THE OCTOPUS REVELATION

Water, Consciousness, and the Hidden Architecture of Nature
Jeroen J. J. Sluiter
World Alliance of Independent Thinkers (WAIT)
Version 20.2 — Narrative Edition | October 2026

Author's Note

I have been fascinated by the octopus for as long as I can remember. But more than a decade ago, that fascination became something else: a question I could not put aside.

How does an animal transform itself so completely that it seems to become part of its surroundings? Not simply change colour, but alter its pattern, texture and apparent shape until the distinction between the creature and its environment almost disappears.

There is, I should confess, something mildly ridiculous about my fascination with the octopus.

I have never observed one in its natural habitat. In fact, I have never been particularly comfortable swimming in open water. The sea and I have maintained a respectful distance for most of my life.

There is photographic evidence of this arrangement. Somewhere in the family archives is a picture of me, aged about five, sitting in a small plastic tub at the edge of the Mediterranean on Spain's Costa Brava. The sea was right there, magnificent and inviting. I wanted absolutely nothing to do with it.

Apparently, I preferred my Mediterranean experience in a considerably smaller, more manageable body of water.

Not much has changed.

And yet, here I am, decades later, writing a book inspired by an animal whose entire existence unfolds in precisely the environment I have spent a lifetime avoiding.

Perhaps there is a lesson in that. Fascination does not always require proximity. Sometimes a little distance leaves more room for curiosity.

My encounters with the octopus have taken place through films, photographs, scientific research and the extraordinary work of people who are considerably more comfortable beneath the surface than I am. I watched its camouflage unfold on screen, again and again, and found myself wondering whether there was something

about the relationship between the octopus and its environment that we had not yet fully understood.

That question eventually led me somewhere I had never expected: to water itself.

Not merely the water in which an octopus lives, but the water within its body. The water within our own bodies. The substance so familiar, so ordinary, that we rarely stop to consider how extraordinary it actually is.

What if water is doing more than we think?

That possibility has occupied my imagination for years. It has taken me through biology, physics, the history of scientific discovery and some of the more unconventional attempts to understand the natural world. Along the way, I encountered ideas I found compelling, others I questioned, and still others that seemed almost impossible until I began asking what, precisely, made them impossible.

I am not a laboratory scientist, nor do I pretend to be one. My approach has always been to begin with an observation, question the assumptions surrounding it, and follow the reasoning as far as it will take me.

The arrival of artificial intelligence changed the pace of that exploration dramatically. Questions that once sent me searching through books and papers for days could suddenly become extended conversations. Ideas could be challenged, compared, dismantled and rebuilt. What had lived largely in my head for more than a decade began to take the shape of a book.

And what a journey it became.

From an octopus disappearing against a reef to single-celled organisms communicating through water; from the remarkable behaviour of water near biological surfaces to questions about fields, perception and consciousness; and, unexpectedly, to an ancient description of the waters above and below.

I do not expect every reader to follow me to every conclusion. Indeed, I would be surprised if everyone did.

What I hope is that you will experience something of the fascination that has kept me returning to this question: the possibility that one of the most familiar substances in existence may still have something fundamental to teach us about how living things perceive and respond to their world.

The question has become a hypothesis I am determined to make intelligible and testable. And the adventure, I suspect, has only just begun.

Jeroen J. J. Sluiter
Maastricht area, October 2026

What fascinates me most is not simply the octopus's speed. In film after film, it seems attuned to the wider landscape, not merely the rock beneath it. Its apparent grasp of what surrounds it—and perhaps what it has not directly touched—has occupied me for years. Vision, memory and distributed senses may explain that impression. But it is the impression that made me ask whether water could provide an additional physical route by which environmental information reaches living tissue.

Prologue — The Animal That Disappears

There it is.

An octopus resting against a reef, its eight arms spread across the rocks, its eyes watching a world that appears to offer nowhere to hide.

Then something extraordinary happens.

Its skin begins to change. Dark patches appear, lighter areas dissolve into the background, and the smooth surface of its body rises into small projections that resemble the uneven texture of the rock beneath it.

A moment later, the animal is almost impossible to distinguish from its surroundings.

It has not slipped into a crevice. It has not covered itself with sand. It has simply transformed the evidence by which we recognise it.

I have watched footage of this phenomenon countless times. Yet I still find it astonishing.

Perhaps what fascinates me most is not the transformation itself, but the apparent intimacy between the animal and its environment. The octopus does not merely change colour. It produces a remarkably convincing response to the particular world around it.

How does it know what to become?

Of course, scientists have answers. Remarkable answers, in fact. Octopuses possess sophisticated eyes, specialised pigment cells, muscular structures and a nervous system distributed throughout much of their bodies. Their camouflage is an extraordinary achievement of evolution and biological engineering.

But understanding these mechanisms does not exhaust my curiosity.

I keep returning to another question.

What if the relationship between an organism and its surroundings involves more than the familiar sequence of sensing, processing and responding? What if the physical medium within living tissue participates more actively in that exchange than we presently recognise?

And what if that medium is water?

Consider what this would mean.

Every living organism exists within a physical environment rich in information. Light carries patterns. Matter has measurable electrical and electromagnetic properties. Temperature, pressure and chemical composition vary from place to place. The world is not silent; it is continually expressing its physical condition.

We already know that living things have evolved astonishing ways of detecting these signals.

But might the organised properties of water itself contribute to how some of those signals are registered and coordinated?

That is the possibility at the heart of this book.

It begins with the octopus, but it does not end there.

Along the way, we will encounter water behaving unexpectedly beside solid surfaces, cells communicating through waves in the liquid around them, spiders rebuilding elaborate structures, entire reefs synchronising their reproduction, and scientists who have spent their lives asking whether the familiar physical picture of water is complete.

We will also venture further, into questions about consciousness, information and the possibility of connections in nature that remain poorly understood.

Some of these journeys lead through established discoveries. Others lead to hypotheses that have yet to be demonstrated. And some take us to the boundary between science and philosophy, where imagination can suggest questions that experiment must eventually answer.

I find that boundary irresistible.

Because the most interesting discoveries often begin not with an answer, but with someone refusing to stop asking a question.

And mine began with an octopus.

An animal that, on screen before my eyes, seemed to become the world around it.

What if water is part of how it knows?

1 — The Animal That Disappears

There is a peculiar pleasure in watching an octopus disappear. The observer knows the animal remains where it was. The eye searches for an outline that was plainly visible a moment ago. Sometimes the contour returns only when an arm moves or a sucker detaches from the surface. The octopus has changed not its location, but the evidence by which we recognise it.

Camouflage is more than colour. Chromatophores change the visible area of pigment through muscular action. Reflective structures contribute other optical effects, and papillae can change the texture of the skin. Pattern, brightness and relief form a coordinated performance. It is a body capable of remaking its appearance.

The machinery of disguise is extraordinary in its own right. Chromatophores answer to muscles and nerves; reflective structures alter the play of light; papillae reshape the skin. I once thought the astonishing speed must mean the nerves could not possibly keep up. The research corrected me. Biology is already capable of very rapid responses, and a convincing disguise need not be a photographic copy of every stone. Knowing that did not end my fascination. It made the animal more interesting.

What held my attention was the extraordinary coordination of the whole performance. The animal does not simply possess a collection of clever parts; those parts act together. I began to wonder whether the water-rich tissue in which they work contributes something identifiable to that coordination, alongside the senses, nerves and muscles we already understand.

That is why I keep returning to the octopus. Its transformation is visible; its timing can be measured; and its skin offers an unusually rich meeting place of environment, sensation and response. Here, perhaps, a question I had carried privately for years could finally be made answerable.

The animal does not have to paint the reef pebble by pebble. It can respond to contrast, brightness, edges and texture. That insight is a useful antidote to my own first astonishment: the disguise may look impossible without being inexplicable. But it leaves me with a better question about how so many responsive structures work together.

The Skin That Sees

One discovery genuinely delighted me. In experiments on the California two-spot octopus, skin separated from the animal's eyes and central brain still responded to light. The researchers called the effect light-activated chromatophore expansion, or

LACE. The skin was not literally seeing a scene as an eye does; it contained local light-sensitive machinery capable of a response. What I had imagined as a simple chain—eye, brain, skin—was already more interesting than that.

This discovery also sharpened my own idea. If skin already senses light locally, I cannot claim every unexpected response as evidence for water. I have to ask what, if anything, an organised state of water contributes beyond that remarkable known machinery. The question becomes harder, and much more worth asking.

2 — The Extraordinary Nature of Water

The water that surrounds an octopus is not merely scenery. It carries light, pressure disturbances, dissolved chemicals and heat; the animal's own tissues contain water in intimate contact with membranes and proteins. I began to wonder whether those interfaces might be more than the stage on which biology performs. The question sounds simple. Following it leads into one of the most absorbing histories in natural science.

I find it extraordinary that a substance so commonplace still rewards such close examination. Water resists compression, stores considerable heat and dissolves a remarkable range of materials. Its molecular interactions help ice float and shape the movement of liquids through narrow spaces. These are established properties, yet each was once a problem demanding explanation. What interests me is not the claim that water must therefore conceal another mystery, but the possibility that familiar molecular behaviour acquires new consequences inside the crowded architecture of a cell.

Water is so familiar that we rarely notice how much explanation it requires. We pour it into a glass, watch rain run down a window, or feel the cold of a river against our skin. These experiences encourage a reassuring assumption: water is simple because it is everywhere. Yet the more closely scientists have examined it, the more its ordinary behaviour has demanded attention.

Long before anyone could describe a hydrogen bond, people recognised that water behaved differently from many other substances. Ice floats. Lakes freeze from the surface rather than from the bottom. A drop holds together, and a narrow tube can draw water upwards against gravity. These are not mystical exceptions. They are measurable consequences of molecular interactions. But their familiarity should not disguise their importance: if ice routinely sank, the seasonal life of lakes and ponds would be very different.

The development of modern chemistry changed the question from what water does to why it does it. The identification of water as a compound of hydrogen and oxygen

made it possible to treat the liquid not as an elemental substance but as a population of interacting molecules. Later work on molecular structure and hydrogen bonding helped explain its unusual thermal behaviour, surface tension and solvent properties. A water molecule is small; the network of interactions among many water molecules is anything but trivial.

Consider the amount of heat water can absorb before its temperature rises substantially. Oceans and lakes do not simply occupy space: they moderate the movement of heat through landscapes and living bodies. Or consider the fact that water dissolves ions and many polar substances so effectively. In a cell, this makes water indispensable to chemistry. Molecules move, react and assemble in an aqueous environment whose properties affect what reactions are possible and how quickly they occur.

But a living cell is not a beaker filled with an evenly mixed solution. It is crowded with proteins, membranes, filaments, channels and compartments. Water is continually encountering surfaces. Some of it is confined to narrow spaces. Some molecules spend time in hydration shells around proteins and ions. At those boundaries, local orientation, mobility and electrical behaviour can differ from what would be measured in the bulk liquid.

This is where the history of water becomes a history of interfaces. The physicist or chemist studying a free liquid asks one set of questions; the investigator studying a thin layer next to a surface must ask another. Surface charge, dissolved ions, temperature gradients and the chemistry of the material itself can alter the behaviour of nearby water and suspended particles. An effect that seems mysterious when described only as ‘water behaving strangely’ may become intelligible when the surface and its surrounding gradients are measured.

The history of capillarity offers an instructive example. Water rises in a narrow tube not because it has acquired a new intention, but because adhesion, cohesion, surface tension and geometry act together. Understanding the phenomenon did not make it less remarkable. It revealed that a boundary can reorganise the behaviour of a liquid in ways that are difficult to anticipate from the liquid alone.

Inside a living cell, water is seldom far from a membrane or protein. The interfaces are everywhere. Once I began thinking about that crowded landscape, a glass of water no longer seemed quite the right picture of the water inside us.

Imagine a few tiny particles suspended in water. They drift, apparently without preference. Bring them near certain water-attracting surfaces under particular conditions, however, and the particles retreat, leaving a clear region beside the

boundary. It is a small spectacle compared with an octopus disappearing against a reef, but it can provoke the same startled question: what, exactly, has changed?

The clear region is an observation, not yet an explanation. Perhaps gradients of dissolved material move the particles; perhaps surface chemistry is decisive. The microscope tells us where the particles have gone, not what every molecule of water is doing. That gap between the sight and its explanation is precisely what interests me.

Gerald Pollack and his colleagues made these exclusion zones a subject of sustained investigation. Their experiments asked whether the water next to some surfaces behaves differently from water farther away. I found the question irresistible because biological life is built from surfaces: membranes enclosing cells, proteins folded into intricate shapes, structures suspended in liquid.

Another investigator approached water from a different direction. How could countless molecules, constantly colliding and exchanging energy, ever produce organised collective behaviour? We know that coordinated effects can emerge from local interactions. But could water and electromagnetic fields participate in a more sustained form of organisation?

Emilio Del Giudice and his collaborators explored this possibility through a particular quantum-electrodynamic model. Their proposed coherent domains are not established features of octopus tissue. Still, I was drawn to the intellectual move: from the restless activity of individual molecules to the possibility of collective order.

The attraction for me lay in the question rather than a promised answer. Pollack drew attention to behaviour near surfaces; Del Giudice asked how molecular interactions might become collective. Neither line of work, on its own, demonstrates the biological function I propose. Together they made it easier for me to formulate the question that had been taking shape.

The point at which those questions meet is also the point at which my own conjecture begins. Could an organised water-associated state make a measurable contribution to the way living tissue registers an environmental change and coordinates its response?

It helped me to separate three ideas I had once been tempted to merge. A substance can respond to a signal without interpreting it. It can transmit a disturbance without remembering it. And it can exhibit order without holding an image of its surroundings. My proposal would have to clear a higher bar than any of those observations alone.

I return, therefore, to the skin of the octopus: a living boundary crowded with responsive structures and surrounded by water. The established biology is not an

obstacle to my question; it tells us where to look and what any additional account must explain.

Water's history does not answer the question for me. It shows why the question is reasonable to pursue. And by now I was less interested in calling water extraordinary than in discovering whether one of its measurable states actually matters to an organism's response.

An Unconventional Question: Tom Cowan

Tom Cowan has asked a related but more radical question about the physical role of water in living tissue. Drawing on observations of exclusion-zone behaviour and on the gel-like character of cellular interiors, he has proposed that the organised state of water may be more central to cellular function than conventional accounts allow. In particular, Cowan has argued that breathing primarily captures and organises electrical charge rather than serving principally to take up oxygen for metabolism. This is his proposed reinterpretation, not an established account of respiration.

The suggestion is striking because it reframes a familiar physiological act. In Cowan’s account, if the water within and around cells can hold and transmit charge in structured ways, then the continuous movement of air through the lungs might serve, among other things, to maintain or restore that organisation. Cowan has developed this idea in lectures and writings that sit well outside mainstream respiratory physiology.

The established measurements, however, remain clear. Oxygen is taken up by the blood, transported by haemoglobin, and used in measurable metabolic pathways. These processes are not in dispute. Cowan’s interpretation is therefore heterodox: it does not replace the oxygen-centred account but proposes an additional or alternative emphasis on charge and water structure that has not been demonstrated by the same standards of evidence. It cannot, on present showing, be used to support either the local biological hypothesis advanced in this book or any wider atmospheric extension.

Even so, the question he raises is intelligible within the larger inquiry. If organised water at biological interfaces can participate in the registration and coordination of environmental information, then the physical state of that water may matter for cellular function in ways that go beyond its role as a solvent. Cowan’s work is one attempt to pursue that possibility into the realm of everyday physiology. It remains an open and contested proposal, useful here mainly as a reminder that questions about water’s organised properties continue to be asked at the boundary between laboratory observation and living tissue.

The investigators behind the questions

Gerald Pollack did not begin with an octopus. He studied what happens to water near certain hydrophilic surfaces. Suspended particles can move away, leaving an exclusion zone. That observation is intriguing in its own right, even while explanations involving gradients and diffusiophoresis compete with Pollack's stronger interpretation of an ordered phase. I was drawn to the interface: in a cell, water is almost never far from a surface.

Emilio Del Giudice approached water through theoretical physics. He asked whether molecular interactions with electromagnetic fields could produce collective organisation. His coherent-domain model is not a demonstrated feature of octopus skin. It nevertheless made me think about how a material's organised dynamics might contribute to coordination without being identical to a nerve impulse.

Tom Cowan, a physician and author, pursued more sweeping claims. He interpreted charged, gel-like water as fundamental to cellular organisation and extended the idea into accounts of circulation, metabolism and breathing. His claim that breathing primarily captures electrical charge rather than oxygen is inconsistent with established oxygen physiology. I include him because the reasoning illustrates how a modest physical observation can inspire a much larger proposal—and how carefully one must test the steps between them.

3 — The Possibility I Could Not Ignore

The question that kept returning to me was not whether the octopus could move its pigments quickly enough. Researchers already know a great deal about how it does so. It was the animal's apparent grasp of its surroundings. Watching it cross one background after another, I was struck by the way it seems to respond to a scene larger than the patch of rock directly beneath it. Its eyes, learning, memory and local sensory capacities may account for that impression. Still, I wanted to know whether the physical environment itself offered information through an additional channel.

That is where my proposal begins. Imagine that a particular organised state of water at a biological interface changes in response to an environmental signal and that this change contributes something identifiable to what neighbouring tissue does next. Not simply the ordinary transport of ions or a mechanical wave in fluid, but a measurable contribution that remains after the familiar mechanisms are taken seriously. If that were demonstrated, the discovery would be modest in its first dimensions and enormous in its implications.

The biological proposition is simple to state and difficult to establish. Water may not merely sustain the machinery of biological perception; under particular physical

conditions, its organised properties may themselves participate in the acquisition, transmission and coordination of environmental information.

I do not mean simply that cells need water or that electrical currents depend on ions. I mean something more particular: an organised water-associated state might carry an identifiable part of the work of sensing or coordination, beyond what the established neural, muscular, optical and metabolic account already predicts. That is a demanding claim, and I prefer it that way.

I can imagine a researcher asking me to stop admiring the idea and name the measurement. Fair enough. What changes in the water? For how long? What input produces the change? Can that change be altered without damaging the tissue, and does the animal's response change as a consequence? The fascination becomes productive when it has to answer questions like these.

4 — When Nature Moves as One

The Geometry That Returns

In a garden at dusk, the most intricate architecture may be suspended between two branches. An orb-weaving spider moves along a thread so fine that it disappears until the light catches it. From a handful of anchor points, a geometry begins to emerge: a frame, radiating spokes, and finally the spiral that will intercept an insect passing through the night. By morning the web may be torn, eaten, or gone. By evening, a similar structure appears in nearly the same place. To an observer returning to the garden, it can seem as though the location remembers its design.

Yet the scene offers a useful experiment in how questions are formed. What exactly persists when the silk is removed? The branch and its shape persist; so may traces of silk, odours, mechanical features, local moisture and the animal’s own experience. One could remove residual silk, vary humidity, alter attachment points and observe whether rebuilding choices change. A proposed water-associated site signature would need to predict an outcome beyond these ordinary cues, not simply redescribe the spider’s fidelity in more mysterious language.

In the next chapter, a single-celled organism will give us a much more immediate example of water carrying a signal. The spider leaves me with a different image: a familiar place, an intricate structure and an animal that can rebuild it without any need for a mysterious blueprint suspended in the air.

I like the spider precisely because it resists a convenient conclusion. Its web asks what remains in a place after a structure disappears. The answers may lie entirely in supports, traces, behaviour and memory. To discover that would still be to understand something real.

A Night When the Reef Releases Its Future

After sunset, a reef can seem almost motionless. Fish withdraw into crevices; the hard architecture of coral remains under the dark water. Then, on certain nights, the apparent stillness gives way to an extraordinary event. Across a colony, small bundles rise from the coral surface and drift upwards. Nearby colonies begin to release their own. Soon the water contains thousands of tiny travelling possibilities, suspended in a sea that carries them away.

For a diver, the spectacle can resemble an underwater snowfall in reverse. It is easy to imagine that the reef has received a single instruction. Yet a coral colony does not need a mysterious broadcast to respond to its environment. Lunar illumination, seasonal temperature, daily light cycles and species-specific physiological timing offer powerful cues. Synchrony can emerge when many organisms respond to shared conditions.

What interests me is the distinction between sharing an environment and sharing a message. Water is indispensable to this event: it surrounds the animals, carries chemical cues and transports the released reproductive material. But none of that, by itself, implies that water has acquired a separate memory of the night or an undiscovered capacity to coordinate the colonies.

The question can still be asked experimentally. If particular interfacial states of water contribute to the timing of release, would changing those states alter the pattern once light, temperature, chemistry and the colonies' physiological clocks were accounted for? The scene is beautiful before the question is asked. It becomes scientifically interesting when the question admits an answer that could be no.

The spider returns to a place; the coral responds to a moment. I would not claim they share a hidden mechanism. They broaden the question that began with the octopus: how much coordination can emerge from an organism's ordinary physical relationship with its surroundings?

When ice appears to carry an image

Masaru Emoto's photographs of ice crystals exposed to words, music and other prompts have a peculiar power. They invite the eye to see meaning in geometry. But freezing conditions, selective photography and unblinded interpretation make it impossible to infer from the pictures alone that water understood or remembered the prompt. I am interested in the question his pictures raise, not persuaded by the conclusion they are sometimes made to carry.

Veda Austin, a New Zealand artist and independent investigator, photographs partially frozen water formations she calls hydroglyphs. Some patterns resemble recognisable shapes. The visual experience is arresting. Yet a resemblance is not a

demonstrated information channel. To show that a hidden input had been registered, independent observers would need to recover it reliably under blinded, controlled conditions. I would love to see that experiment.

These images led me towards a distinction I now consider essential. A physical trace is not automatically a message. A signal is not automatically a memory. A material can respond to an influence without representing its meaning. If organised water carries usable environmental information, we must be able to specify what was encoded and how it was recovered.

5 — The Information Within Matter

Every object has physical characteristics that can be measured: temperature, composition, surface structure, electrical charge, and the ways it absorbs or reflects light. These characteristics do not amount to a hidden message addressed to an observer. Yet they allow information to be obtained. A spectrum tells us something about a substance; a pressure wave can tell an animal that something has moved nearby. The leap I am interested in is not from matter to magic. It is from measurable differences to the possibility of another biological means of registering them.

The language of fields gives that question an unusually rich history. Michael Faraday imagined lines of force where others saw only action across empty space. James Clerk Maxwell later gave electromagnetic fields a mathematical description capable of remarkable predictions. Those achievements do not demonstrate a universal information field. They do remind me that invisible interactions can become precise science when a proposed mechanism yields measurable consequences.

Picture a drop of pond water magnified until the life within it fills the screen. A slender single-celled creature, Spirostomum ambiguum, extends through the liquid. Its outline looks almost too delicate to contain any machinery capable of violence. Then it contracts. In only a few milliseconds, the long body shortens with astonishing force. Water around it moves, not because the cell intends to send a message, but because a rapidly changing body cannot move without disturbing the fluid that surrounds it.

Now imagine a second cell nearby. It has no shared brain with the first and no nerve running between them. Yet the movement of water can reach it. Mechanical forces register at the cell boundary and can trigger another contraction. The second disturbance can affect others. What appears from a distance to be a coordinated decision is, at least in substantial part, a chain of local physical interactions. A wave of behaviour passes through the group because each organism lives inside the moving medium created by its neighbours.

This is a particularly revealing example because we do not have to invent a mysterious carrier. The carrier is ordinary water in motion. Its role is direct, measurable and compatible with established fluid mechanics and cellular mechanosensation. That makes Spirostomum a useful intellectual companion to the octopus, but not a confirmation of the water-state hypothesis. It teaches us to ask the next question with greater precision: once known mechanical coupling has been accounted for, is there any additional effect associated with how water is organised at the cell boundary?

A decisive experiment would not merely film the wave again. It would measure the flow, the response threshold and the properties of the interface while changing one candidate water-associated variable at a time. If ordinary mechanics predicts the outcome completely, the stronger hypothesis gains nothing. If a reproducible difference remains, and can be traced to a specific intermediate water state, a new question has earned its place.

Sulphur mollies offer a brisk contrast. When aerial predators threaten, fish dive in succession and send conspicuous waves across the surface. Cilia, meanwhile, beat in travelling patterns through local physical coupling. The details differ, but both examples remind me how easily the surrounding medium becomes part of the visible behaviour.

These are demonstrations of known ways organisms and their surroundings interact, not evidence of a universal field. That is why I value them. Each gives us a clearer picture of what a proposed additional water-state contribution would have to add.

A stone left in sunlight grows warm. A leaf changes its spectral appearance with its pigments and surface. A metal object responds to a magnetic field; a drop of water bends and absorbs light. None of these things needs to possess a message in the human sense. Yet each has properties that can be measured by another physical system. A thermometer reads one kind of difference, an eye another, a spectrometer many at once. The world is full of such differences before anyone interprets them.

The idea of a field arose partly because nature seemed able to organise effects across space without requiring visible contact at every point. Faraday imagined lines of force; Maxwell gave electromagnetic relations mathematical form. Their achievement was not to announce that everything is secretly communicating. It was to specify interactions that could be measured and used to predict what would happen next. That history offers a demanding model for any contemporary proposal about connection.

Information begins to matter biologically when a difference in the environment changes what an organism does. A shadow alters the direction of a fish. A dissolved

chemical draws a cell along a gradient. A pressure disturbance causes a protist to contract. The environment supplies a physical variation; a receptive structure makes that variation consequential. In each case the word “information” names a relationship among a source, a physical coupling and a response. It is not a substance waiting to be collected.

The conjecture of this book concerns the middle of that relationship. We know water changes its behaviour near some surfaces; we know living tissue is crowded with interfaces. Could a measurable organisation of water help turn an environmental difference into a coordinated biological action? This is not the same as saying that every object broadcasts a readable portrait of itself, or that a distant observer can access it. It is the smaller and more consequential question of whether an additional interface can be identified inside an organism already equipped with senses.

Older images of aether, cosmic resonance and an interconnected universe can enrich the imagination. They are interpretations, however, not substitutes for a physical carrier with measurable behaviour. The biological proposition must succeed or fail in the laboratory even if every grander picture of the cosmos proves mistaken.

A signature is not automatically a message. A receiver has to be sensitive to something specific. My wider question is whether organised water could sometimes be part of that receiving arrangement, rather than merely the substance through which other components operate.

Even if such a biological contribution were discovered, it would tell us nothing by itself about distant minds or planetary communication. I am content to leave those larger possibilities waiting. The local question is absorbing enough.

Cosmological proposals, including those associated with Nassim Haramein, may provide analogies for thinking about a connected physical world. They are not required for the local biological test and do not supply its missing evidence.

Faraday and Maxwell are a reminder of what made the field concept powerful: not its grandeur, but its capacity to predict physical effects. I take from that history permission to ask an ambitious question—and an obligation to let measurement answer it.

Fields, aether and the meaning of information

Faraday gave the invisible interactions of electricity and magnetism a field-based language; Maxwell made that language mathematically predictive. The lesson is not that every imagined connection is real. It is that a good field concept identifies measurable quantities and makes predictions. That is the standard I would want for any proposed information field.

The older luminiferous aether was an attempt to explain the propagation of light through a medium. Its classical form did not survive the development of relativity. That does not make all questions about the physical vacuum meaningless, but it means that invoking an aether is no substitute for specifying a mechanism.

Nassim Haramein's proposed holographic and fractal architecture of reality belongs to a much more speculative tradition. I encountered it because it places information and interconnectedness at the centre of a cosmological story. His theory does not establish the biological mechanism I propose, and the local hypothesis does not depend on his cosmology. It is an illustration of the wider question, not proof of an answer.

6 — The Waters Above Us

A sea mist can make the landscape seem joined by one continuous substance. It is an arresting image, and I understand its appeal. But atmospheric water is not a giant liquid membrane. Vapour molecules move through a mixture of gases, and the conditions that sustain organised behaviour beside a biological surface need not exist in open air. The question is therefore a new one: could any water-associated organisation persist long enough, and with sufficient specificity, to convey a recoverable signal?

I am drawn to the possibility without confusing it with a finding. A serious answer would be exciting precisely because it would be concrete: a defined source, an observable change in the medium, and a receiver able to distinguish that change from ordinary light, sound, humidity and electromagnetic interference. It would give the poetic idea of connection a physical meaning.

The pond, the reef and the living skin all contain water close to biological surfaces. Above them stretches another kind of aqueous world: the air we breathe. To follow the hypothesis there is to leave the relatively crowded boundaries of cells and enter a medium in which water molecules are dispersed among gases. It is a new question, not merely a larger version of the old one.

A humid morning can make the whole landscape look connected. Mist gathers around branches and softens the edges of buildings. It is a beautiful image, and a seductive one. Yet vapour is not simply liquid water spread across a larger space. Its molecules move among other gases, colliding and dispersing under conditions very different from those beside a cell membrane.

Water vapour absorbs and emits radiation in distinctive ways. We can measure those interactions from the ground and from satellites. But to say that vapour carries a

readable message about a distant event is a very different proposition. The atmosphere makes me curious; it does not grant the answer.

If I were to pursue that possibility, I would begin by asking whether a sufficiently organised state could persist under realistic conditions. Then I would want to see a defined signal alter it, and a receiver recover that signal. Humidity, temperature, aerosols and ordinary electromagnetic transmission would have to be measured carefully. A poetic picture of connected air would not be enough.

A success would be exciting precisely because it would be limited and describable: a particular signal, a particular carrier, a particular range. It would not immediately explain consciousness. The details would be the discovery.

I keep this second horizon separate from the octopus. The atmospheric idea may fail completely while the biological question remains open. That separation does not make the adventure smaller; it means one disappointment need not erase another possibility.

7 — Consciousness and the Limits of the Question

People have long reported experiences that seem to exceed ordinary perception. Some have been studied under controlled conditions. Cold War programmes investigated remote viewing, and their archives form a genuine historical record. The existence of the programme, however, does not establish the claimed ability.

The assessments of the American programme in 1995 diverged: Jessica Utts considered some statistical results worthy of attention, while Ray Hyman challenged the inference. The work did not establish a reliable intelligence capability or an accepted non-local mechanism. Selected striking anecdotes cannot substitute for rigorous controls and independent replication.

Independent discovery is similarly fascinating. Newton and Leibniz developed calculus separately, but shared mathematical problems and intellectual traditions offer powerful conventional explanations. To infer field-mediated cognition, we would need prospective predictions that outperform those explanations, not retrospective coincidences.

A wider water-mediated information theory would have to specify a source, carrier, encoding, receiver and measurable transfer, with ordinary sensory leakage excluded. Curiosity is not diminished by such demands. It is given a route by which it might become knowledge.

What would the octopus actually tell us?

I imagine three possible endings to the experiment. First, a measured water-associated state predicts part of a response, a selective intervention changes it, and another laboratory reproduces the finding. That would be exciting evidence of a local biological contribution, not proof of universal consciousness.

Second, the measurement adds nothing once established neural, optical, ionic and muscular processes are properly accounted for. We would have tested a particular idea and learned its limits. Third, an apparently striking result disappears in replication. I would find that disappointing, but it is precisely why experiments matter: the world must be allowed to disagree with us.

8 — What If We Could Test It?

The experiment begins before the first instrument is switched on. It begins with a choice of what, precisely, we wish to know. An octopus can change its appearance; that is not in doubt. Its skin is served by nerves and muscles whose operations can be studied. What remains to be tested is the additional proposition advanced in this book: that organised water at biological interfaces contributes an identifiable element to the way environmental information becomes coordinated action.

Imagine a quiet research room adjoining a seawater tank. Across one wall of the tank, a carefully controlled pattern changes: pale stones become dark; a broad band gives way to fine mottling. An octopus resting nearby does what an octopus does. Its skin responds. From above, a high-speed camera catches a succession of changes that the unaided eye compresses into a single fluid transformation. Another camera records the animal's posture, the movement of its arms, and the small muscular papillae that alter its silhouette.

There is excitement even in the first recording. To slow a living transformation into individual frames is to discover that a moment contains a sequence of decisions—or, more precisely, a sequence of physical events whose organisation we have not yet completely described. Some chromatophores expand before others. Boundaries emerge and dissolve. The response has a temporal structure. That structure is the experimenter's first map.

The obvious temptation is to point at an especially rapid change and announce that something beyond nerves must be responsible. We resist it. Speed alone cannot settle the question: established neural and muscular mechanisms are capable of remarkably fast activity. The laboratory must do something more difficult, and more interesting. It must ask whether a particular property of the water-rich tissue predicts part of the transformation that the established account does not predict.

The first task is therefore to make the ordinary explanation as strong as possible. The animal's visual stimulus is measured rather than described impressionistically. Light intensity and wavelength are recorded. Water temperature and chemistry are held within carefully defined ranges. Where feasible and ethically appropriate, investigators record relevant electrical and muscular activity. They map the time at which a pattern is presented, the onset of skin response, and the subsequent changes across different regions of the body.

These recordings do not diminish the hypothesis. They give it something substantial to contend with. A proposed new mechanism is most persuasive when it survives comparison with the best available account, not when it is offered in place of a simplified caricature of that account.

Now comes the unusual instrument. Somewhere at the interface between cells and their aqueous surroundings, researchers attempt to measure a water-associated state independently of the visible camouflage. This is the difficult part. Water does not carry a label announcing when it has become "organised". A change in a spectrum might reflect a change in hydration, temperature, protein conformation or ionic composition. An electrical potential might arise from a familiar membrane process. The experimenters must define in advance which measurement would count as the proposed intermediate state, and how alternative explanations would be excluded.

A spectroscopic probe might reveal a change in the local molecular environment; microelectrodes might track potential differences or ion fluxes. Other techniques might become necessary as the question is refined. No single instrument, by itself, proves that a coherent domain exists or that water is carrying information. The instruments provide observations. The argument emerges only from the relationships among those observations.

Picture three traces displayed on a monitor. The first marks the environmental stimulus. The second marks a candidate change in the interfacial-water state. The third marks the response of a group of chromatophores. On one trial the traces seem to fall into a suggestive sequence. The environmental input changes; the water-associated signal shifts; the skin follows. The moment would be exhilarating. It would also be far too early to celebrate.

Three events occurring in sequence do not establish that the middle event caused the last. A nerve signal might have produced both. Temperature or ion movement might account for all three. The apparent water signature might be an incidental accompaniment of the skin response rather than a contributor to it. The next stage is not to admire the traces but to ask whether the second one supplies information that the other measurements cannot.

That question can be made precise. Suppose the established model predicts the timing and distribution of chromatophore activity from the visual stimulus, neural recordings, muscular state and ordinary electrochemical conditions. Does adding the independently measured water-associated state improve its predictions on trials the model has not previously seen? Can it anticipate which patch of skin will respond first, or how a response spreads, with a reproducible advantage? If the answer is no, the proposed information-handling contribution has not been demonstrated, however beautiful the correlations appear.

If the answer is yes, a still more demanding question follows: what happens when the putative water state is changed? The intervention must be selective enough not to injure the tissue, disrupt ordinary hydration or simply interfere with the known machinery of nerve and muscle. That is an ambitious experimental requirement. It may demand preliminary work on isolated skin preparations, carefully chosen chemical or physical perturbations, and independent confirmation that the established pathways remain functional.

Imagine that, after this preparation, a particular intervention alters the candidate water-associated measurement. The skin response changes in the predicted direction, while the conventional measurements remain sufficiently stable. The result is repeated under different conditions, and the analysis was specified before the experiment began. It would not prove a universal field. It would, however, justify a new and substantial question: has a previously unrecognised water-associated variable become part of the causal explanation of biological coordination?

The answer would still need to survive the arrival of another laboratory. Different instruments, different investigators, different animals and different experimental habits have a way of exposing what a first result concealed. A phenomenon that disappears under independent replication is not a discovery waiting to be defended by rhetoric. It is a clue that something in the original arrangement remains to be understood.

There is another possibility, less dramatic but no less instructive. Perhaps every apparent water-associated signal turns out to be a consequence of familiar ionic gradients. Perhaps perturbing the local aqueous environment changes camouflage only because nerves and muscles are sensitive to the same chemical conditions. Perhaps the proposed intermediate state adds nothing to prediction once the established variables are measured properly. In that case, the local hypothesis would lose the explanatory contribution it claims. The result would narrow the theory, and the book should welcome that narrowing.

The comparative organisms discussed earlier offer a different kind of laboratory. In Spirostomum, a contraction generates a hydrodynamic disturbance that travels

through water and stimulates neighbouring cells. The signal is already known to be mechanical. Researchers could use that well-characterised process as a baseline, asking whether an independently measurable interfacial-water state contributes anything beyond flow, viscosity, geometry and mechanosensitive response. A result that merely reproduces the known trigger wave would confirm good fluid mechanics, not the stronger hypothesis.

What makes such experiments appealing is their clarity. The biological drama is visible. The physical medium is present. The alternative explanations can be stated. A curious reader need not master spectroscopy to appreciate the question: if the same movement of water produces the same known forces, does changing some additional organised property of the water alter the organism's response in a specific, repeatable way?

Only after the local biological question has yielded a reliable result would the second horizon deserve a comparable investment. Atmospheric water is an entirely different experimental environment. Vapour molecules are widely separated compared with liquid water and undergo frequent collisions. To propose a durable information-carrying organisation in ordinary air is to accept a fresh set of physical demands. Researchers would first need to show that such an organisation exists under realistic conditions, that it persists long enough to matter, and that it can carry a defined signal from a specified source to a receiver.

One can imagine a sealed chamber with humidity, temperature, aerosols and electromagnetic conditions measured and controlled. The chamber is not a stage for extraordinary claims. It is a place to find out whether an apparent signal is merely an artefact of ordinary absorption, condensation, electrical leakage or instrumentation. If a new phenomenon survives those tests, the next experiment becomes possible. If it does not, the atmospheric conjecture ends there without invalidating a separate finding in living tissue.

This separation is essential to the architecture of the book. The octopus experiment does not have to carry the weight of telepathy, cosmology or the history of human insight. It has enough work of its own. It asks whether organised water is part of the information-handling apparatus of a living animal. A positive answer would change the description of that apparatus. It would not, by itself, establish that water transmits thoughts or that distant objects can be read without ordinary signals.

And yet the imaginative stakes remain high. Scientific inquiry is not made courageous by announcing a revolution in advance. It becomes courageous when a proposition is clear enough to risk being wrong. Here the risk is concrete: a new measurement may fail to predict anything; a selective intervention may do nothing; a replication may erase an apparent effect. But the possibility on the other side is equally concrete. A

physical property of the aqueous interface, long treated as part of the conditions of life, might prove to participate in the organisation of a living response.

I would like to see that experiment performed. Not because I know its outcome, but because the outcome would mean something. A camera, a controlled stimulus, an animal whose skin is capable of astonishing transformations, and a carefully defined measurement of the water in which its cells operate: the apparatus is modest compared with the reach of the question. The octopus may offer no confirmation of my hypothesis. It may instead reveal a different and better explanation. Either way, it will have done what first drew my attention to it: made the familiar world more difficult, and more rewarding, to understand.

A positive experiment would not prove the universe interconnected by water. It would identify a candidate causal contribution in a particular biological system. The reward would be a new question made precise enough for other laboratories to examine. A negative result would be equally valuable if it excluded the proposed contribution under clearly defined conditions. This is how wonder becomes a programme of investigation.

Three Endings to One Experiment

Imagine returning to the laboratory some months later. The camera is familiar now. The animal has been studied under many conditions, and the researchers know the rhythm of the measurements. What remains uncertain is which of three very different stories the data will tell.

In the first, the measured water-associated state consistently improves the prediction of a skin response. More importantly, when that state is selectively altered, the response changes in the anticipated way while competing explanations remain controlled. Another laboratory repeats the result. This would not establish a universal field. It would be something more immediate and, in its own way, more exciting: evidence that a previously overlooked physical variable participates causally in a living system's coordination.

In the second, the water measurement adds nothing once the known physiological signals are included. The apparent novelty dissolves under better instruments. There would be disappointment, certainly, but also progress. An attractive explanation would have been given a fair test and found unnecessary in that setting. The octopus would still change colour; we would simply know more about how to account for it.

The third ending is the one science knows particularly well. A first laboratory sees an effect; a second cannot reproduce it. Perhaps an unnoticed temperature gradient or a difference in tissue preparation was responsible. The right response would be neither triumph nor embarrassment, but renewed attention to the conditions under which

the result appeared. An effect that depends on an invisible experimental habit is not yet a discovery.

All three outcomes have something to teach. The purpose of an experiment is not to arrange a victory for an idea. It is to bring a compelling possibility into contact with a world that is under no obligation to agree. I would still want to be in the room when the answer arrives.

9 — The Octopus Revelation

What would actually be revealed if a water-associated contribution were found? Not that the octopus possesses supernatural vision, and not that every curious observation in nature shares one cause. The first revelation would be that our map of biological perception had omitted an active participant. Water would no longer appear only as the indispensable substance surrounding the machinery of life; under defined conditions, its organised properties would be part of the machinery itself.

I find that possibility exhilarating because it is neither trivial nor beyond examination. The octopus would remain the same extraordinary animal. The reef would remain rock, algae and moving light. What would change is the account we give of their interaction. We might discover that an organism's relation to its surroundings is distributed more widely through its material constitution than we had imagined. That would be a substantial result even if every grander idea about consciousness and cosmic fields remained unanswered.

Return to the reef. The octopus is still there, though for a moment we cannot find it. The light shifts across the stone; the animal changes with it. It is tempting to imagine that explanation will drain the scene of wonder. I think the opposite. A real mechanism makes a real event more remarkable, not less.

This book proposes one additional possibility: organised water at living interfaces may participate in the acquisition, transmission and coordination of environmental information. It is a local biological proposition before it is a cosmological one. The larger idea of a universal informational architecture remains a separate and much more speculative horizon.

If the hypothesis fails, we will have learned something about the boundaries of water's role in life. If it succeeds, it will not need exaggeration to become important. The octopus will continue to disappear against the reef, indifferent to our theories. What may change is our understanding of the medium in which living systems operate.

If organised water were shown to participate in information handling, the medium surrounding biological machinery would become part of the machinery itself. That

possibility is worth investigating even if none of the more distant philosophical extensions survives. The octopus has not proved the conjecture. It has given it a memorable place to begin.

The Waters Above and Below

6. And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

7. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.

8. And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.

Genesis 1:6–8 — The Holy Bible, King James Version (1611)

Long before humanity understood the molecular structure of water, its place in the atmosphere or its extraordinary role within living organisms, an ancient account of creation placed water at the centre of the world's architecture.

The distinction was elemental: waters below, waters above, and a firmament between them.

Read today, these verses offer a striking literary parallel to the two horizons explored in this book. The first concerns water within living systems, organised around biological interfaces. The second concerns water distributed through the atmosphere, raising a different and more speculative question about the possible reach of physical information.

The parallel is not scientific evidence, nor does the ancient text establish a molecular mechanism. Its significance here is philosophical: across vastly different ways of understanding the world, water repeatedly appears not merely as something contained within creation, but as part of the structure through which creation is understood.

Perhaps that is the most fitting place to conclude our inquiry. We began with an octopus disappearing into the waters below. We end by looking towards the waters above, wondering whether the substance that makes life possible may also participate in ways of perceiving the world that we have only begun to investigate.

Research Note — The Octopus–Water–Field Interface Hypothesis

The following adopted formulations are preserved verbatim from the authoritative technical manuscript. They are supplied for readers who wish to examine the scientific claim separately from the narrative.

2.3 The Original Biological Hypothesis: Water as an Active Information Interface

The central proposition of this book is that water within living tissue may perform a function not adequately recognised in conventional accounts of biological information processing: it may participate directly in the acquisition, transmission and coordination of environmental information. This is a stronger claim than suggesting that water influences cellular chemistry or electrical conductivity. Those functions are already recognised. The hypothesis proposed here is that the physical organisation of interfacial water may constitute an additional information-handling mechanism, capable of registering environmental signals and contributing to coordinated biological responses. The octopus provides an unusually revealing system in which to investigate this possibility. Its remarkable camouflage depends on the coordinated transformation of thousands of specialised skin structures. Established neural and muscular mechanisms explain important aspects of this behaviour. The question advanced here is whether these mechanisms describe the entire information-processing architecture, or whether the water-rich environment in which they operate contributes an additional, physically identifiable layer of coordination. The Octopus–Water–Field Interface Hypothesis proposes that organised water at biological interfaces can participate in the detection and propagation of environmental information through coupled electrochemical and potentially collective electromagnetic dynamics, thereby contributing directly to the speed, precision and coordination of adaptive responses. Under this model, water is neither a passive solvent nor simply an electrical conductor. It is proposed to function as an active interface between the physical environment and the organism's responsive structures. In octopus skin, such an interface could operate alongside established sensory and neural pathways. Environmental signals may influence the electrical or structural organisation of interfacial water, while changes in that organisation may alter the timing, sensitivity or coordination of chromatophore responses. If sufficiently coupled across neighbouring structures, these dynamics could contribute to the remarkable coherence of camouflage across the animal's skin. This does not require the nervous system to be bypassed. It proposes that the nervous system may not be the only physical system participating in the coordination of the response. Nor does the biological hypothesis require the prior existence of a universal information field. Its first claim is local and experimentally accessible: water-associated dynamics contribute information-bearing effects to camouflage that cannot be fully explained by the established neural, muscular, optical and metabolic mechanisms alone. This distinction is decisive. A water-dependent change in electrical conductivity would not,

by itself, establish the hypothesis. The proposed mechanism must demonstrate an identifiable contribution to information handling: a reproducible relationship between an environmental signal, a measurable water-associated state and a coordinated biological response. The hypothesis therefore makes a concrete prediction. If the relevant properties of interfacial water are selectively altered while established neural and muscular functions are controlled, measurable aspects of camouflage coordination should change in a reproducible manner. Those changes should be attributable to water-associated dynamics rather than merely to general tissue damage, altered hydration or disrupted metabolism. If no independent information-handling contribution can be demonstrated, the proposed biological mechanism loses its explanatory basis. If such a contribution is established, however, the implication would be substantial. It would mean that at least some biological information processing is distributed not only across neurons, sensory receptors and signalling molecules, but also through the organised physical properties of the aqueous medium in which those systems operate. Water would then be recognised not merely as the medium supporting biological information processing, but as one of its active participants. That is the biological proposition this book advances.

4.1 The Bridge from Biological Observation to Universal Information

The distinction between what is observed and what is proposed must remain clear. Octopus camouflage is observable. The participation of structured water in its information-processing architecture is the hypothesis. The possibility that this mechanism belongs to a wider informational organisation of physical reality is its philosophical extension. Yet these distinctions should not obscure the significance of the central proposition. The Octopus–Water–Field Interface proposes that the aqueous organisation of living tissue is not merely the setting in which biological information is processed. Under appropriate physical conditions, it may itself participate in registering, transmitting and coordinating information about the surrounding world. The proposed mechanism begins locally. Physical environments possess measurable properties: electromagnetic fields, optical patterns, chemical gradients, mechanical forces and thermal distributions. These properties interact continuously with biological matter. The hypothesis asks whether organised interfacial water can transform some of these interactions into coordinated responses through mechanisms not yet incorporated into conventional accounts of biological sensing. If demonstrated in octopuses, such a mechanism would establish something important without requiring an immediate appeal to cosmology: the existence of an additional, water-dependent contribution to biological information handling. The wider proposition follows from that possibility, but is not established by it. The discovery of a water-mediated information mechanism would be consequential in its own right, even if the broader field hypothesis were eventually rejected. Conversely, evidence of unusual electromagnetic or coherent behaviour in water would not establish non-local

information exchange without a demonstrated transmission mechanism and reproducible information transfer. The immediate hypothesis is that water participates actively in biological information handling. The broader possibility is that this capacity reflects a more general informational property of matter and its interactions. The octopus is the starting point because its camouflage offers an extraordinary, observable expression of coordinated biological response. It is not proof of the proposed architecture. It is the living system through which that architecture can first be meaningfully investigated. The hypothesis therefore has two experimental horizons. The near horizon is biological: can a water-dependent signal be isolated in cephalopod skin, and does it explain variance that established physiology does not? The distant horizon is atmospheric and cognitive: can coherent water transmit controlled information across distance with ordinary sensory and electromagnetic leakage excluded? The philosophical implication remains bold. If those bridges were experimentally established, water would be more than the medium in which life's chemistry occurs; it would also be part of a previously unrecognised information architecture. Until then, the octopus is an invitation to investigate, not a demonstration of the whole architecture.

Appendix B — How the Claim Could Be Tested

A decisive experiment would compare a controlled environmental input, an independently recorded interfacial-water variable, and a biological response after known sensory, neural, muscular, ionic and mechanical processes are accounted for. Predictive improvement alone would not prove causality. A selective perturbation, with suitable controls, would be needed to establish a contribution. Failure of one defined mechanism would reject that version, not every conceivable role of water.

Acknowledgements and AI Assistance

Acknowledgements and AI Assistance

The author acknowledges the scientific and historical work discussed in this book, including contributions from researchers whose conclusions are contested. Discussion does not imply endorsement of every interpretation. ChatGPT and Grok were used for drafting, restructuring, editing and generating research leads. Their outputs are not independent verification of scientific claims. The original hypothesis, selection of arguments and final responsibility belong to Jeroen J. J. Sluiter.

About the Author

About the Author

Jeroen J. J. Sluiter is an entrepreneur and independent thinker whose interests include information systems, biology and the philosophical implications of scientific inquiry. This book develops his original conjecture concerning water as a possible interface for environmental information.

Sources and Further Reading — Provisional

The following sources inform the principal claims of this edition. Full primary-source verification of every numerical claim and quotation is required before commercial release. • Del Giudice, E., et al. Quantum field theoretical methods in biology. Various papers on coherent domains in water (1980s–2000s). • Hanlon, R. T., & Messenger, J. B. Cephalopod Behaviour. Cambridge University Press (multiple editions). • Mathijssen, A. J. T. M., et al. Collective intercellular communication through ultra-fast hydrodynamic trigger waves. Nature (2019). • Pollack, G. H. The Fourth Phase of Water. Ebner and Sons (2013). • Utts, J. An assessment of the evidence for psychic functioning. Journal of Scientific Exploration (1995). • Hyman, R. Evaluation of the program on anomalous mental phenomena. Journal of Scientific Exploration (1995). • Reviews of cephalopod chromatophore kinetics: Current Biology (2023) and related Oxford reviews on cuttlefish patterning timescales. • Critical discussions of exclusion-zone phenomena and alternative mechanisms (diffusiophoresis, interfacial electrochemistry). • Haramein, N. Quantum Gravity and the Holographic Mass. Resonance Science Foundation (2013). • Reports on spruce-tree bioelectrical activity during solar eclipse (2025) and subsequent methodological critiques.

Publication note: Primary references, numerical claims and historical attributions require final verification before commercial release. This narrative edition does not claim experimental confirmation of the proposed mechanism.