

ENDOPHYSICAL MODELS BASED ON EMPIRICAL DATA

R.G. Jahn & B.J. Dunne

R. Buccheri, A. Elitzur*, M. Saniga, eds.

Endophysics, Time, Quantum and the Subjective: Proceedings of the ZiF Interdisciplinary Research Workshop, Bielefeld, Germany, 17–22 January 2005 (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2005), reprinted with permission

For those readers interested in further summary of the logical entwining of the experimental and theoretical findings of the PEAR program as they build a supporting case for a similar approach to consciousness-mediated health and healing, we recommend the following article drawn from a Proceedings Volume derived from a recent international conference entitled “Endophysics, Time, Quantum and the Subjective.” This assembly commingled several theoretical physicists, psy-

chologists, philosophers of science, alternative healthcare advocates, and others, each of whom was struggling to accommodate consciousness-related anomalies within their own academic, pragmatic, and personal perspectives. Our message to this group was essentially an exhortation that they base their hypotheses and models on experimental data, rather than “spinning webs out of themselves” as Francis Bacon warned some four centuries ago.

Abstract

Any proposed endophysical models need to acknowledge a number of subjective correlates that have been well established in such objectively quantifiable experimental contexts as anomalous human/machine interactions and remote perception information acquisition. Most notable of these factors are conscious and unconscious intention; gender disparities; serial position effects; intrinsic uncertainties; elusive replicability; and emotional resonance between the partici-

pants and the devices, process, and tasks. Perhaps even more pertinent are the insensitivities of the anomalous effects to spatial and temporal separations of the participants from the physical targets. Inclusion of subjective coordinates in the models, and exclusion of physical distance and time, raise formidable issues of specification, quantification, and dynamical formulation from both the physical and psychological perspectives. A few primitive examples of possible approaches are presented.

SUPPLEMENTARY THEORETICAL REFERENCES

In addition to the assortment of conceptual models developed in the preceding Items 16–21, our colleague York Dobyns has pursued various statistical issues pertinent to our data analysis and interpretation. Several of these efforts have merited publication in their own right.

Empirical Evidence against Decision Augmentation Theory

Y.H. Dobyns & R.D. Nelson, *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, **12**, No. 2 (1998)

<www.princeton.edu/~pear/pdfs/jse_papers/Evidence-against-DAT.pdf>

Overview of Several Theoretical Models on PEAR Data

Y.H. Dobyns, *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, **14**, No. 2 (2000)
<www.princeton.edu/~pear/pdfs/jse_papers/Overview.pdf>

Retrocausal Information flow: What are the implications of knowing the future?

Y. Dobyns, AIP Conference Proceedings, **863** (2006) *Frontiers of Time: Retrocausation – Experiment and Theory*, D. Sheehan, ed. AAAS Symposium San Diego, California, 20–22 June 2006
<proceedings.aip.org/proceedings/confproceed/863.jsp>

Statistical Consequences of Data Selection

Y.H. Dobyns, *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, **21**, No. 1 (2007)