

Very dear colleague

To understand something about the technique of treating distant burns, a scientific introduction is required.

Science should be: trying to reach the limits of our cognitive capacity.

To reach the limits, we use scientific systems. Scientific systems are mutual agreements between practitioners of a scientific system with the enormous advantage of mutual communication between the practitioners of that scientific system.

The disadvantage is the restriction that they impose in these agreements. With a scientific system only a small part of the cognitive capacity is used and there is a limitation of the knowledge area.

When we talk about medical science, we are talking about a medical scientific system and not about medical science.

A scientific system is based on assumptions and propositions, which we test with our observations. If we make an observation that does not fit with these assumptions and propositions, then we have to adjust our assumptions and propositions in such a way that the observed fits in with the changed assumptions and propositions, or something does not fit in the observation. The rejection in advance of the observation that is not appropriate in the system is an unscientific attitude. The rejection of the observed is an understandable attitude. A scientific system gives us security and uncertainty frightens us. We want to avoid this fear. A real scientist is characterized by his resistance to this fear. It takes courage to go against the established dogmata. As Nietzsche said, that a new position is first ridiculed, then this new proposition is opposed in order not to be accepted in the event of any opposition. Normally many years pass.

Knowledge, the basis of science, is the neural processing of information that comes to us.

There are two ways of knowing.

1. The cognitive power through our sensuality with awareness of the senses being affected. This ability could process 61 bites per second.
2. Being affected on an unconscious level. Unconsciously we are affected by 500,000 times more bites than by the cognitive power linked to consciousness.

If a scientific system is limited to the first cognitive capacity, then a large part of the information that has been received and thus known will fall.

But how can this received unconscious information be made aware to communicate about it?

If this unconscious information enters our nervous system and not through our sensory cognition, only the neurovegetative nervous system remains, which in the nervous system has contact with the central nervous system through the sympathetic and parasympathetic nervous system. We can consciously feel our organs. I consciously feel my heartbeat. I feel that I am more perspiring. I hear my stomach go. I experience that my breathing stops or goes faster. I feel dizzy. My hairs stand up straight. And for the more gifted I hear voices or see visions, smell odors or feel tingling. These are all sensed sensations of my involuntary nervous system, which responds to the unconscious information.

The fact that non-sensorial information can be made aware has already been demonstrated by several researchers (Radin, Bierman et al.).

My own Sahara experiments showed clearly in an experimental setup that extrasensory information can be passed on.

One of the experiments went like this. There are two subjects. One is the recipient and the other is the sending person. The receiving person stands with his eyes close to the sending person and the sending person taps the hands of the receiving person with his hands and starts walking. In a place he chooses, he turns around and says in a loud voice: I turn around. At that moment the receiving person has a sensation in his body. It may be that he feels pulled back, which can be seen because he is about to fall behind. Or he feels a sensation to his stomach. Or he feels tingling in his right or left hand. An emotional feeling is also possible, such as sadness. In hundreds of subjects, the sensation was different, but specifically appropriate for the sending person. When the receiving person feels a sensation, he indicates that by saying stop. Although most receiving subjects experience it the first time, there are no subjects who only experience it after the third time, it does not indicate that the consciousness does not allow the unconscious sensation to feel it consciously. This seems consistent with the found 0,365 seconds of Libet and Feinstein. Nevertheless, all test subjects eventually feel it. It was striking that women in general were much more sensitive and that people with an academic degree had a lot of trouble to make the feeling aware.

The second part of the experiment was that the sending person left the receiving party in the same way, but had to turn around without sound. The receiving person was instructed to stop if he felt the sensation experienced in the first experiment. The receiving person was instructed to stop immediately and not hesitate. Yet about 50% saw you hesitating, despite the fact that the researcher clearly saw that the receiving person was making a backward movement. Nevertheless, every experiment succeeded and an informed information was proven through extrasensory perception.

In the third experiment the sending person left and was instructed to continue and at some point to think about turning around without doing that. For the experimenter, the sending person had to raise his hand. What we found was that the thought of turning around was immediately registered and indicated by the receiving person. The sending person hardly had the time to raise his hand. Thoughts are transferred super-fast and may well have a nonlocal character, not to be proven in this setting. Non-local means in quantum physics not bound to time and space.

A conclusion is clear. It is possible to remotely effect physiological changes in other people through a thought. After all, the felt sensations are physiological changes in the receiving persons. The mindmatter influence not only applies intrapersonally, but also between two individuals.

Now these were experiments between two living persons. Later experiments also showed information transfer with deceased, plants (Baxter) and animals.

Although it is clear in an experimental setup, where the information comes from, the question remains where those 500,000 more extrasensory information bites come from. According to Bell's theorem everything is connected with everything in a non-local way. That is, as mentioned above, not tied to time and space.

Experimentally it seems that our neurovegetative nervous system plays a role in this. Theoretically, that information could come from the postulated Zero pointfield. From many parapsychological observations there might be the possibility that everything exists at the same time, but that because of the limitations of our brains we can only partially participate in it. Through brainwashing through education, education and religion, it seems that nature appears to us in the same way through the overlapping of cultural or brainwashed interpretation.

It is of course impossible to have exactly the same experience of another person.

Now we come back to our starting point whether a scientific system is conceivable, that makes use of this unconscious information and with which instruments we can make this information aware in order to be able to communicate about it. At that time, these instruments are meaningful in a scientific system.

What conditions must these instruments meet?

In the first place they must be extrasensory. What we can perceive sensory need no other perception. However, sensory perception has two important aspects. The first aspect is that of the solubility level of that perception. Here we mean: what can one sense in terms of distance?

Visually we can express that in the distance from the eye to an object. We can make an appointment between them. For example, what is the distance that two objects of 1 mm size at a distance of 1 mm from each other can still be seen separately as two objects. This is then the solubility level of our vision. Artificial changes (the armed eye and thus an increase of that solubility level) change the observed. This requires some explanation. Take a picture of Trump in a newspaper as an example. Increasing the solubility level of our vision using a magnifying glass causes us to see ink stains against a white background. An ink stain is something different than Trump. With further increase we see ink molecules. A molecule is something other than a stain. A step further we see an atom, which is something else than a molecule. Then a subatomic particle is different from an atom. Quarks are different from the subquar Strings and finally the possible energy quantumms are slightly different than a string.

The sequence probably does not stop here, but each solubility level of observation has its own characteristics and is different from the next step. So something is not equal to something and finally not equal to itself. We call this the *Panta rei* principle after the Greek philosopher Heracleitos.

We can also go the other way. When the newspaper is removed with the photo of Trump, he is no longer recognizable. Upon further removal, the newspaper also disappears, becomes a dot and is no longer visible. The limitation of our nervous system limits our perception.

What then remains of the statement that everything that seems equal is also equal? This is one of the most important statements in a scientific system. It therefore seems very dependent on the solubility level of our perception. A photo of Trump in a newspaper is the

same photo in the same edition of that newspaper. An ink stain is the same as another ink stain. Etc.

Here again, the possibility of communication offers further exploration and thus trying to reach the limits of our cognitive capacity.

A second aspect of our sensorial perception is our frame of reference. That means the appointment of the sensory be affected. Our frame of reference has an inborn part and an acquired part. The congenital part is mainly unconscious. A newborn child immediately finds the mother's breast and the milk parts know exactly what they have to fabricate in the intestines to serve growth and development.

Knowing to do is intelligence.

We will come back later on the non-cerebral intelligence.

The conscious frame of reference includes education, education, religion and personal experience. It is clear that every person has his own frame of reference. But education, religion and education make communication possible again with groups of people with similar upbringing, religion and education. Again, the achievement of the cognitive capacity is sacrificed to the communication capacity.

The question now arises whether extrasensory perception has the same problem. I'm afraid, because the processing mechanism (our nervous system), which causes awareness and the appointment of the exatrasealone are affected is not the same for everyone. Even if only a single reality exists, it loses its meaning completely, because the interpretation is unequal to everyone. Fortunately, we are very superficial beings in the processing of affected things, otherwise communication would be impossible. Everything that appears to be the same is our great salvation, even though this statement is in principle incorrect.

We live in a false world. We can not touch the essence.

Take an example. When I look out of the window I see a green tree. I can only see him if there is light. In this case the light comes from the sun. When there is no sun or any other light source, I do not see the tree. The sun emits its spectrum. From that spectrum the tree takes the orange part, which it needs for its photosynthesis. That is therefore proper to the tree. He reflects away the rest of the spectrum, which he does not absorb. That is green light. So we see a green tree. But that light or photons are not from him at all, but from the sun. So what I see is an infusion of the sun. Even if that would be an infusion then it is something that no longer exists. After all, what is still there is that sun minus the emitted photons.

We can never know the real reality. So also in the macroscopic reality the indefiniteness principle of Heisenberg applies.

The proposition of "what we perceive is reality" is therefore not true. Even though we are being bombarded at an unconscious level by enormous information, the question remains: what kind of information? The only thing that remains is that I will be sent on an unconscious level. This is evident from the experiments of Libet and Feinstein.

From the Sahara experiments we can conclude that the extrasensory information can be made aware. But what happens to all that information that unconsciously bomb us? It seems that we are being lived without us being aware of it.

The next question then is: how does this information come in? That this information comes in is clear from the Sahara experiments. It is also clear that part of it can be made aware. It is therefore probable that the central nervous system has something to do with it. With a PET scan it appears that anatomical changes. The anatomy is again supported by our biochemistry. So something has to change at the molecular level.

Submolecular change should then be another step. And then? What controls the spin of electrons and protons. Thinking of a field influence seems obvious. The postulated Zero Point Field could be a solution. Would all information and control be stored there? Everything is in contact with everything in a nonlocal (not bound by time and space), says John Bell. A nice role for the Zero Point Field.

Do the energetic orbits from the acupuncture play a role here as a receiver for this information?

Information is "shaping".

Energy comes from the Greek and means: capable of labor. We know that there was energy because we experience or perceive labor. At the moment of observing labor, however, the energy has disappeared. The concept of energy or the use of energy is therefore only an assumption. Energy in itself is simply not perceivable and could therefore also be a nonlocal something. The energetic job system from the acupuncture could, as mentioned above, be a nice intermediate step between this Zero Point Field and our neurovegetative nervous system. Here we could place our extrasensory perception.

How can we make that plausible now?

With the help of Galvanic Skin Reaction instruments I showed that there are certain circles around the human body and that the passing of those circles by other persons shows a clear change in the GSR pattern. (this will be discussed in detail in another paper). So there is a neurovegetative perception response to a remote influence. But those circles are ours and lie outside my body surrounded by the skin. My perceptive capacity thus extends beyond my physicality. I measured these circles experimentally up to 100 meters. My experimental space was not bigger. It is therefore quite possible that these rings go through to the infinity and could therefore be a nice physiological proof of the theorem of Bell, where everything is connected with everything in a nonlocal way.

This circle system could also be a nice explanation of distance healing. Distance healing would then be an influence on biological systems by other systems at a distance. Look at Lynn McTaggerd's experiments of intentionality.

Neurophysiologically, the willingness potential is tied to our intentionality. Whether this willingness potential is also the control of the influence circles around us is speculative, but it would explain a lot.

Looking further at Radin's experiments, it could well be possible that the specific reaction just before the "reality" we experience may well be our unconscious neurovegetative perception and that which we perceive as the "reality" by us being created on a conscious level. What quantum theory states, that the observer plays a role in the creation of reality would tie in with this.

These reflections are necessary to understand something of the perceived distance healing. It remains an open question at which level of healing takes place.

That healing occurs does not lead us to perceive the disappearance of the disease symptoms.

The present case of burn influencing by the technique of Claudia Heerdink becomes less strange on the basis of the above. There are several people who use this technique. This is not a parapsychological gift. It is the use and development of a technique that falls outside the official medical system.

No health system can boast 100% cure. In that respect, all systems are complementary. As a physician, after taking the oath of Hipocrates, I must actually give the other methods a possibility morally.

Although first and second degree burns do not threaten life, in more than 30% of a third degree burn is life threatening.

Morally I am obliged to at least make the technique of complementary medicine, even though it is far away from my own bed show.

It is precisely the serious incidents of incineration that we do not have adequate answers to should be eligible for research. The resistance to applying this technique is immoral.

I am happy to explain a few things and I am prepared to think along with any research.

J.C.J.van Hemert, Neurologist