

Experimental

EFFECTS OF TWO FLOWER ESSENCES ON HIGH INTENSITY ENVIRONMENTAL STIMULATION AND EMF

Jeffrey R. Cram, Ph.D.

Abstract

Certain flower essences are thought to have an antidoting effect on the impact of high levels of environmental stimulation. Using a randomized double blind experimental design, this study explored the effects of two flower essence formulas (Yarrow Special Formula and Five Flower Formula) on the intense environmental stimulation of fluorescent lights and its concomitant electromagnetic fields (EMF). Twenty four subjects (N = 8 per cell) were monitored using a 19 channel quantitative electroencephalograph (qEEG) system, along with the activity of six surface electromyograph (SEMG) sites (Frontal, C2 (mastoid to mastoid), Cervical (C4 paraspinals), Thoracic (T6 paraspinals), Lumbar (T12 paraspinals) and Sacral (L1 Paraspinals)). A 12 minute study was conducted which assessed baseline activity; reaction to the flower essence or placebo; reaction to the high intensity light stimulation; and concluded with a recovery period. The artifacted qEEG and SEMG data were submitted to standard statistical analysis (ANOVA). The results of the study show EEG activation of the frontal lobes area to the photic stimulation, but only for those individuals who received the Placebo preparation. Concurrent activation of the T6 paraspinals was also noted for only the Placebo control group as well. This demonstrates that the stress response was seen only in the Placebo group. Here the executive and premotor functions of the frontal lobes activate to determine the course of action to the perceived threat, while the subjects concurrently extended their chest in preparation for fight or flight. The two flower essence groups did not show a similar stress response. Thus flower essences are demonstrated to antidote environmental stressors.

KEYWORDS: SEMG, flower essence, energy medicine, EMF, chakra, qEEG

INTRODUCTION

We live in a society in which our bodies are continuously bombarded by man made and natural energies. In his book *The Body Electric*, Robert O. Becker reviews a myriad of studies which strongly suggest that the Electromagnetic Field (EMF) associated with electricity in general, and other man made sources (e.g.; microwaves, radio waves, etc) may have deleterious effects on our health.¹⁻⁵ Many studies have focused upon Extremely Low Frequencies (ELFs), such as the 60 cycle that emanates from our power lines, while others have focused on the Electromagnetic Radiation (EMR) which is associated with Video Data Terminals (VDT), microwaves and cell phones. These studies conclude that chronic low grade exposure to these energy fields may over-excite the nervous system, promote fatigue, increase cancer risk, stimulate spontaneous miscarriages, or provoke allergic reactions, just to mention a few untoward effects. An environmentally sensitive individual would benefit from finding ways to antidote these energies.

Certain flower essences are thought to have an antidoting effect on the impact of high levels of environmental stimulation. During the 1980s, the Flower Essence Society (FES) introduced a flower essence therapy based on the observations of Dr. Aubrey Westlake of England, a well-known homeopathic researcher. Westlake had been experimenting with a combination of English flower remedies in sea salt water as an antidote to the effects of radiation on the human energy field.⁶ In response to the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear power disaster, FES developed the Yarrow flower essence in a sea salt base. The feedback from the field work and case studies showed this to be helpful in those individuals exposed not only to nuclear radiation, but also other forms of environmental stress such as X-rays, CRT monitors and fluorescent lights. Approximately a decade later (1995) the formulation was broadened to include the flower essences of Echinacea and Arnica as well as the herbal tinctures of Yarrow. The use of these three essences in salt water is called the Yarrow Special Formula, and it is used widely to protect individuals from a variety of adverse environmental stimulations.

The knowledge of flower essence properties is derived from study of the physical and energetic properties of the source plants. For an excellent review of these properties, please refer to *The Twelve Windows of Plant Perception* by Katz and

Table I
The Healing/Protective Qualities of Yarrow Special Formula⁶

Essence	Quality or Attribute
Yarrow	Works on vulnerability to the influence of others or the environment. It is felt to encourage a sense of self, integrity and stronger ego function
Arnica	Mollifies physical or psychic trauma by allowing the integration of the psyche and the soul with the body.
Echinacea	Awakens the true inner self, and restores the soul's self identity and essential wholeness in relationship to the earth and the human family.

Kaminski.⁷ These properties are then refined and verified by extensive anecdotal reports of their effects in clinical practice and home care. Table I shows the essences and their healing/protective properties for those found in the Yarrow Special Formula.

In addition to the Yarrow Special Formula, the current study also investigated the impact of the Five Flower Formula (based on Bach's Rescue Remedy) on the impact of intense environmental stimulation. Along with a 70 year history of anecdotal case reports on the effectiveness of Dr. Bach's formula in ameliorating the effects of stress and trauma, previous research by Cram has scientifically documented that the Five Flower Formula was effective in reducing the physiological arousal induced by a mental stressor.⁸ It therefore seemed a likely candidate to reduce the physiological response to an environmental stressor in some way.

The Five Flower Formula is prepared by Julian Barnard in Herefordshire, England. Barnard follows Dr. Edward Bach's original method and formula, which he developed in the 1930's as "Rescue Remedy." The primary use of Five-Flower Formula is for the treatment of physical and psychological trauma, emergencies and crisis situations. It contains the flower essence combination described in Table II.

Table II
The Flower Essences found in the Five Flower Formula^{8,9}

Flower Essence	Quality
Cherry Plum <i>Prunus cerasifera</i>	For tension and fear of losing control. Helps create a sense of inner peace and stillness.
Clematis <i>Clematis vitalba</i>	For lack of clarity and consciousness. Helps to draw one's consciousness back into the body, and into present time.
Impatiens <i>Impatiens glandulifera</i>	For irritability, impulsiveness and hastiness. Allows one to flow with outer events.
Rock Rose <i>Helianthemum nummularium</i>	For conditions of fear. Providing a calming, stabilizing force to the situation.
Star of Bethlehem <i>Ornithogalum umbellatum</i>	For shock and trauma. Helps one to accept and understand the deeper meaning of one's experience.

To give the reader some general background on flower essence therapy, it should be noted that it was introduced by the English physician Dr. Edward Bach in the 1930's.¹⁰⁻¹² Bach was a bacteriologist and homeopathic doctor before turning to his flower essence research. He was one of the pioneers of psychosomatic medicine, recognizing before Dr. Hans Selye, the impact of stress reactions and other states of mind on physical health.¹³ Bach observed the effects of worry, anxiety, fear, confusion, indecision, depression, despair, jealousy, resentment and the like on the health of his patients. The 38 flower remedies that he developed each address specific emotional states.

Flower essences should not be confused with aromatic essential oils that are used for aromatherapy. Rather, flower essences are prepared by creating a very dilute infusion of the fresh blossoms of a particular plant species. The preparation takes place *in situ*, where the wildflower or garden flower is in full bloom. Dew-filled blossoms are collected in the early morning, and are placed into a clear glass bowl of fresh water.¹⁴ After exposure to direct sun for approximately three hours, the flower-infused water is collected and preserved with brandy

alcohol in a one-to-one ratio. This “mother essence” is then further diluted, at an approximately 0.2% ratio, in an alcohol solution for the Five Flower Essence, and into a “normal saline” and alcohol solution for the Yarrow Special Formula, to form flower essence “stock.” Flower essences are typically taken orally (under the tongue) from a dropper bottle. In the case of environmental stimulation issues, the essence is typically taken four times a day. They may be used in more an acute fashion and may be taken just prior to, during, or just after an exposure.

As noted above, flower essences are extremely physically dilute substances. As such, there is no plausible biological or biomechanical mechanism of action that can be explained by their bio-chemical composition. Flower essence therapy presupposes that living beings are comprised of more than their physical bodies. There are also “bodies” of subtle energies, including the “etheric body” which acts as a field of “formative forces” that give shape and direction to the growth of physical body, and the “astral body” or soul, which is the seat of our feelings and experiences.¹⁵ The ideas of “vital force” in homeopathy and “chi” in acupuncture are examples of the concept of subtle energy. This study assumes that the Yarrow and Five Flower Formulas used will strengthen the “vital force” or subtle energies of the individual using it and this will assist in mollifying the effects of noxious environmental stimulation.

In this study, we conducted a randomized double blind study to assess the effects two flower essence remedies (Yarrow Special Formula and Five Flower Formula) on the physiological impact of electromagnetic (photic) stimulation. The psychophysiological procedure utilized in this study examines the emotional reactivity of the physical I emotional body, and is called “stress profiling”. Psychophysiology is aimed at being able to objectively determine the individual’s emotional state without having to rely upon self report.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ In the current study, both brainwave activity (qEEG) and muscle activity (SEMG) from the forehead and along the spine were measured. The 19 channel qEEG allowed us to examine the cortical arousal patterns evoked by the high intensity photic stimulation and EMF. The 6 SEMG sites allowed us to examine the effects of photic stimulation on muscle tone in general, as well as its impact on posture.²⁰⁻²³ In addition, the SEMG sites paralleled the locations for the chakras²⁴⁻²⁸ thus allowing us to examine the psychophysiology in a more metaphysical fashion describe in an earlier publication by Cram.²⁹

METHOD

SUBJECTS

Twenty four subjects participated in the study. They were solicited from a local newspaper ad which called for participation in a flower essence study. There were 10 males and 14 females, with a mean age of 40.04 (\pm 11.3) years old. There were 8 subjects per group.

PROCEDURE

A randomized double blind control group procedure was utilized. The nature of the study was explained to the subjects and consent forms were signed. Electrodes were then placed on the subject. A standard qEEG cap which utilized the 10/20 system and 19 site montage was placed on the subject. All EEG sites were impedance tested, and were found to be below 10,000 ohms. Surface SEMG measurements were conducted at six sites. The SEMG sites were located bilaterally at the forehead (frontal), C2 (mastoid to mastoid), Cervical (C4 paraspinal), Thoracic (T6 paraspinal), Lumbar (L12 paraspinal) and Sacral (L3 paraspinal) areas. Standard pre-jelled electrode pads with an inter-electrode distance of 3 cm (Norotrode 30) were placed bilaterally at each site with the exception of the C2 site. Here the electrode pad was cut in half, and each active electrode was placed on the Mastoid Processes. The EEG recording was conducted utilizing a Lexicor Neurosearch 24 computerized EEG system. The EEG was artifacted prior to any data analysis. The SEMG was monitored utilizing a J & J I-330 computer interface with the SEMG amplifiers (M-501) having their filters set in the 100-200 range. This filter selection was chosen to minimize heart rate artifact contaminating the quantitated SEMG data.

Once the electrodes were in place, a vertical florescent light panel was positioned approximately 3 feet in front of the subject, and tested for EMF levels. The light panel consisted of 4 standard 4 foot florescent bulbs which emitted 75 foot candles of light at 3 feet as measured by a Weston Master II light meter. During a calibration procedure, the subjects were asked to close their eyes while the light panel was turned on for approximately 10 seconds. The light panel

was then positioned such that each subject was exposed to 3 milligauss per meter of Electro Magnetic Fields (EMF) as indicated by a TriField Meter placed on the middle of the thigh of the subject. There was a minimum of a 5 minute break between the positioning of the light panel and the initiation of the data collection period.

The subject was asked to keep their eyes closed for the rest of the study. The study consisted of the following conditions: A three (3) minute baseline; a one (1) minute period in which the subject was administered either a sublingual flower essence or placebo preparation; a three (3) minute period to observe the physiological response to the essence or placebo; a three (3) minutes period where the subject was exposed to high intensity photic stimulation; and a three (3) minute post stimulation/recovery period.

The administration of the sublingual preparation given to the subject was as follows. The manufacturer retained the experimental code and provided bottles for the study each marked with a subject number. The bottles contained one of three substances: A brandy and salt water Placebo (in the same proportion as the Yarrow Special Formula); or The Five Flower Remedy; or The Yarrow Special Formula. A half of a dropper full of the substance was placed under the subject's tongue. At the appropriate time, the subject was simply asked to open their mouth and lift their tongue while the substance was squirted under the tongue. They were asked to wait a brief time and then to swallow. Both the subject and the experimenter were blind as to the actual substance administered.

RESULTS

The EEG data was artifacted before the qEEG values for each of the four experimental periods were calculated. A separate analysis was done for each of the four brain wave states (Beta, Alpha, Theta and Delta) for each qEEG site. The SEMG data was artifacted, as well, before the averages for each of the three minutes of each experimental period were calculated. A separate analysis was conducted for each of the SEMG sites. The quantified data for each modality were submitted to an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures. The between variable was that of SUBSTANCE

Table III
The Condition Effects for the qEEG Data *

Site	Beta	Alpha	Theta	Delta	Site	Beta	Alpha	Theta	Delta
FP1	0.49	0.01	0.01	0.95	FP2	0.47	0.01	0.01	0.13
F3	0.90	0.02	0.00	0.44	F4	0.66	0.02	0.00	0.30
F7	0.23	0.46	0.28	0.19	F8	0.63	0.10	0.02	0.22
FZ	0.57	0.02	0.06	0.34					
T3	0.18	0.01	0.21	0.22	T4	0.46	0.13	0.30	0.11
C3	0.50	0.00	0.01	0.24	C4	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.11
CZ	0.97	0.01	0.12	0.53					
T5	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.21	T6	0.23	0.03	0.00	0.15
P3	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.44	P4	0.59	0.10	0.00	0.25
PZ	0.69	0.00	0.00	0.21					
O1	0.31	0.03	0.00	0.64	O2	0.18	0.09	0.00	0.58

**The probability statement is noted for the analysis of each site and each brainwave state. The significant effects are bolded.*

(Yarrow, Five Flower or Placebo), and the within variable was CONDITION (Baseline, Response, Lights and Recovery) for the qEEG data, and CONDITION and TIME (minute 1-3) for the SEMG data. The interaction terms were of greatest interest.

qEEG RESULTS

The results of the CONDITION EFFECT on the qEEG data are reflected in Tables III, and Figures 1-4 below. Table III shows the probability statements for the analyses of the Condition Effect for each site. As can be seen, there is a strong and pervasive Condition Effect for both the Alpha and Theta states. Here, the light stimulation attenuated alpha and theta activity. This effect is commonly seen in EEG studies, and can be seen in Figures 1-4.

The Direct effects of the Substance on the qEEG was inconsequential. Only three of the sites show an effect, which is approximately chance variation. This may be seen in Table IV.




Figure 1. Beta activity as a function of Condition. (qEEG activity is averaged across all sites.)




Figure 2. Alpha activity as a function of Condition. (qEEG activity is averaged across all sites.)




Figure 3. Theta activity as a function of Condition. (qEEG data averaged across all sites.)




Figure 4. Delta activity as a function of Condition. (qEEG data averaged across all sites.)

Table IV
The Substance Effect for the qEEG Data*

Site	Beta	Alpha	Theta	Delta	Site	Beta	Alpha	Theta	Delta
FP1	0.37	0.97	0.89	0.64	FP2	0.38	0.98	0.97	0.50
F3	0.36	0.97	0.58	0.06	F4	0.32	0.91	0.42	0.38
F7	0.24	0.96	0.73	0.08	F8	0.28	0.81	0.65	0.09
FZ	0.35	0.97	0.54	0.33					
T3	0.30	0.22	0.11	0.20	T4	0.34	0.26	0.19	0.40
C3	0.42	0.88	0.67	0.52	C4	0.46	0.82	0.54	0.56
CZ	0.97	0.01	0.12	0.53					
T5	0.26	0.84	0.43	0.35	T6	0.22	0.68	0.70	0.46
P3	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.44	P4	0.35	0.76	0.86	0.69
PZ	0.33	0.98	0.93	0.37					
O1	0.27	0.74	0.94	0.39	O2	0.17	0.60	0.97	0.48

**The probability statement is noted for the analysis of each site and each brainwave state. The significant effects are bolded.*

The Interaction term (Substance x Event) is of the great interest in that here we can see how the flower essences and placebo interact with the experimental conditions. As may be seen in Table V, there is a very strong trend which presents itself. This trend does not randomly scatter itself across the potential sites or brainwave states. Instead, eight of the 10 “trendy sites” (0.15 and below), are found in the Beta state, and seven of these are located on the prefrontal, premotor and central region. When this effect is examined in greater detail, what is seen is an increase in Beta activity for the Placebo Group only. In addition, the essence most strongly touted for the amelioration of environmental effects, Yarrow, shows a slight decrease in beta activity. These may be seen in Figure 5.

SEMG RESULTS

When the entire SEMG data array is submitted for statistical analysis, significance is seen for the MUSCLE variable ($F(5, 105) = 4.41; p < 0.001$). As can be seen in Figure 6, the cervical site is the lowest of all sites.

Table V
Interaction Effect (Condition x Substance) for the qEEG Data*

Site	Beta	Alpha	Theta	Delta	Site	Beta	Alpha	Theta	Delta
FP1	0.36	0.50	0.69	0.61	FP2	0.27	0.55	0.86	0.52
F3	0.08	0.48	0.93	0.30	F4	0.11	0.64	0.93	0.67
F7	0.09	0.46	0.60	0.38	F8	0.48	0.79	0.46	0.25
FZ	0.09	0.56	0.98	0.67					
T3	0.15	0.06	0.73	0.40	T4	0.45	0.45	0.86	0.76
C3	0.07	0.41	0.67	0.22	C4	0.12	0.22	0.68	0.54
CZ	0.07	0.25	0.97	0.62					
T5	0.38	0.94	0.86	0.40	T6	0.71	0.38	0.53	0.47
P3	0.38	0.93	0.68	0.32	P4	0.35	0.12	0.55	0.55
PZ	0.26	0.60	0.54	0.73					
O1	0.34	0.69	0.35	0.55	O2	0.73	0.62	0.42	0.61

**The probability statement is noted for the analysis of each site and each brainwave state. The significant effects and trends are bolded.*




Figure 5. Beta activity. The interaction between Substance and Event. (Only the 8 sites which were significant are included in the graphic.)




Figure 6. SEMG activity by muscle site.

The individual analysis of the SEMG for each site shows a fairly low level of significance. This is shown in Table VI.

Given these overall findings, I found it informative to look at some interesting parallels in the paraspinal SEMG data to the qEEG data.

The first is the general interaction of Substance with Event. While this interaction was non-significant ($F(6, 63) = 0.70$; $p < 0.6526$), Figure 7 below shows the overall general activation of the SEMG as a function of Substance to be similar to that which was seen in the qEEG. It would appear that the premotor cortex of the brain is associated with increased muscle tone, but only for the Placebo group.

Next, I visually examined the non-significant interaction of SEMG activation as a function of Muscle Site and Substance ($F(10, 105) = 0.59$; $p < 0.8197$). In Figure 8 we see an activation of the mid and lower back, suggesting an extension of the back more so for the Placebo group than for either of the experimental group.

Table VI
Probability Statement from the ANOVAs Calculated
at Each SEMG Site*

Muscle Site	Substance	Event	S x E Interaction	S x E x M Interaction
Frontal/3rd eye	0.32	0.57	0.34	0.01
Mastoid/Medulla	0.22	0.08	0.08	0.32
Cervical/Throat	0.58	0.03	0.30	0.96
T6/Heart	0.58	0.84	0.95	0.50
T12/Lumbar	0.72	0.76	0.62	0.71
L1/Sacral	0.16	0.49	0.93	0.96

**Significance and trends are bolded.*

Given the above finding, I more closely examined the interaction of Substance, Event and Minute at the T6 site ($F(12, 126) = 0.94, p < 0.50$). In Figure 9 one can easily see an activation in the chest area, which occurs only in




Figure 7. SEMG interaction of the Event and Substance. (Collapsed over all muscle sites and minutes.)




Figure 8. SEMG recordings as a function of Substance and Muscle Site.




Figure 9. Substance by Event by Time Interaction for the T6/Heart area.




Figure 10. Substance by Event by Minute interaction for the T12/Lumbar Site.

response to the light stimulation, and only in the Placebo Group. Once again, suggesting the extension of the thoracic spine as part of the stress response. This is not present in the two experimental groups.

If the Placebo group reacts most strongly in the Chest area, where does one find the strongest reaction for the two other groups. For the Yarrow group, it was in the Lumbar area. Figure 10 shows the same interaction is presented for the Lumbar area ($F(12, 126) = 0.73, p < 0.71$). This suggests more of a Lumbar extension. Comparing this to the T6/Heart area recruitment, there is very little activation seen up above, thus it all comes from below.

Then the largest reaction to photic stimulation for the 5 Flower essence was observed in the large drop in SEMG at the Mastoid/Medulla site ($F(12, 126) = 1.5; p < 0.32$). This maybe seen in Figure 11.

DISCUSSION

The overall finding for this study suggests that the intense photic stimulation from the banks of florescent lights provoked a physiological stress response.




Figure 11. Substance by Event by Minute interaction for the Mastoid/Medulla area.

This stress response was seen in Frontal Lobe activation, along with extension of the thoracic spine. This fight or flight response was seen only in the placebo subjects, but not for the subjects that took either of the flower essences. Thus, flower essences seem to have an ameliorating effect on the stress response associated with noxious environmental stimulation.

The qEEG data was highly significant for the main effect for the CONDITION, indicating that the photic stimulation was an adequate stimulus for the study. This effect was seen in the clear attenuation of the alpha and theta bands of activity. This “alpha blocking” is well known in the BEG arena.

The qEEG INTERACTION effect (CONDITION x SUBSTANCE) for each energy band is of the greatest interest for the study. With this analysis, we can see the how the flower essences modulate the physiological effects of the high photic stimulation. The findings for the Beta band of BEG were quite striking. Here, seven of the nineteen recording sites, all located in the prefrontal, premotor and motor area (F7, P3, Fz, F4, C3, Cz, and C4), showed strong trends ($p < 0.1$ or better). Post Hoc analyses of these trends show that the placebo condition subjects experienced increased beta activation. The Five

Flower essence group's Beta activity didn't change, and the Yarrow Special formula group actually shows a slight decrease in Beta activity.

While the major finding of the study was the substantial attenuation by the two flower essences of frontal lobe activation seen during and following intense photic stimulation, it should be noted that none of the qEEG interactions reached a .05 level of significance. The .05 level of significance is used to protect from TYPE 1 errors, and allows only 1 out of 20 comparisons to be significant by chance alone. In this study I considered and examined findings at the 0.1 level of significance. Thus, only 1 out of 10 comparisons could be reached by chance alone. The confidence in the qEEG findings in the current study centers on the fact that there were seven significant trends for the Beta bandwidth, substantially more than the two which could occur by mere chance alone. And, these significant trends were not randomly scattered around the brain, which one would expect by random significance alone. Instead, they were all clustered tightly together in the frontal lobes of the brain. The pattern of the results is actually very remarkable.

The frontal lobes of the brain house “executive” functions. They are the location where we interpret, plan, decide and direct. They are also the location where our emotions are interpreted and our emotional reactions regulated. An emotion is generated by the limbic system of the brain, is sent to the frontal lobes to be evaluated for the degree of threat, and to plan a response strategy. For example, if one had seen a bear while walking in the woods, the limbic system would signal fear, and the frontal lobes would evaluate the level of threat, survey the options available and decide whether to throw rocks at the bear, climb a tree or run. A physiological fight or flight activation occurs once the threat is perceived.

In this study, the “threatening event” wasn't a bear, but rather intense environmental stimulation via bright fluorescent lights. When the placebo group was compared to the two flower essence groups, the placebo group activated the frontal lobes and began to engage in the appraisal of this event, along with orchestration of a physiological response of fight or flight. The two flower essence groups did not show the cortical activation, perhaps suggesting that flower essences affect structures below the cortex, thus preventing the cortex from being strobed or queried.

Turning our attention to the neuromuscular system or spine, the overall findings for the SEMG sites generally parallel and support the frontal lobe activation observation for the placebo group. Specifically, the Condition by Essence shows the pattern of activation identical to that of the qEEG. Even though significance was not reached, the pattern of SEMG activity for the Placebo group showed increased activation of the dorsal spine during photic stimulation, while the two flower essence groups appear not to react, and in fact seem to show a decrease in dorsal SEMG activity. The net effect of the muscular effort for the placebo group is to lift the chest, thus allowing the eyes to meet the horizon. This provides a stronger base for the visual sensory information needed to service the alarm being processed in the frontal cortex. The more erect posture also better prepares the individual to fight or flee. The brain and the spine work together to carefully orchestrate the stress response.

When we examine the biomechanical aspects of the SEMG findings, we note a significant Site effect. Here, the cervical site seems to be significantly lower than all other sites. This may be an artifact associated with the strain relief of how the qEEG cap is secured to the chest.

When we look at overall muscular tone, the Placebo group appears to have higher resting tone in the muscles from the mid back (T6) down. As a group, overall these muscles seem to be extending the spine slightly more than the response seen in two flower essence groups.

When one puts emotional reactivity together with posture, a picture begins to form. Examining the non-significant interaction pattern of the T6 site for Substance and Event (Figure 9), what one clearly sees is an activation of the mid back during photic stimulation, but only for the Placebo group. This suggests that the placebo group is not only activating the frontal lobes to process the potential threat, but it is also raising its chest (and head) to fight or flee. Such a reaction is not seen for the two flower essence groups.

In further exploring the patterns of activation along the spine, the Yarrow Special Formula group appears to show a strong, if not striking activation at the T12/Lumbar site during photic stimulation. Perhaps the combination of essences in the Yarrow Formula affect the Lumbar chakra in some special way.

Could different essences affect different segments of the etheric body? The lumbar chakra seems to organize itself around identity of self, self image, self confidence, the self out into the world.^{30,31} And many of the substances in the Yarrow Special Formula speak to these concepts. The photic stressor may have played out its impact on this level of organization, rather than the physical/physiological one seen in the placebo group.

The Five Flower Formula subjects seemed to react most strongly at the medulla site. Here we see a striking drop in the SEMG activity as a function of photic stimulation. The medulla is often referred to as the “seat of the ego.”^{30,31} It is seen as the negative pole of the “3rd Eye,” and while the 3rd Eye reflects our intuitive knowledge, the medulla sits more with our ego. Again, rather than working on a cortical level, it is possible that these essences work at energetic levels that preclude the physiological response from occurring by dealing with the stressful event at a “pre conscious” level, or deeper level.

In conclusion, this study systematically assessed the effect of two flower essences on intense environmental (photic) stimulation. Using a scientifically based randomized double blind placebo control group design, the two flower essences were found to reduce physiological activation and stress on the human organism. They appeared to antidote the individual from the adverse physiological effects of intense environmental stimulation.

• • •

CORRESPONDENCE: Jeffrey Cram • Sierra Health Institute • 202 Providence Mine Road, Suite 202 • Nevada City, CA 95959 • Email: cram@semg.org

REFERENCES & NOTES

1. R. O. Becker & G. Selden, *The Body Electric* (Quill, New York, NY, 1985).
2. R. A. Jaffe, B. L. Laszewski & D. B. Carr, Chronic Exposure to a 60-Hz Electric Field: Effects on Neuromuscular Function in the Rat, *Bioelectromagnetics* **2,3** (1981), pp. 227-239.
3. R. H. Lovely, Recent Studies in the Behavioral Toxicology of ELF Electric and Magnetic Fields, *Prog. Clinical Biological Research* **257** (1988), pp. 327-347.
4. N. Wertheimer, D. A. Savitz & B. Leener, Childhood Cancer in Relation to Indicators of Magnetic Fields from Ground Current Sources, *Bioelectromagnetics* **16,2** (1995), pp. 86-96.

5. S. Milham, Jr., Mortality in Workers Exposed to Electromagnetic Fields, *Environmental Health Perspective* **62** (Oct., 1985), pp. 297-300.
6. R. Katz & Kaminski, *Yarrow Special Formula* (Flower Essence Services, Nevada City, CA, 1995).
7. R. Katz & P. Kaminski, *The Twelve Windows of Plant Perception* (Flower Essence Society, Nevada City, CA, 1995).
8. J. R. Cram, A Psychological and Metaphysical Study of Dr. Edward Bach's Flower Essence Stress Formula, *Subtle Energies & Energy Medicine* **11**,1 (2000), pp. 1-21.
9. P. Kaminski, *The Five-Flower Formula* (Flower Essence Services, Nevada City, CA, 1995).
10. E. Bach, *Heal Thy Self* (C. W. Daniel Co, England, 1931).
11. N. Weeks, *The Medical Discoveries of Edward Bach Physician* (Daniel Co, Essex, 1940).
12. J. Barnard, Ed., *Collected Writings of Edward Bach* (Ashgrove Press, Bath, England, 1994).
13. Hans Selye, *The Stress of Life* (McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, 1956).
14. J. Barnard & M. Barnard, *The Healing Herbs of Edward Bach, An Illustrated Guide to the Flower Remedies* (Ashgrove Press, Bath, England, 1994).
15. P. Kaminski & R. Katz, *Flower Essence Repertory* (Flower Essence Society, Nevada City, California, 1996).
16. J. Lacey & B. Lacey Verification and Extension of the Principle of Autonomic Response-Stereotype, *American Journal of Psychology* **71** (1958), pp. 50-73.
17. M. H. Lader & A. M. Mathews, A Physiological Model of Phobic Anxiety and Desensitization, *Behavior Research and Therapy*, **6** (1968), pp. 411-421.
18. R. B. Malmo & C. Shagass, Physiologic Studies of Reaction to Stress in Anxiety and Early Schizophrenia, *Psychosomatic Medicine* **11** (1949), pp. 9-24.
19. M. Schwartz, Ed., *Biofeedback: A Practitioners Guide* (Guilford, New York, NY, 1987).
20. J. R. Cram, G. Kasman & J. Holtz, *Introduction to Surface Electromyography* (Aspen Press, Gaithersburg, MD, 1997).
21. B. Goldstein, Electromyography: A Measure of Skeletal Muscle Response. In *Handbook of Psychophysiology* (Greenfield & Stembach, Eds., Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, NY, 1972).
22. A. J. Frilund & J. T. Cacioppo, Guidelines for Human Electromyographic Research, *Psychophysiology* **23** (1986), pp. 567-589.
23. J. R. Cram, Surface SEMG Recordings in Pain Related Disorders: A Diagnostic Framework, *Biofeedback and Self Regulation* **13**,2 (1988), pp. 123-137.
24. D. V. Tansley, *Radionics and the Subtle Anatomy of Man* (Health Science Press, Devon, England, 1972).
25. S. Daragulla & D. V. G. Kunz, The Chakras and Energy Fields, *The Theosophical* **111** (Publishing House, Whaton, 1989).
26. S. Muktananda, *Siddha Meditation: Commentaries on the Shiva Sutras and Other Sacred Texts* (SYDA Foundation, Oakland, CA, 1975).
27. F. M. Muller, Ed., *Sacred Books on the East: The Vedanta Sutras* (Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Ltd, New Delhi, India, 1904).
28. M. Rangacharys & M. B. V. Aiyanger, *The Vedantasutras with the Sribhasya of Ramanujacarya* Volumes 1& 2 (Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt, Ltd, New Delhi, India, 1981).
29. J. R. Cram, A Psychological and Metaphysical Study of Dr. Edward Bach's Flower Essence Stress Formula, *Subtle Energies & Energy Medicine* **11**,1 (2000), pp. 1-21.

30. S. Rama, R. Ballentine & S. Ajaya, *Yoga and Psychotherapy: The Evolution of Consciousness* (Himalayan Institute, PA, 1976).
31. L. Rosalyn, Jeanne Bruyere & Farrens, *Wheels of Light: Chakras, Auras, and the Healing Energy of the Body* (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1994).

∞ ∞ ∞