



RESEARCH REPORT OF THE EXAMINATION OF THE INFORMED LATEX WITH TECHNOLOGY OF NEAR FIELD

Research ordered by:

VYROLAT, spot.s ro.
Průmyslová 2220,
288 78 Nymburk
Czech Republic

Research performed by:

Institute Bion,
Ljubljana, February 2007

SCOPE OF RESEARCH

Through many years of development, testing and research the scientific team of the Bion Institute has developed the method of imprinting molecular information into various liquid substances, polar or non-polar. While already knowing the positive effectiveness of such imprints in water (alcohol solution) and kerrock (aluminium hydroxide and polymetacrylat), we had no experiences of such imprints into latex – in the process of its solidification. Encouraged by the response concerning various kerrock products, we tackled the problem of imprinting the information that should cause appeasement (based on benzodiazepines) into latex during its production – this was performed in Vyrolat factory in December 2006. The goal was to see if the information can be imprinted and if it has any biological effects on people. After informing latex we took one informed pillow, a control pillow of the same form and several minor parts of informed and control latex.

We decided to subject the informed latex to the same, already standardised, procedure as we do for our customers with "bio" products, who try to gain our certificate for the biofield quality. But since the results, especially concerning people, are very important, we decided to make two independent double blind tests with the volunteers instead of only one. Other 3 tests were: digital-electrophotography (DEF) tests to examine the biofield characteristics of latex in an instrumental way, emission-absorption near-electric field detection of biofield (EMADEL) – instrumental tests that measure the changes of the human biofield exposed to the informed pillow vs. the control one. The third test was done on our biological (plant) sensor system to examine the general biological effectiveness of the informed pillow. Through all these

tests we should come to the recognition of the basic subtle field characteristics, general biological influences and specific effects of the informed latex.

RESULTS

DIGITAL ELECTROPHOTOGRAPHY

The diagrams below show the difference between the two water samples, exposed to the influence of the informed pillows vs. the control water, i.e. the water, exposed to the non-informed pillows. Figures **2a** and **3a** are showing the differences for luminosity and some overall *parameters*, while the Figures **2b** and **3b** are showing the differences for structural parameters.

A greater *difference* between the red and blue line at particular points means greater difference between the compared samples at corresponding parameters. If the red line is outside of the blue one, than the value of particular parameter is greater for the corresponding sample (see legend) and vice versa.

The data including the *number* of positive and negative points are shown bellow in **Table 2**. Here are also included the data from the first series of experiment.

Figure 2a




Figure 2b




Figure 3a




Figure 3b




Table 2: The number of positive and negative points for respective parameters, when comparing different samples in pairs. Only the significant results (red writing, $p < 5\%$), or the partly significant results (purple, $p < 10\%$; no formatting, $p < 20\%$) are given.

PARAMETER	inf_latex (full proc.) : control	inf_latex (only vulc.) : control	infW_inf_latex : infW_cont_latex	W_inf latex : W_cont latex
Luminosity_above 75%				
Luminosity_50-75%		11 : 19		
Luminosity_25-50%				
Ring_luminosity	11 : 19	11 : 19		
Streamer_luminosity				
Streamer_contrast				
Streamer_width				
Streamer_homogeneity	11 : 19	11 : 19		
Streamer_split		17 : 10		11 : 19
Total_streamer_contrast				
Total_streamer_width				
Number of streamers	7 : 17	7 : 19		18 : 10
Streamer_length_1			21 : 8	
Streamer_length_2				
Streamer_length_3		9 : 19		
Streamer_range_1		15 : 8		
Streamer_range_2	17 : 9	19 : 9	15 : 7	
Streamer_range_3			3 : 0	
Stdev_length1				

Stdev_length2				
Stdev_length3		22 : 8		19 : 11
Streamer_decrease_length1		11 : 19		10 : 20
Streamer_decrease_length2	9 : 18			
Streamer_decrease_length3	1 : 4	0 : 3		
Streamer_slope			18 : 10	19 : 11
Radial sinhrony			10 : 19	
Ring_luminosity1				
Ring_luminosity2				
Ring_luminosity3				
Streamer_luminosity1			21 : 9	
Streamer_luminosity2			18 : 11	
Streamer_luminosity3			19 : 10	20 : 8
Streamer_contrast1			19 : 10	
Streamer_contrast2				
Streamer_contrast3				
Streamer_width1				11 : 19
Streamer_width2				
Streamer_width3	9 : 19		8 : 22	
Streamer_homogeneity1				
Streamer_homogeneity2	11 : 18			10 : 20
Streamer_homogeneity3		10 : 20		
Streamer_split1				10 : 20
Streamer_split2				10 : 18
Streamer_split3				
Total_streamer_contrast1				
Total_streamer_contrast2		19 : 11		
Total_streamer_contrast3		18 : 10	20 : 10	
Total_streamer_width1				
Total_streamer_width2	8 : 16			
Total_streamer_width3	10 : 17		8 : 19	
Streamer_bundle_width1				11 : 19
Streamer_bundle_width2		11 : 19	11 : 18	11 : 18
Streamer_bundle_width3			11 : 18	9 : 21
Number of streamers1				19 : 6
Number of streamers2	10 : 18	9 : 19		
Number of streamers3		7 : 20		
Radius of water droplets				
Water drops eccentricity	20 : 9			

From graphs 2a and 3a (luminosity and overall parameters) we see, that pillow made of informed latex influences the water in such a way, that some luminosity parameters yielded higher values than the control water. These parameters are *ring luminosity 3*, *streamer luminosity 1 to 3*, and *streamer length 1*. Also the *streamer slope* is higher. Higher luminosity parameters generally mean that there is more energy

in the subtle field of the investigated object, or put it in another way, the subtle field has considerable energetic component.

In the graphs 2b and 3b (structural parameters) we noticed higher *streamer contrast*, lower *streamer bundle width*, and lower *total width of the streamers*. Higher *streamer contrast* means that the difference between the luminosity of streamers and the luminosity of the depressions between the streamers are higher. This is usually associated with more distinctive field of the investigated object. Lower *streamer bundle width* means, that radial profiles of different streamers are closer together. It is interpreted as a consequence of higher coherence and inner inter-connectedness of the subtle field of the investigated object. *Total streamer width* expresses the ratio between the total area, covered by the streamers, and the total area, covered by the depressions between the streamers. Higher total streamer width means that the streamers are more focused. Together with higher streamer contrast this points to the distinct and focused influence of the subtle field. This focusing together with the relative luminosity increases from the drop outwards (from the ring 1 to the ring 3). This points to the good performance of the subtle field at larger distances.

BIOLOGICAL SENSORY SYSTEM

The results with informed latex pieces showed that the information imprinted into latex material provoked reaction of the plant sensor system. The Table 3a showed the effects of two types of the informed latex pieces, to which the water was exposed. The water was exposed indirectly through the quartz test tube (this water was then used for watering the plants). One type of latex was during manufacturing exposed to high temperature (fully processed, with washing and drying, marked Ei in the following) the other was not (only vulcanisation, not so high temperatures, marked Ein in the following). The growth was inhibited by 3%, but there was not much difference in the effects between the heated or the unheated pieces of the informed latex. In the next experiments, using the entire informed pillows, the growth was inhibited by 5 and 6% and statistically significant by the parametric Student t-test (Table 3b).

Table 3a: The influence of the informed and differently heated pieces of the latex pillows on the growth of the biological sensory system (Ei - seedlings exposed to informed and heated latex, Ein - seedlings exposed to informed but not heated latex, C – control seedlings exposed to not informed latex, AV – the average length of seedlings, SD – standard deviation, %C – difference from the control, at the control value 100%; p – statistical significance (the result is statistically significant (Student t-test) when this value is equal or below 0.05), N – the number of all germinated seeds, %N, the percentage of germinability)

	AV	SD	%C	p	N	%N
Ei	20,8	3,9	97	0,07	189	95

Ein	20,9	4,6	97	0,167	196	98
C	21,5	3,6			197	99

In the second type of experiments, the tested latex pieces (taken from the entire pillow) were soaked directly in the water, which was subsequently used for watering the seeds. The results are presented in Table 3b. Two experiments were performed. The growth was inhibited by 3% and it was statistically significant in both cases ($p > 0,02$).

Table 3b: The influence of informed latex pillows on the growth of the biological sensory system – two experiments (E - seedlings exposed to informed latex, C – control seedlings exposed to not informed latex, AV – the average length of seedlings, SD – standard deviation, %C – difference from the control, at the control value 100%; p – statistical significance (the result is statistically significant when this value is equal or below 0.05), N – the number of all germinated seeds, %N, the percentage of germinability).

	AV	SD	%C	p	N	%N
E1	19,2	4,8	95	0,05	186	93
C	20,2	4,9			193	97
E2	19,8	5,4	94	0,02	194	97
C	21,1	5,0			194	97


When the data of all the experiments were normalized, the average effect was inhibitory by 4% compared to control and highly statistically significant $p < 0,001$ (Table 3c and Fig. 4). The value 4% seems small, but it has to be emphasized that the plants are less susceptible to subtle fields than the humans. The orientation of the effect does not correspond to the human reactions as well. But the preference of the plant sensory system is, that it can show highly objective and repeatable effects, which would be otherwise hard to detect. Especially when the effects are statistically significant, the tested object (i.e. informed latex) can be reliably recommended as effective for humans, too.

Table 3c: The results of all three experiments together. The data are obtained by the process of normalization (E - seedlings exposed to informed latex, C – control seedlings exposed to not informed latex, AV – the average length of seedlings, %C – difference from the control, at the control value 100%; p – statistical significance (the result is statistically significant when this value is equal or below 0.05), N – the number of all germinated seeds).

	AV	%C	p	N
E	19,3	96	0,0008	765
C	20,2			584

Figure 4. The effects of the informed latex pillows on the growth reaction of plant sensor system. (Ei, Ein: the water exposed to informed latex via quartz test tube: Ei - seedlings exposed to informed and heated latex, Ein - seedlings exposed to informed but not heated latex, E1, E2 –


the water exposed to informed latex via direct soaking). The effects were mostly statistically significant ($p < 0,05$).



DETECTION OF THE INFLUENCE ON THE ORGANISM'S BIOFIELD BY EMADEL

In this experiment we have tested what was the influence of informed vs. non-informed latex pillow on the relaxation process of human organism. It is our common experience with this type of experiments that during the relaxation the measured values of signals on our EMADEL sensors slowly diminish (this is usual response, but the signals can also be rising, particularly if the effect of vitalisation prevails over the effect of relaxation). A typical result after 12min of relaxation is shown in the diagram below.


Figure 5



By considering the size of this diminishing (or enhancing), and also the type of measurements (contact, proximity), and the type of the sensors, we evaluate the differences between the compared products.

The diagram below represents the differences of the measured signals after the relaxation with heads on one of the compared pillows. K3 and K4 are labels for two different sensors.

Figure 6



The next diagram (Figure 7) shows the differences in signals before and after the relaxation on informed and non-informed latex pillow. A vertical line in the middle of the diagram separates the measurements, taken before, from the measurements taken after the relaxation. The differences before the relaxation are some existing differences for whatever reason (usually due to some extent altered physiological state of tested persons before particular measurements). We are interested in the change of these differences after the relaxation (if the effect of different pillows is the same, we do not expect any change).

In Figure 7 we see the obvious change in these differences for the sensor K4, and a smaller change for the sensor K3. Figure 8 represents similar data, but here there is a comparison between the 1st and the 2nd measurements on the same day, regardless of the type of the pillow. Here we also see some differences across the line, but they are smaller.

Figure 7





Figure 8



Obvious change in the differences, seen in the Figure 7, is strong indication that the informed pillow has definitive subtle effect on the organism's biofield. Figure 9 below represents the average difference of effect of relaxation between the informed and non-informed pillow. The significant difference is at the sensor K4 in the proximity measurements mode. If we look separately at the measurements that were taken in the morning (1st measurement), or later during the day (2nd measurement), we see similar behaviour (see Figure 10a for the morning measurements, and Figure 10b for the later measurements). In both cases there is the most pronounced difference at the sensor K4 in the proximity measurements mode. At the measurements in the morning this difference is only partly significant, while later during the

day it becomes strongly significant. This is biologically highly relevant, since it points to the fact that in the morning, when the organism is normally most rested, there is little effect, while later during the day, when organism becomes more and more tired, there is also correspondingly stronger effect of the informed pillow in the direction of relaxation and resting.

Figure 9




Figure 10a






Figure 10b




To see the effect of the informed pillow vs. the non-informed one from another perspective, we represents below (see Figure 11) also the differences of the effect of relaxation between the morning measurement (1st measurement) and between the measurement, performed later during the day (2nd measurement), regardless of what pillow was used. What we see here is that the differences occur just at the other combinations of type of sensors and type of the measurements (K3-contact, K3-proximity, K4-contact), than at the comparison of informed/non-informed pillow (K4-proximity, see Figure 9).

Figure 11



We interpret these results as follows: The timely ordered measurements (see Figure 11) reflect the changes that occur in the organism during the day. Hence it is natural that organisms respond differently to the relaxation in the morning (when organism should be most rested) than later in the day (were there are already the effects of daily work and corresponding growing tiredness), which is clearly seen in Figure 11. We see that the effect of the informed latex is mostly in the opposition to the time effect. This is shown below in Figure 12. We consider this as a positive effect, since it opposes or reverses the effects of growing tiredness during the day. From this we conclude that the pillow from the informed latex has positive biological effects on the organisms.

Figure 12



TESTS WITH VOLUNTEERS

Detailed answers of the first group of the sensitive volunteers are presented in Table 4 and Fig. 13). The analysis of the answers on the first question showed that the control pillows provoked more stimulative feelings while the active pillows provoked more soothing or sleep-inducing feeling. The results were close to be significant by Chi-square non-parametric test, which means that it is less than 10% possibility that the answers are chosen by chance.


The analysis of the answers on the second question, dealing with the quality of the perception, showed that the volunteers choose various categories. The largest difference between the answers regarding the active vs. the control pillow was in the category “pricking”, being higher for active pillow.

Table 4a. Answers of the sensitive volunteers to the first question.

person	Active pillow	Control pillow
1	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
2	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
3	Stimulative	Sleep inducing
4	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
5	No perception	Sleep inducing
6	No perception	Sleep inducing
7	Sleep inducing	Stimulative

8	No perception	Sleep inducing
9	No perception	Stimulative
10	Stimulative	Sleep inducing
11	Stimulative	Stimulative
12	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
13	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
14	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
Frequency of sleep inducing answers	7	5
Frequency of stimulative answers	3	9
Sleep inducing and Stimulative answers – Chi-square test – p value		0,1

Figure 13. Frequency of the answers according to different chosen categories – comparison between active and control pillow – answers of the sensitive volunteers to the first question.




Detailed answers of the second group of the ordinary volunteers, who were resting on the tested pillows for 15 min, are presented in Table 5 and Fig. 14. The analysis of the answers on the first question showed that the control pillows provoked more stimulative feelings or no feelings while the active pillows provoked more soothing or sleep-inducing feelings. The results were statistically significant by Mann Whitney non-parametric test, which means that it is less than 2% possibility that the answers were chosen by chance (Chi-square test was not possible here because of too little answered categories).

The analysis of the answers on the second question, dealing with the quality of the perception, did not show any noticeable difference between the active and control pillow.

Table 5b. Answers of the ordinary volunteers to the first question.

person	Active pillow	Control pillow
1	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
2	Sleep inducing	No perception
3	No perception	Sleep inducing
4	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
5	Sleep inducing	No perception
6	No perception	Stimulative
7	Sleep inducing	No perception
8	Sleep inducing	No perception
9	Sleep inducing	Stimulative
10	Stimulative	No perception
11	Sleep inducing	No perception
12	No perception	No perception
13	No perception	No perception
14	Stimulative	No perception
15	No perception	No perception
Frequency of sleep inducing answers	8	1
Frequency of stimulative answers	2	4
All answers – Man Whitney test – p value		0,02

Figure 14. Frequency of the answers according to different chosen categories – comparison between active and control pillow – answers of the ordinary volunteers to the first question.



INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION

The electrophotographic results are showing that there is more energy in the subtle field of the informed latex, or that the subtle field of latex has a considerable energetic component. The subtle field of latex is also very distinctive, more coherent than the subtle field of the non-informed latex, and more interconnected. The influence of the subtle field of informed latex is also more focused than that of the non-informed one, and shows good performance also at larger distances.

The tests with the biological sensory system demonstrated that the informed latex inhibits the germination of plant sensor system in four experiments. These results show that the differences are sufficient to enable us to confirm the existence of definite biological effects of the informed latex produced by the new technology. From the long experience with our biological sensory system we may infer that inhibition of germination actually connotes a positive general biological effect, since it lulled the germinating seeds into a sense of security, and therefore the seeds were not prepared for the applied heat stress (to be prepared for this, the pre-treatment has to have also a mild-stress influence).

The measurements of the effects of the informed latex pillow vs. the non-informed one with the EMADEL method (absorption-emission near field detection of biofield) shows definitive influence of the informed latex pillow on the relaxation process of the organisms. These influences are less pronounced in the morning, where the organism is normally in its most rested state, and becomes stronger during the day, when other influences on the organism, such as a growing tiredness more and more sets in. This behaviour is biologically highly relevant and desirable. If we compare the effect of the informed latex pillow with the effects of the time passage (with the growing tiredness etc, as already mentioned), we see that the effects are mainly opposite. This confirms the previously mentioned biologically positive influence,

since it opposes or reverses the effects of growing tiredness during the day. From this we conclude that the pillow from the informed latex has a very positive biological influence on the organisms in the sense of rest, relaxation, and anti-stress.

The tests with volunteers clearly show that the latter distinguish between informed and control pillows. The results were more statistically significant when the persons were resting on the pillows. From the both experiments and their statistically evaluated results we may safely conclude that the informed pillows enhance the sleeping process and relaxation. It is also in concordance with the EMADEL tests.

According to the standards for granting *The certificate of the quality of biofield*, this product acquires 27 points of 35 possible (77,1%). The electrophotography yielded 7,5 point out of 15 possible, biological sensory system yielded 4 bonus points out of 5, EMADEL yielded 8,5 points out of 10, and test with volunteers yielded 7 points out of 10 possible. This corresponds to attaining the silver certificate of the quality of biofield [the grades are: bronze (minimum 60% of maximum), silver (minimum 75%), and golden (minimum 90%)].

From the whole research we may very safely conclude that the informing process of latex according to the method of near field influence imprints latex with source molecular information that remains in it and that has a clearly distinctive and provable biological effect in the sense of the source molecule's physiological influence. We therefore strongly recommend to enrich the production process of latex with the here presented and evaluated method.

REFERENCES

- Jerman I. (2006): Homoeopathy and digital biology. *Homoeo Times* 3(1): 21-24
- Krašovec R, Jerman I (2006): Utemeljitev biološke inteligence kot elementarne kognitivne lastnosti vseh organizmov (Argumentation of biological intelligence as a cognitive property of all organisms). In: *Information society. Informacijska družba IS 2006.* (eds. Bohanec M, Gams M, Rajkovič V, Urbančič T, Bernik M, Mladenič D, Grobelnik M, Heričko M, Kordeš U, Markič O, Musek J, Osredkar M, Kononenko I, Škarja Novak B). Ljubljana, Slovenia, October 9-14, pp.365-368.
- Krašovec R, Jerman I (2006): Je elementarna kognitivna lastnost imenovana biološka inteligenca zakonitost ali naključje? (Is an elementary cognitive property called biological intelligence a lawfulness or a chance?) In: *Information society. Informacijska družba IS 2006.* (eds. Bohanec M, Gams M, Rajkovič V, Urbančič T, Bernik M, Mladenič D, Grobelnik M, Heričko M, Kordeš U, Markič O, Musek J, Osredkar M, Kononenko I, Škarja Novak B). Ljubljana, Slovenia, October 9-14, pp.369-371.
- Škarja M, Jerman I, Leskovar RT (2006): Realna moč zavesti (Real power of consciousness). (eds. Bohanec M, Gams M, Rajkovič V, Urbančič T, Bernik M, Mladenič D, Grobelnik M, Heričko M, Kordeš U, Markič O, Musek J, Osredkar M, Kononenko I, Škarja Novak B). Ljubljana, Slovenia, October 9-14, pp.369-371.
- Znanje za prihodnost – infopatija (Science for a future – infopaty). Strokovni seminar domačih udeležencev. Gradivo iz predstavljenih predavanj. (Symposium od home experts.

- Material from presentations). Organised and published by Institute BION, Ljubljana Sept. 30, 2006. Lecturers: Lovrečič B, Jerman I, Ružič R, Krašovec R, Senica M, Žagar E.
- Jerman I, Ružič R, Krašovec R, Škarja M, Mogilnicki L (2005): Electrical transfer of molecule information into water, its storage and bioeffects on plants and bacteria. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 24(3): 341-354
- Leskovar RT, Jerman I, Škarja M (2005): Near-field influence of organism's endogenous electromagnetic field on environmental light particles. In: *Coherence and electromagnetic fields in Biological Systems. Frölich Centenarian Symposium, Abstract book, Prague July 1-4, 2005*, pp.74-73
- Škarja M, Jerman I, Leskovar RT (2005): Changes of electric potential of sensors due to near field contact with organisms. in *Biological Systems. Frölich Centenarian Symposium, Abstract book, Prague July 1-4, 2005*, pp.76-78.
- Jerman I, Ružič R, Škarja M, Leskovar RT (2005): New sensor for possible measurement of bioplasma state of organisms. In: *Coherence and electromagnetic fields in Biological Systems. Frölich Centenarian Symposium, Abstract book, Prague July 1-4, 2005*, pp. 97-98.
- Ružič R, Škarja M, Jerman I (2005): Biological effects of electromagnetic information imprinted into water. In: *Coherence and electromagnetic fields in Biological Systems. Frölich Centenarian Symposium, Abstract book, Prague July 1-4, 2005*, pp. 143-145.
- Krašovec R, Jerman I, Škarja M (2005): Electromagnetic information imprinted into medium acts as environmental signal for bacteria *Escherichia coli*. In: *Coherence and electromagnetic fields in Biological Systems. Frölich Centenarian Symposium, Abstract book, Prague July 1-4, 2005*, pp. 146-148.
- Berden M., Jerman I., Škarja M. (1997): Indirect instrumental detection of ultraweak, supposedly electromagnetic radiation from organisms. *Electro Magnetobiol* 16(3): 249-266.
- Leskovar R.T., Škarja M., Jerman I.. Detection of biofield – ambient light interactions. Kognitivna konferenca. (ur. Kononenko I, Jerman I). Anthology/Collection of scientific papers of 6th international multiconference Information Society 2003. Ljubljana, Slovenia, p. 12-15, 2003.
- Ružič R, Jerman I (2002): Weak magnetic field decreases heat stress in cress seedlings. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 21(1): 43-53.
- Škarja Metod, Berden Maja, Jerman Igor (1998). The influence of ionic composition of water on the corona discharge around water drops. *J. Appl. Physi.*, Vol. 84, no. 5, str. 2436-2442.
- Škarja M., Jerman I., Ružič R.. Some evidence that organisms' endogenous field may influence ambient light (previous report). *International Symposium on endogenous physical fields in biology, Prague, Czech Republic*, p. 74-75, 2002.