

EPILOGUE

R.G. Jahn & B.J. Dunne

Clearly we must leave any extrapolation of the PEAR proposition into the venues of integrative and complementary medicine to those practitioners and advocates who are far more qualified than we to assemble the requisite batteries of basic experiments, clinical trials, diagnostic and therapeutic techniques, physiological and pharmacological models, and infrastructures of scholarly and pragmatic support. But it is our hope that the objective evidence and subjective experience derived from our own explorations, as laid before you in this anthology, may be helpful in guiding, validating, and sustaining your own endeavors along paths of understanding and application. The challenges, of course, must be met by both insight and implementation. With respect to the former, in several of the articles in this anthology we attempted to identify general attitudinal tactics that seem propitious for the requisite beneficial alteration of experiential reality. To recapitulate, our evidence supports the efficacy of:

- genuine acceptance of the possibility of alternative realities;
- invocation of conceptual metaphors for accessing them;
- tolerance and utilization of uncertainty, randomness, and complexity in manifesting them;
- replacement of conceptual duality by conceptual complementarity;
- attribution of meaning, at a deep emotional and/or spiritual level, in the expression of intentions and desires; and
- resonant engagement in information-creating interactions with the life-giving Source.

Each of these lends itself to specific invocations in particular healing contexts, and many are indeed already commonly applied—albeit intuitively or empirically—by proponents of alternative healthcare. Our suggestions are thus more validations of such practices, than fresh propositions.

With regard to specific technical implementations, our inclination would be first to pursue application of the FieldREG technology and analysis techniques (References 21 and 22) and of the remote perception protocols and scoring methods (Reference 8). These should be amenable to coordinated balances of further basic research and clinical trials that could achieve access to diagnostic and therapeutic information to complement the more conventional medical procedures. As confidence with these modalities grows, attention could be extended to other consciousness-correlated information sources, such as remote human/machine interactions (Reference 16); robotic influences (Supplementary References to the Relevant Overviews Section); and filter-tuning strategies (Reference 28).

In the penultimate paragraph of his ringing editorial to this special issue of *EXPLORE*, Dr Dossey graciously insulated us from his own personal convictions regarding the global implications of our work for the future welfare of mankind and its earthly environment. Much as we appreciate his courtesy, it was unnecessary; our feelings in this regard are very close to his own,

and equally intense. As we confessed in *Margins of Reality* (pp. 292–293), beyond its implications for basic science and engineering applications, a third and dominant motivation for our initial and enduring commitment to the PEAR enterprise has been, and will remain:

...—the spiritual implications, in the fullest sense of the term—in imbuing this engineering research with yet broader relevance and excitement. Here we refer not to any quasi-religious zeal or dogmatic conviction, but to the same desire to improve the quality of life, and to the same quiet philosophical reverence for the majesty of the cosmos and man’s role in it that have been acknowledged by most creative scholars throughout history. In this category, for example, we ponder whether incontrovertible scientific demonstration of the ability of consciousness to influence its physical reality . . . might substantially alter individual and collective perception of the human state, its value system, and its consequent patterns of behavior.

We also concur with Dr Dossey’s endorsement of de Broglie’s vision of the “engineers of the future.” Careful application of scientific knowledge and rigor of method, within a permeating atmosphere of “love, in a very general sense,” is clearly a noble and powerful plan for relating thought to action in any technical arena. But the formula appears particularly pertinent to our topic in its specific efficacy for realization of the phenomena themselves. For it is precisely through the bonds of consciousness established between human operators, or with their technical devices and processes, that the anomalous data seem to emerge. Thus, the spiritual component participates in a very pragmatic sense: selfless investment of self can affect physical reality.

The only nuance of distinction between Dr Dossey’s persuasion and our own is that we have been drawn to our position primarily by the tangible, objective results encountered on a daily basis over many years of rigorous laboratory experimentation. The consistency of these with the long-established spiritual and metaphysical traditions he recounts strengthens the case, but the evidence that the power of love can surface, even in the most pristine and quantitative contexts of this secular scientific age, should encourage deeper and broader reliance on its capacity for individual and collective healing.

In most of the papers included in this anthology, we have resorted to the term *resonance* as a relatively antiseptic substitute for the academically discomforting word *love*. But as the PEAR spirit prepares to move beyond its present physical confines, it is also time to relinquish this semantic conservatism as well. In its place, we would leave our readers with reiteration of the heartfelt conviction with which we concluded the paper “Information, Consciousness, and Health,” namely, the *scientific* message is this:

In loving ourselves, we can heal ourselves;
In loving the world, we can heal the world.