

# Editorial

## DOUBT

Steven L. Fahrion, Ph.D.

**Doubt:** To lack trust or confidence in.

“Half the failures in the world arise from pulling in one’s horse as he is leaping.”  
—Julius Hare (1795-1855), English cleric, writer

“When we are not sure, we are alive.”  
—Graham Greene (b. 1904), British novelist

“The first step toward philosophy is incredulity.”  
—Denis Diderot (1713-1784) French philosopher

“There is a vulgar incredulity, which . . . finds it easier to doubt than to examine.”  
—Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832), Scottish novelist, poet

In this issue of the Journal, through reports of some very strange events that have been subjected to scientific study, we are presented with opportunities to exercise trust, doubt, and/or our skills at *examining*. Each of these three modes of evaluation, trust, doubt, or examining, could be appropriate as we approach the phenomena under study, depending upon our experiential histories, attitudes and values, and technical and professional skills. It is what we do *after* our first moment of encounter with the materials presented here that is crucial in determining our capacities as scientists and as citizens of the new world that is emerging around us, one beyond conventional scientific understanding. Do we simply accede to credulity—or to incredulity—or are we able to suspend judgement until the data is in and the dust has settled? Can we proceed with the artist’s high tolerance for ambiguity as *meaningful*

design emerges from the stone, stroke by stroke (in combination with random effects), showing a version of what is *real* at light of day).

As suggested in the quotations above, doubt may be *examined* or simply reflexive (knee-jerk) in quality. In either case, doubt maintains itself in a dualistic environment where doubter is “separate from” the phenomena at issue rather than being “at one,” merged with the item. Doubt is allied with questions rather than answers, with limits rather than open possibilities.

Currently we are being treated to a variety of forms of doubt in pronouncements from practitioners of conventional science as though those of us who study and use energy medicine have little understanding of conventional methods of “proof.” In general, these pronouncements miss the mark and fail to capture essential understanding of energy medicine, preferring to categorize energy medicine studies as unscientific, nothing but placebo or self-delusion. There are many ways of canceling the intellectual tendency to examine new phenomena with *pro forma* incredulity; the strong temptation to reject new observations does not make the facts go away.

Evidence is gathering. Paradigms are emerging. Critics are failing to contend with emerging data (e.g. of nonlocal effects), and are failing to tolerate and explore ambiguities connected with new phenomena, instead hiding behind simple denial or absurd and incorrect attempts to excoriate energy medicine studies as perhaps not following traditional investigative rules. Light increasingly shines through cracks in old ways, aiding understanding of the world that surrounds us. Data increasingly dispels both the heavy crust developed to protect us from our fears, and need for it.

Walter Dibble, Jr. and William Tiller, in *Developing of pH and Temperature Oscillations in Water Containing ZnCO<sub>3</sub> Crystallites Using Intention Imprinted Electronic Devices*, reveal another chapter in their paradigmatic investigation of parameters of effects of intention on the material universe. The exciting value of an energy medicine protocol that can be altered one element at a time is further revealed—see our previous issue—in allowing synergistic accumulation of scientific knowledge. of impacts of intention on the universe at large. In this new chapter, two experiments demonstrate predicted and serendipitously discovered nonlocal effects from electronic devices imprinted by intention.

*Scientific Analysis of An Artifact from a Presumed Episode of Spontaneous Human Combustion: A Possible Case for Biological Nuclear Reactions* by Sue Benford and Larry Arnold stretches our tolerance for ambiguity in understanding both phenomenon and mechanism in energy medicine. The authors have contributed careful scientific investigation of an object remaining behind after a mysterious event, an instance of spontaneous human combustion. Surprisingly, despite some 400 reports of such events spanning the ages, few attempts exist that try to explain how such events could occur. The authors of this paper are to be congratulated for their integrity in pursuing detailed scientific investigations of possible origins of a rare but dramatic event.

Geoffrey Leigh, Jeanne Metzker and Jeanne Hilton have seized an exciting opportunity to extend knowledge about human energy fields by beginning to study children of different ages in *An Observational Study of Human Energy Fields in Infants and Young Children*. Sometimes a convergence of two fields launches entirely new perspectives. By melding classical developmental research strategies with energy medicine diagnostic observational procedures, these authors have creatively launched what is certain to become a broad ongoing effort to understand changes in human energy fields across time and life experiences.

Finally, in *Psychology and Spiritualism*, we reprint a classic paper of Carl Jung which compliments very well the theme of this issue, that it is possible to bring into scientific study phenomenon that until recently were regarded as “beyond the pale,” as unsatisfactory for scientific investigation. Jung attributed many of these phenomena to the unconscious mind, noting that such phenomena may be regarded as offering “. . . valuable information about the unconscious and its ways.” Later he identifies mechanistic thinking as an “Americanism.” What is new about the paradigm revolution in which we are participating is that it is clear that our object of study is not simply one of mechanics of operation of the unconscious mind, but that it also includes consensual observable events in the physical world, and that it is not limited by mechanistic (Newtonian) rules, nor by the political boundaries of particular countries.

In the cover for this issue, *Original Face*, Alex Grey reveals the energetic *form within* that cannot help but shock us with its human yet electric and somehow very technologic quality. The expression is enigmatic and easy to interpret as uncaring or detached at first, yet with prolonged study its character grows on one as it seems to change to one of friendliness, integrity and high purpose.

In its essential nature this Face is not unlike the phenomena we study, mysterious, reserved and somewhat frightening at first, and then transforming as we come to know it into a perfect mirror of our own nature, revealing, playful, *intent!* Integrated, integrative and untroubled by doubt.

∞ ∞ ∞