

rod. It is any rod that is longer than zero. For instance when you tested the rod first, it reacted before you came to the witness. Had you measured the distance as four feet, then you had in your hand a "four footer." That rod would react at four feet or any multiple of four feet of distance or depth. To check that measurement, you stand alongside the witness, poise the rod and walk away. The distance between witness and first reaction is the one by which the rod is known. In the case of a long rod such as ten feet, it is far easier to sit in the back of an open car and get a friend to drive you along the road till the rod reacts to the hat you have left at the starting point. It is likely to be miles.

The most convenient thicknesses of rod legs are around as thick as number 12, 10 or 8 knitting needles, around one-eighth inch. I am told that Titoki, Toro, Tanekaha, and Southland Beech will furnish good rods. So far I have not tried these. To ensure that the rod you are testing does not react to any element you may be passing over, put more binding over the original binding temporarily. In some cases rods don't oblige by their best behaviour. If you put up a ten footer in the direction of a person on the move (his or her witness in hand) the rod should beat at every ten feet of distance travelled. If you cut a small notch up near the binding, with pocket knife or three-cornered file, the rod will beat every 20 feet, cut another notch near the first and it will beat every 30 feet. Fill the notches with soap or wax, and you're back to ten feet again. This type of rod is useful in tracing schools of fish or shoals.

If you poise your rod and it persists in flicking, it is because you are not clear of unwanted radiation. It is essential, if you aspire to accuracy, that you clear yourself absolutely before commencing. Test your self frequently during your operations until you have learned to keep clear, as you proceed, automatically.

I am of the opinion that the best material for rods is Fibre Glass. I haven't made or owned one but I like the behaviour of what I have seen. I think I would run a few grooves twenty-five inches long by one eighth inch by one eighth inch ($\frac{1}{8}$ in. x $\frac{1}{8}$ in.) so that if I wished I could make two $12\frac{1}{2}$ in. sides out of one length. I don't know if Fibre Glass of that dimension would be strong enough. Would someone supply an article on this. I have broken as many as four wooden rods in one hour through gripping too tightly, but not aware of the fact.

NEUTRALISING HARMFUL RAYS

BY R. LEFTWICH, Esq.

I would like to offer some comments on Mr. A. D. Manning's article published in the December, 1964, issue of the *B.S.D. Journal*, in which he expounded his theory for the neutralisation

of harmful rays, and at the same time express some ideas which may contribute to the greater understanding of this profound aspect of dowsing. Any comments directly opposed to Mr. Manning's ideas are not in any way intended to be derogatory or disrespectful but are the outcome of my own experience and mind training.

I, myself, have been engaged in dowsing activities for some years and no one professing the ability to neutralise rays has so far been successful in preventing me from locating my objective. At the Society's last Congress at Tunbridge Wells, a speaker gave us an interesting talk on this very subject and showed us an assemblage of copper coils similar to those designed by Mr. Manning and diagrammatically shown on page 197 of that December's issue and here again, I challenged the speaker to neutralise any stream or object of his choice at any time or place and for convenience, where presumably he had previously tried out some experiments, he suggested I might try to locate a small stream he had neutralised running through the Spa Hotel car park which he maintained could not be found by other dowsers present. Accordingly, I set out to locate the "missing" stream and experienced no difficulty in ascertaining its breadth, depth and flow.

I mention this particular experience only to emphasise that in so many cases, dowsers have, in my opinion, the wrong approach to the whole phenomenon. They use samples to differentiate between the substances being sought whilst others use various other supposed aids but probably none of these are really necessary if one realises that the entire process is a mental one? For example, if I dowsing for water, I really think in terms of water and I obtain no reaction from my rods or whatever means I choose to use to amplify those minute muscular movements from anything else. If, on the other hand, I am seeking a disused tunnel which is more likely in my particular field of work, only a tunnel or some form of cavity will cause a rod reaction.

Many dowsers appear to find dowsing physically exhausting, but why should this be so if it is a mental process and the mind is permanently active? Surely this is a misconception and indicative of faulty thinking. Few of us seem to realise that we use our accepted five physical senses throughout our lives every day without experiencing any undue tiredness (unless of course any one sense is greatly abused, when Nature usually retaliates), so there should be even greater cause for lack of exhaustion when exercising our mental senses, particularly dowsing, since it largely relies on the activity of the Super-conscious; a sense that requires little conscious effort.

Dowsing is merely one of our many mental faculties that has been bestowed on man for his protection and self-preservation and not unlike their counterpart our physical senses, these mental

forces can be developed to Nature's originally intended level which in the vast majority of us, are hopelessly under-developed or even non-existent.

A good dowser can easily locate anything that is different from the immediate surroundings beneath him and, as far as the less obvious process of map dowsing is concerned, the forces at work are precisely the same—namely, the Super-conscious, which is able to project itself from the physical body and relay back the required information instantaneously regardless of the distance involved, for it is possible to obtain signals from stars on astronomical maps and these are literally light years away.

To revert to the neutralisation of rays, etc., I feel quite certain that this is all in the mind, and the success Mr. Manning has obviously experienced with his two thousand homes in the United Kingdom is largely due to the faith and confidence he inspired in his clients, which is, of course, very commendable, but it was not due to those wonder coils. After all, it would indeed be difficult to believe that if radiations were given off by an underground stream (a theory I do not entirely support), surely the placing of copper coils in its path could hardly be expected to isolate these radiations merely over the area of a limited site, as the stream's continued path would also be affected and this certainly is not the case.

CORRESPONDENCE

Palma de Mallorca, Spain.
February 20th, 1966.

To the Editor,

Dear Sir,—Why the dowsing instrument moves in a particular manner has been stated to be due to a neuro-muscular reflex, an electro magnetic contact which affects the instrument through the muscles or some such cause.

Being a dowser seventy-five years old and querying in my mind as to how long my elderly muscles would respond, I tried an experiment with my pendulum which others may like to emulate. Instead of holding the "string" in the approved manner over a known stream of underground water, I held it between my teeth (false at that!) clear of lips and chin, and to my astonishment and delight, in a short while it started to gyrate. I kept my head quite still.

I could not convince myself that any muscular cause was involved in causing the revolving, and it would be interesting to hear what results any other dowser obtains who is willing to carry out a similar experiment.