

## The quest for biofield

Igor Jerman  
Bion Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Since Ancient philosophers began to think about life, two basically different paradigms (views) of life sprang up: one reductionist-mechanistic (Democritus) and another holistic-organistic (Aristotle). These two opposing lines of thought have remained with us up to now; at a certain period one prevailed, at another the opposite. The present epoch of the established molecular reductionist thought started more than 160 years ago. Life is regarded as a complex intermolecular interaction and organisms as only ordered molecular systems, self-replicating molecular automatons, having achieved their present status by an unpredictable and unrepeatable evolutionary path grounded on whimsical mutations and selection forces. The view that life is only a complex (inter)molecular (i.e. chemical) phenomenon leaves no room for any additional entity that would work on a supramolecular level and would have its - even if limited - own causal powers.

Many scientists who find this contemporary reductionist paradigm too narrow and deficient advocate a concept of a biological field. This term is vague and does not have any generally accepted definition. It may concern various organism's electrical and to some measure also magnetic fields. Moving away from the established biological knowledge, the term may comprise also such entities as potential fields (A field (magnetic vector potential) and scalar field (behind electric field)). Still more unconventional it may concern physically not yet accepted entities, like toroidal field, orgone, scalar electromagnetic waves etc. Here it will be used for many possible versions, especially for the less conventional ones and denoted as biofield.

The term field was first used in physics in the 18th century and became well established with the development of electromagnetism in the 19th century, defined by Michael Faraday in 1849. It denotes an entity having an integrated influence in a certain region of space. In biology such field was seen as something either organizing the morphogenetic process (the concept of the morphogenetic field, Gurwitsch, Goodwin) or something enabling highly ordered energetic processes (Ho, Fröhlich, Giudice, Vitiello, ...). According to these conceptions the biofield would primarily function at the level of the organism as a whole, but should have the power to work also on the levels of biochemical reactions, encompassing all intermediary levels (organs, cells, organelles). In the established biology, this view is perceived as a remnant of medieval and Renaissance mysticism, or of the subsequent vitalism.

Since the dawn of civilization, however, many human experiences, especially those concerning natural healing, have testified to such a field (energy). And much more, even many scientific researches, mainly neglected or even persecuted by the mainstream science, testify to its existence, although they may have rather different views about its nature. Among the researchers were Reichenbach, Reich, Kilner, Ehrenhaft, Rothen, Burr, Harvalik, Cope, Tiller, Bearden, Sheldrake, Correa, DeMeo, Korotkov, Hubacher and many others. Some of them also proposed theories linking of its measurement. But so far, no one has described its nature in a manner sufficient to establish a clear link to contemporary physical theories and to indisputably prove its existence.

In the presentation the empirical research of the biofield stemming from appropriate devices will be presented. It will be shown that the biofield may be measured by using certain systems where water plays its essential role. The role of the biofield and its possible physiological expression will be explained.