to find an answer to the question “[What is an objective?](#)” ([Background C](#))

No answer to this question could to be found in literature.

So I had to discover:

- the description of [the “Phenomenon Objective”](#) ([Background D](#)),
- the fact that the “Phenomenon Objective” is a particular **state of** the human **mind**, and
- the fact that the “Phenomenon Objective” plays a **central role** in the conscious part of that what is called “thinking”.

I presented to about a hundred different groups of people:

- my description of the “Phenomenon Objective”, and
- my description of the role the “Phenomenon Objective” plays in the conscious part of that what is called “thinking”.

After some experiments and discussion, the people in these groups agreed that my description of the “Phenomenon Objective” does indeed describe that which they could observe in their own minds.

On the basis of the discovery of the **central role** that the “Phenomenon Objective” plays in the conscious part of that what is called “thinking”, I found answers to the following questions over the course of the last 40 years:

- What is the phenomenon “consciousness” ?
- Which role does the phenomenon “consciousness” play in the functioning of the human brain?
- What is the phenomenon “paying attention to something” ?
- Which role plays the phenomenon “paying attention to something” in the functioning of the human brain?
- What is the phenomenon “cognising” (=somebody’s act to put information into his memory) ?
- What is the phenomenon “recognising” ?
- What is the phenomenon “language” ?

- Which role plays the phenomenon language in the functioning of the human brain ?
- How are the visual “cognition-marks” born out of a picture projected on the retina in an eye?

The answers I found to these questions are concise.... and precise.

FORSEEABLE BENEFITS

Of course I can't oversee all consequences of a better understanding of the functioning of the human (animal) brain.

But some benefits can be foreseen.

Leadership

Judged by the almost endless stream of books, journals and congresses on management I have monitored the last 40 years, no satisfactory answer has been found to the questions:

- "Can I lead people ?" - put by individuals, and
- "Will that person be able to lead people ?" - put by organisations.

The answers to these questions are:

- leading a person is "to make sure that that person adopts a particular objective",
- one can't "find out whether a person has adopted a particular objective" when one does not know the answer to the question "What is an objective ?",
- an answer to the question "What is an objective ?" requires an answer to the question "What is the description of the Phenomenon Objective ?"

It has been demonstrated that when a person UNDERSTANDS the answer to the question "What is the description of the Phenomenon Objective ?" that person is likely to become a successful leader (when he has some talent for it).

Psychiatry

One does not need to have an education in diagnosing and curing mental diseases to know that somebody's feeling of having no objective in life can be an important aspect of the mental health of that person.

A person who attempts to cure a patient who experiences his life as meaningless aimless, purposeless, et cetera should at least have the answer to the question "what is the description of the Phenomenon Objective ?"

Furthermore it would be helpful for him to know the answer to the question "which role plays an objective in the functioning of the human brain?".

Brain Research

Somebody's observations on that what occurs in his own head can be "objective" or "subjective".

"Objective" = sticking to the facts; not influenced by own feelings or prejudices; not "subjective".

"Subjective" = belonging to one individual subject; relating to, departing from, belonging to the contemplating "I" only.

Relentless striving for objectivity, while:

- building a theory
- scrutinizing that theory, and
- testing that what that theory predicts via measurements.....

was the key to the spectacular achievements of physicists during the last centuries.

In an almost pathological urge to reap similar achievements, neuroscientists:

- banned the idea that somebody's observations on that what occurs in his own head can be objective, and
- adopted the idea that objective information on that what happens in the head of a person can only be achieved via measurements..... with "machines".

Somebody's observations on that what happens in his own head **can be objective** however.

Seeing these facts, it is most likely that:

- very many observations on the functioning of the human brain have been made over the course of the last decades, and
- that the results of these observations have not reached (or been acknowledged by) the community of neuroscientists.

This might explain why no theory seems to exist about what happens in the brain of a human being.

History

In the mid 1980's Benjamin Libet designed an experiment in which:

- a test person was asked to push a button, and
- in which something of that what happened in the head of that test-person was measured in the form of an electro encephalogram ("machine"....!)

Such a test person was told to be free to choose the point in time at which he wanted to push that button.

Furthermore he was asked to indicate the point in time at which he became aware of his urge/ intention to push that button.

The following was recorded:

- The time passed between:
 - the point in time at which the test-person became aware of his urge/ intention to push the button, and
 - the point in time at which the button pushing was realised
 used to be about 0.2 seconds.
- The time passed between:
 - the point in time at which his brain activities, involving the button pushing, started according to the electro encephalogram (EEG), and
 - the point in time at which the button pushing was realised
 used to be on average 0.5 seconds.

This means that brain activities to prepare for this button pushing were measured to start 0.3 seconds before the test person became aware of his urge/ intent to push that button.

This leads to the conclusion that the decision of that test person to push that button could:

- either have been taken during the 0.3 seconds **before** he became aware of his urge/ intent to push that button,
- or could have been taken during the 0.2 seconds **after** he became aware of his urge/ intent to push that button

Not Libet, but several other neuroscientists:

- decided that the decision to push the button was taken **before** the test person became aware of his urge/ intent to push that button,
- concluded from this that such a thing as "Free Will" does not exist, and
- wrote bestsellers with titles like "Free Will does not exist".

Future

Now, 20 years after the experiments of Benjamin Libet with the “machine” EEC and 10 years after similar experiments by John-Dylan Haynes with the “machine” fMRI, prominent neuroscientists admit that they can’t distinguish between:

- brain activities “preparing for” a physical action of a test person, and
- other brain activities of that test person on their fMRI “machines”.

It would therefore be helpful for neuroscientists to know my answers to the questions:

- What is the description of the “Phenomenon Objective” ?
- Which role does the Phenomenon Objective play in the functioning of the human (animal) brain ?
- What is the phenomenon “consciousness” ?
- Which role does the phenomenon “consciousness” play in the functioning of the human (animal) brain ?
- What is the phenomenon “paying attention to something” ?
- Which role does the phenomenon “paying attention to something” play in the functioning of the human (animal) brain?

These answers are likely to:

- enable neuroscientists to understand what they see on their “machines”, and/ or
- tell them what they should see on their machines, and/ or
- tell them what kind of machine should be developed for them to be able to see what they should see - but don’t see on their machines these days.

Artificial Intelligence

Garry Kasparov writes in his book “**Deep Thinking: Where Machine Intelligence Ends and Human Creativity Begins**” (p. 75):

The basic suppositions behind Alan Turing’s dreams of artificial intelligence were that the human brain is itself a kind of computer and that the goal was to create a machine that successfully imitates human behaviour.

This concept has been dominant for generations of computer scientists. It’s a tempting analogy – neurons as switches, cortexes as memory banks, etc. But there is a shortage of biological evidence for this parallel beyond the metaphorical and it is a distraction from what makes human thinking different from machine thinking.

*The terms which I (Garry Kasparov) prefer to highlight these differences, are: “**understanding**” and “**purpose**”.*

Andrew McAfee and Erik Brynjolfsson:

*Computers and robots can - despite their intelligence - understand little of the **human condition**, of the unique human perception of the world.*

My (Hans Damen) description of

- the Phenomenon Objective and
- of the role the Phenomenon Objective plays in the functioning of the human (animal) brain

describes the essence of the mental part of the **human condition**.

An answer to the question “**What is understanding ?**” might be derived from my answer to the question “**What is language ?**”

History

In 1956, at the ‘Dartmouth Conference’, a group of prominent scientists started the thinking about that what they called “Artificial Intelligence” (A.I.).

Herbert Simon, one of the attendants of that conference, predicted in 1965:

“machines will be capable, within 20 years, of doing any work a man can do”.

Marvin Minsky, another attendant of that conference agreed, writing in 1967:

“within a generation....the problem of creating Artificial Intelligence will substantially be solved”.

In 1973 it had become obvious that these scientists had grossly underestimated the difficulty of building a truly intelligent machine, and funding of undirected research in Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) was stopped in the USA and the UK.

Garry Kasparov (p.99)

A.I. would not see its spring until a movement arose that gave up on grandiose dreams of imitating human cognition.

The field was “machine learning”.

The basic concept of “machine learning” is that you don’t give the machine a bunch of rules to follow, the way you might try to learn a second language by memorising grammar and conjugation rules.

Instead of telling it (the rules of) the process, you provide the machine with lots of examples of that process and let the machine figure out the rules, so to speak.

Language translation is a good illustration. Google Translate is powered by machine learning, and it knows hardly anything about the rules of the dozens of languages it works with.

They feed the system examples of correct translations, millions and millions of examples, so the machine can figure out what’s likely to be right when it encounters something new.

Looking back one could say that “machine learning” rescued A.I. from insignificance, because it worked and it was profitable.

Future

Garry Kasparov (p.247 and 248):

Intelligent machines have been making great advances thanks to “machine learning” and other techniques, but in many cases they are reaching the practical limits of data-based intelligence.

Going from a few thousand examples to a few billion examples makes a big difference. Going from a few billion to a few trillion may not.

In response, in an ironic twist after decades of trying to replace human intelligence with algorithms, the goal of many companies and researchers now is how to get the human mind back into the process of analysing and deciding in an ocean of data.

*Humans do many things better than machines, from visual recognition to interpreting meaning, but how to get the humans and machines **working together** in a way that makes the most of the **strength** of each without slowing the computer to a crawl ?*

Thinking about the future of Artificial Intelligence is

- thinking about replacing the mental part of the work of a person
 - who is working as a nurse in a health-care situation or
 - who is assisting an older person or a patient in a domestic situation or
 - who is driving a car
 by a robot or
- thinking about the working together of a human and a robot

Replacing a human by a robot

A person, who

- is working as a nurse in a health-care situation or
- who is assisting an older person or a patient in a domestic situation or
- who is driving a car

usually has

- an objective with respect to the job she is doing, and
 - a plan on how to achieve that objective
- in her brain.

Such a plan is a prediction, consisting of a sequence of “in between objectives” (“milestones”) along the road of that person to that objective.

After a person has finished a particular job, she can compare

- the sequence of “in between objectives” she intended to realise before she started working on that job and
- the sequence of “in between objectives” she did realise.

Such a comparison shows that these sequences are different.

These sequences are for example different because that person often got in an **unpredicted** situation, in which

- she got aware of the fact that she would suffer a particular damage when she would continue pursuing her current “in between objective”, and
- in which she had to **decide** between
 - **continue** pursuing her current “in between objective”,
 - because she decided that the disadvantage of suffering that damage

would be **smaller than** the benefit of pursuing/realising her current objective,
at the one hand and

- **the actions**

- **stop** pursuing her current “in between objective”,
because she decided that the disadvantage of suffering that damage would be **greater than** the benefit of pursuing/realising her current objective,
- **make a new plan** for pursuing her current objective in which **the suffering of that damage would be avoided** and
- **start** pursuing the first “in between objective” in that new plan.
at the other hand

This means, that

- a person, who
 - is working as a nurse in a health-care situation or
 - who is assisting an older person or a patient in a domestic situation or
 - who is driving a car
 usually **makes new sequences of “in between objectives”(=“new plans”) for pursuing her current objective many times a day**, and
- that a robot which should replace that person **should be capable of making new sequences of “in between objectives” (=“new plans”) for pursuing its current objective many times a day.**

Note:

Each of the computers “Deep Blue”, “Alpha Go”, “Watson”, and “Google Translate” was given

- an objective and
- a plan on how to achieve that objective

at the start, and the computer concerned did not alter that plan while pursuing that objective.

Before deciding to spend billions of dollars on designing a computer

which is capable of making new sequences of “in between objectives” (=“new plans”) for pursuing its current objective many times a day.

one obviously should at least know the answers to the questions:

- “What is an objective ?
- “What is the description of the Phenomenon Objective ?”
- “What is the role the Phenomenon Objective plays in the functioning of human (animal) brain ?”

ABOUT

I studied at the Technical University Delft and chose the specialisation “Chemical Engineering”. Then I worked in chemical factories for some years. This was a very interesting time.

In 1974 I met Hans van Mourik Broekman who was an independent consultant on “innovation”.

He used the knowledge - which is distributed amongst the respective brains of people with different functions and disciplines in a company - to guide these people to the birth of an innovation.

I realised that that was a major part of what I had been doing whilst working in the chemical industry.

I discovered that I had more affection for dealing with people than dealing with technology.

We worked together for quite some time.

Before 1972 Hans van Mourik Broekman had discovered a method for speeding-up deliberations on difficult subjects by a factor of 3 to 10, and sometimes more.

He asked me to find out why this method yielded such good results.

Several years later I concluded that:

- the progress of the deliberations in a meeting, in which much information from different functions and different disciplines has to be considered, is limited by the size of the working-memory of a human being, and
- that van Mourik Broekman’s method spectacularly increases the respective working-memories of the participants in the deliberation.

We gave the method the name “**OPTOFRONIE**” (Greek: “optos” = visible ; “fronein” = thinking).

Further qualifications are presented on the LinkedIn site of [Hans Damen, Rotterdam, The Netherlands](#)

Contact Information

If you are interested in the proposal presented at the “HOME” page of this website please send an email to:

h.damenof@upcmail.nl

Background A: What is meant by “resistance to change”?

The Roman Catholic Church forbid Galilei (1564-1642) to publish a book in which he supported the claim of Copernicus, that the sun does not orbit the earth but that the earth orbits the sun and punished him for not fully obeying this ban.
Pope John Paul 2 made excuses for this in 1992 (....!).

This is an example of

- “**resistance to change**”, which was the resistance of the church to accept reality and
- of the fact that such a **resistance** can be a very strong and persistent force.

My answers to the “**basic** questions” describe a particular part of reality.
These answers **contravene** the **current** views of many scientists on this part of reality in an extreme way.

Such a scientist is confronted with the contradiction between

- my description of that part of reality and
- his current view on this part of reality

as soon as the book, presenting the answers to “**basic** questions”, gets out.

This confrontation will make him aware of the **threat**, that my answers might (.....!) give a better description of reality than his **current views** do.

A “threat”, because

- a major part of his current knowledge would no longer be of any value for supporting his professional prosperity,
- he would be forced to build a new knowledgebase for supporting his professional prosperity from scratch and
- he might (.....!) even lose a part of his existing professional prosperity when my answers to the “**basic** questions” would prove to give a better description of reality than his current views.

In reaction to that threat, scientists will repeat the experiments yielding the answers to these “**basic** questions”, to check whether these answers do describe reality or not.

They will admit that these answers describe reality when the repeated experiments show the same results as the original experiments.

Some of these scientists will – even when the repeated experiments show the same results as the original experiments - start **endless discussions**, in which they try to

prove in some way or another that the answers to the “**basic** questions” do not describe reality.

Thus

- raising uncertainty and distrust with potential readers of that book,
- thus preventing the coming into being of a wide circulation of that book and
- thus **resisting the change**
 - from the general acceptance of the current views of these scientists,
 - to the general acceptance of my answers to the “**basic** questions”.

When most of these scientists have concluded that that change is unavoidable, there often are some scientists left who will continue to offer “**resistance to change**” by putting the content of that book or the writer of that book in a bad light.

History teaches, that the result of these different kinds of “**resistance to change**” will be that a wide circulation of the book concerned is most likely to be **delayed by many years**.

Background B: Making a “concrete” objective out of an “abstract” objective.

Two kinds of objective-making by a person can be distinguished:

- His making of a particular new concrete objective on the basis of a particular existing concrete objective.

That new concrete objective is an “in-between-objective” (milestone) defining the next step on his road to the realisation of his existing concrete objective. All humans make such “in-between-objectives” (milestones) all day long.

Human beings don't experience this kind of objective-making as a difficult activity.

- The making of a particular new concrete objective on the basis of a particular existing abstract objective.

Human beings experience this kind of objective-making as a very difficult activity.

Examples of an abstract objective are:

- a) A person, who is dissatisfied with his current job has the abstract objective ... “having a nice new job”.

Abstract, because:

- there exists a huge amount of different jobs he would judge to be nice jobs,
- he does not know any of these jobs yet.
- he only knows
 - (some of the cognition-marks) of the “group of cognition-marks”, all these nice jobs have in common, and
 - the name “nice job” of that “group of cognition-marks”

- b) The management team of a company with poor financial prospects, has the “abstract objective”... “having a new and suitable way of making a profit”.

“Abstract”, because:

- potentially there exists a huge amount of different “ways of making a profit” the management team would judge to be “suitable ways of making a profit”,
- the management team does not know any of these different “suitable ways of making a profit” yet,
- the management team only knows
 - (some of the cognition-marks) of the “group of cognition-marks” all these different “suitable ways of making profit” have in common, and
 - the name “suitable way of making a profit” of that “group of cognition-marks”

Background C: What is an “objective”?

When searching the Oxford Dictionary for a description of that which is indicated by the word “objective”, one is directed from one of the following words to the other:

- aim,
- design,
- purpose,
- object,
- end,
- cause,
- goal,
- target,
- policy,
- intention,
- intent,
- mission

The fact that one is directed from one of these words to the other suggests that....

- the “group of cognition-marks” all particular **objectives** an individual ever had, have in common
 - the “group of cognition-marks” all particular **aims** that individual ever had, have in common
 - the “group of cognition-marks” all particular **designs** that individual ever had, have in common
 - the “group of cognition-marks” all particular **purposes** that individual ever had, have in common
 - et cetera
- have a “group of cognition-marks” in common.

But no description of any of these “groups of cognition-marks” or the “group of cognition-marks” all these “groups” have in common is given in the Oxford Dictionary.

Background D: The “ Phenomenon Objective”

There exist no two identical dogs.

At some stage in the education of a two year old child his parents point with a finger at the family-dog and say “dog”.

After this has been repeated a few times, that child points with his finger at that dog and says “dog”.

With that the child proves that

- it has put the “group of cognition-marks” representing the family-dog in its memory and
- that it therefore can recognise the family-dog from then onwards.

At some next occasion his parents point with a finger at the dog of the neighbours and say ”dog”. A few days later they point with a finger at a third dog walking in the street and say “dog”.

Thereafter a miracle occurs.....the child points with his finger at a dog it has never seen before, and says “dog”.

With that the child proves that

- it has discovered the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental images of all particular dogs that exist **have in common***,
- that it has stored that “group of cognition-marks” in his memory and
- that it can recognise that “group of cognition-marks” from then onwards.

With that the child also proves, that it can distinguish two different “groups of cognition-marks” in its image of a particular dog

- the “group of cognition-marks of the mental image of that particular dog”, and
- the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental images of all particular dogs that exist **have in common***.

Note:

There exist no two identical dogs.

This means, that

- the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental images of all particular dogs that exist **have in common***, contains less cognition-marks than the “group of cognition-marks of the mental image of the family-dog”, and

- that the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental images of all particular dogs that exist **have in common***, is an **abstraction** of the “group of cognition-marks of the mental image of the family-dog”.

In daily life people use the phrases

- “the dog” and
- “a dog”

but most of these people do not realise, that these phrases respectively indicate the different “groups of cognition-marks”:

- the “group of cognition-marks of the mental image of a particular dog”, and
- the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective images of all particular dogs that exist **have in common***.

The fact, that the same word “dog” can be used to indicate two different “groups of cognition-marks” of the same mental image of a particular dog can lead to some confusion.

To avoid such a confusion I will indicate the difference between these “groups of cognition-marks” by giving these “groups of cognition-marks” different names:

- I call the “group of cognition-marks of the mental image of a particular dog”.....“the dog”, and
- I call the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental images of all particular dogs that exist **have in common***.....“the **phenomenon dog**”

Compare

A teacher can’t help a human being to discover the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental representations of all particular objectives that exist **have in common***, by

- pointing with his finger at an objective and say “objective”,
- by subsequently pointing at another objective and say “objective”,
- et cetera

Simply because one can’t point at something which is invisible and an objective is invisible.

A human being can nevertheless notice that other people

- know the word “objective”, and
- use the word “objective” to indicate hundreds of different “somethings”

On that basis a human being proves to be able

- to discover the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental representations of all these different “somethings” **have in common***,

- to store that “group of cognition-marks” under the name “objective” in his memory, and
- to recognise that “group of cognition-marks” from then onwards.

When he got the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental representations of all these different “somethings” have in common*, in his memory, he can distinguish two different “groups of cognition-marks” in his mental representation of a particular objective

- the “group of cognition-marks of the mental representation of that particular objective”, and
- the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental representations of all particular objectives that exist have in common.*

In daily life people use the phrases

- the “objective” and
- an “objective”

but most of the people do not realise, that these phrases respectively indicate the different “groups of cognition-marks”

- the “group of cognition-marks of a mental representation of a particular objective” and
- the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental representations of all particular objectives that exist have in common.*

The fact that the same word “objective” can be used to indicate two different “groups of cognition-marks” of the same mental representation of a particular objective sometimes leads to unsurmountable confusions.

To avoid of such confusions I give these different “groups of cognition -marks” different names:

- I call the “group of cognition-marks of a mental representation of a particular objective”..... “the objective”, and
- I call the “group of cognition-marks”, *the respective mental representations of all particular objectives that exist have in common..* “the **phenomenon objective**”.