

## Correspondence

Note from the 1981 Research Steering Group of the S.M.N.

-- *Dr Jean Kollerstrom*

With reference to our research team's work on low-dose effects (see Network Newsletters **13**, pages 24-30, **16**, pages 1-9, **17**, pages 38-45 and **19**, pages 70-84, for a full account of this work) we wish to draw attention to the fact that a paper describing the experimental work which was initiated by our steering group and carried out by Professor Brian Goodwin (SMN)<sup>1</sup> and his colleagues, has now been published: viz. Growth Response of Mouse Lymphoma Cells to Low Concentrations of Mercuric Chloride, by S.P. Jost<sup>2</sup>, J. Cole and B. C. Goodwin, M.R.C. Cell Mutation Unit, The University of Sussex, Brighton. Z. Naturforschung **40c**, 922-924 (1985). As already reported in Newsletter 19 (1981) page 70A, the findings herein described fail to confirm those reported by van Mansvelt and Amons whose results we were attempting to replicate.

This is perhaps a suitable point at which to add that William Staffen (S.M.N. member) was unable to confirm the results reported by Jones, R.L, Jenkins, M.D., Br. Hom. J. **70**, 120 (1981); **72**, 143 (1983a), working at the R. Hom. Hospital, 1981, on wheat and yeast as **in vitro** models for investigating homoeopathic medicines (mentioned by me in Newsletter **19**, pages 70 C4), see W.A. Steffen (1984), Br. Hom. J. **73**: 198-210. These negative findings taken together with my report (Br. Hom. J. (1982) mean that we cannot now claim that there is any reproducible evidence for the low-dose effect, in **vitro**, in spite of the vast literature published in several languages, claiming that such effects have been proved to exist.

I would like finally to reiterate that the absence of replicable experiments does not of course necessarily mean that low-potency homoeopathic remedies have a no effect; it shows only that, to date, such effects have not been proven in a scientifically acceptable fashion.

J.K.

<sup>1</sup>Now at Dept. of Biology, The Open University, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA.

<sup>2</sup>From whom reprints are available, Dept. of Anatomy, University of Manchester, M13 9PT.

Some Comments on the Article by Michael Watson in the S.M.N. Newsletter No. 32, p15, Entitled "Some Experiments and Hypotheses on the Biophysical Field".

-- *Dr. Jean Kollerstrom*

I read with great interest [Michael Watson's article in the Newsletter No.32](#). I would like to add a few comments in the light of certain information which came to me privately, from Dr. Boyd's Head Laboratory Technician, Mr. W. A. Eadie, and which I published in the S.M.N. Newsletter **19**, 1981, with his permission. It would require too much space to reproduce the whole of this here. I will summarise the gist of Mr. Eadie's comments (April 1981) on the Emanometer experiments as follows: Initially, the project appeared to give highly satisfactory results. The 'instrument' required a subject who acted as a kind of detector, and an operator. Lord Horder's team reported favourably on the tests they had witnessed, in which the emanometer appeared able to distinguish between different potencies and the presence or absence of a potency. Lord Horder then sent a physicist up from London to examine the phenomenon further, but Dr. Boyd refused to give him a demonstration. Mr

Eadie states "I am of the opinion that Dr. Boyd refused to give a demonstration to the physicist because he found he could no longer do so. The subject and the operator in the Horder test were teenage boys. Before the physicist arrived one boy was sacked for stealing and the other went to America. A new boy was trained as a subject but a young man in his late twenties was taken on as the operator. **From then on the results were merely chance**". Mr. Eadie concluded that success was somehow associated with the use of young assistants in the experiments. This seems somewhat dubious. What is not, however, in doubt is that the results with the emanometer were found to be not reproducible, thus rather negating some statements made in Michael Watson's article.

Since there is at present no satisfactory theory or model which can in any way explain the apparent effect of Ultra-Avogadro dilutions on human subjects, it would be of great importance to examine in more quantitative detail Michael Watson's suggestion of a 'non-quantised field' which may carry information from the original solute to the solvent. None of this evidence would appear to be available in published form. A short statement of Maby's and Mr. Watson's data obtained for the effect of a dowsing field on radioactive decay rate might be of great interest in this connection.

J.K.

Magic or Miracle<sup>3</sup>, a comment on Resonating Energy Signals and Perennial Wisdom.

-- Gerben Andriessen, *Miracle-Mobile*, c/o 25 Burley Farm Road, Exeter, Devon.

Does not Network Newsletter 31 give wonderful opportunity for reflection? Take Dr. C.W.M. Wilson's thought provoking application of the concept that the brain functions like a frequency analyser, receiving external complex patterns of signals and translating these into more or less useful and simpler frequencies. Does it, however, not warrant further enquiry before any true therapeutic implications can be asserted? Was it coincidence that Dr. Willis W. Harman's contribution on "Perennial Wisdom etc" appeared in the same newsletter?

One wonders what remains of Dr. Wilson's proposals if the Third Kind of Metaphysics (M3 - page 7) were indeed to become the prevailing belief system of the future world (and thus of future therapeutic scientists). What if the brain, itself a product of mind, instead of analysing external signals, rather is the projector/broadcaster of internal frequencies, which the eyes as extensions of that self same brain - then translate to and perceives as external matter/energy within a seeming independent space-time continuum? (The question who decides what and when to project is addressed in "A Course in Miracles"<sup>4</sup>).

Seen from this point of view, all that is seemingly outside the observer, including one's own body, is really the projection of inner experiences and thus purely symbolic (G. Jung alludes to this in **Aion** (Collected Works No.9 Vol II paragraph 268). "Scientists use for their observations an apparatus of whose nature and structure they know practically nothing".

Keith Hudson's quote of Patanjali (page 9) becomes very meaningful:

*"There is identity of relation between mind and cause without respect to time and place".*

(It seems Patanjali understood what synchronicity really means long before Jung developed his own ideas about it!) Is this what the Bhagavad-Gita understands by Maya, illusion? Does J. Krishnamurti allude to this when he states that "the observer is the observed"?

Certainly the metaphysical approach of "A Course in Miracles" asserts that Mind is Primary, Causal, Creative, Perfect and Complete, Reality, all inclusive and thus incapable of division or separation of any kind or in any sense.

Seen from this view, therapeutic activity is a contradiction as illusory as what it purports to remedy. It is a form of the attempt to "reconcile the irreconcilable", as the course puts it. No form of therapy can ever be creative (and what is not creative cannot have reality). At best, its highest form - Psychotherapy - recognises the mind the source of all so-called illness. Since this is the first or archetypal illusion, the therapeutic scientist of the future will be a Professor of Wholeness, a Healer of Healers, the last and final Illusionist, who exposes illusions for what they are!

G.A.

<sup>3</sup> A miracle according to "A Course in Miracles" is a shift in consciousness, from fear to love while magic is the belief in illusions, or the mindless (miscreative) use of mind.

<sup>4</sup>"A Course in Miracles", Routledge & Kegan. Paul in Arkana, paperback 1985 - £9.95.  
Copyright 1975 by Foundation for Inner Peace, P.O. Box 635, Tiburon CA 94920, U.S.A.