

## DE-RAYING DEVICES

*Report from the Editor*

16th June, 1984.

Dear Editor,

We, the undersigned members of the Worthing Dowsing Society, attended with interest Geoffrey King's recent lecture 'The Structure and Creation of Earth Energy Patterns' and could not but be impressed both by the dowsing skills of those concerned and their ingenuity in developing a device capable of 'normalising' in some sense disturbed earth energy patterns. We were, however, concerned to discover that there had apparently been no investigation as to the effect of these devices on human beings in spite of the fact that, when used in conjunction with a map to give blanket coverage of an area, they seriously inhibited the dowsing response of those within range.

In this context we inevitably recall Inge Brown's Oxford Lecture (BSD Journal No. 202) 'Some Aspects of Noxious Radiation Elimination in Houses' where a 'diversion machine' successfully eliminated both the noxious radiations and the auras of those who lived nearby. There are also both moral and practical issues where one has a device which can affect groups of individuals at a distance without either their knowledge or permission and, if widespread, could seriously affect the development of our Society and all it stands for.

Central to our concern is that these devices are both powerful and effective and, indeed, could represent a quantum leap in the development of our discipline equivalent at this level to the development of atomic energy and with similar potential for good or ill. We are, therefore, recommending to Council that a working group be established whose terms of reference would be thoroughly to investigate the effect of these devices on human beings. It is suggested that membership would consist of those most closely concerned or their representatives together with a number of skilled dowsers particularly concerned with radionics and medical radiesthesia.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) F. C. Boulton, Tim Box, K. Gardner, Dorothy Pickett.

This letter was received in June 1984 and on reading it I thought it of such a serious matter that the Council should see it at their next meeting in July, before I published it.

The lecture referred to in this letter was given in London in May and dealt with the work that Geoffrey King and Clive Beadon had done in developing a small clear acrylic block in which can be seen

certain gemstones within a copper spiral. Geoffrey King spoke of the various energy lines they had found, related to colours, and how these lines fractured causing disharmony in dwelling places and how they had developed this device to reset these lines back into Nature's original pattern.

I quote from the lecture, sections, which, I think, gave rise to the writers of the letter being concerned.

"If I put the Beadon block over a map I have dowsed and drawn all the lines on it so that you know what is wrong, (a) you will have a perfect circuitry, (b) of course, it will be perfectly peaceful and (c) within the confines of that spiral you cannot pick up any of the energy lines at all, nor can you pick up any underground water. There is nothing inside it and you are totally at peace . . ."

". . . within the circle of that house (Geoffrey King had explained that a map of the property he had been asked to investigate is stuck to the underside of the block so that the block covers the whole of the property, and more sometimes) you will not be able to dowse for almost anything . . ."

*Q.* I have had one of those devices in my house for 9 days and I have been wondering for 8 of them why on earth I could no longer dowse. My dowsing ability seems to have gone from me. Is that to be expected?

*A.* Yes. It has simply removed your ability to dowse. It doesn't normally do that except if you put it over a map. What you probably have not been able to get hold of is some of the broken lines which were there previously.

*Q.* It is on the map.

*A.* Oh, well you won't be able to dowse, then."

The letter was discussed at some length at the July Council meeting and it was decided that Council members should have time before the next meeting in October to consider terms of reference for any working party which might be set up.

Further lengthy discussions ensued at the October Council meeting.

It was decided that the signatories of the letter be approached and asked for evidence of specific instances where harm had been done to either humans or property by the use of devices to alter earth energy lines or fields. It was also decided to encourage Michael Guest to conclude his review of work and practice in this field, which he was taking from past issues of the Journal, so that it may be submitted to the Editor for consideration for publication and also for circulation amongst Council members so that they may be better informed to consider the need and constitution of any working party. The request for evidence of harm done by devices was made so that any investigation into them would reduce the time and effort

of the working party. It is evident that the subject is an emotive one and that the views of people are diverse, and the Council was not convinced that such investigations would result in unequivocal conclusions that would be accepted.

The following letters were received from the four signatories:-

Dear Michael,

26.11.84

. . . I was very surprised by the suggestion in your letter for evidence of harm being done by the use of any device set up to alter earth energy patterns or fields. At the lecture by Geoffrey King, one member, whose name we do not know, said that when he had the device, he couldn't dowse. At this point Ken, Tim, Fred and I took out our pendulums and found we couldn't either!

Ken's letter was written in good faith and out of our deep sense of loyalty to the Society, because we felt that all that the Society stands for might be under threat if these instruments were distributed indiscriminately before they were thoroughly tested for possible harm.

My impression is that the Council would not wish to support any aspect of the many uses of dowsing which might be subject to question on ethical grounds, and it would seem right and proper for the Society to deal with this matter.

The talk given by Terry Ross at the Golden Jubilee Congress is worth noting (Journal, March 1984), and his conditions for remote healing quoted at the foot of page 195 . . . "if the answers — all of them — aren't in the affirmative, stop at once."

May I make the following suggestions:-

1. Publish our letter and ask for comments from our members.
2. Refer the question to a specialist, e.g. our Scientific Adviser, Dr. Arthur Bailey . . .

I do not think that the views expressed in Ken's letter could be described as 'emotive' and as the Society's object is the promotion of dowsing, an investigation into a device which might inhibit the dowsing faculty seemed to be a perfectly reasonable request.

Yours sincerely,  
Dorothy (Pickett).

Dear Michael,

27.11.84

. . . As far as I am concerned the only factual evidence of harm to human beings by the Beadon device is that experienced by myself at the lecture last May.

I was sitting in the third row in front of the platform and was quite unaware of any device being present. Indeed, I had never given it a thought. After about 15 minutes I felt decidedly uneasy and my concentration flagged (not my interest). I am sure any

medical man would have found a significant drop in blood pressure and pulse (i.e. cardiovascular system affected).

It was only at question time I realised other members of the audience had been affected. I was astonished to hear in reply to a question that no investigation as to effect of this device on human beings had been done.

To my mind the matter is a medical problem as to the possible effects on sensitives, invalids and the elderly in the population. Therefore it is essential for the investigation to be made by experienced Radionic and Radiesthesia practitioners . . .

The powerful healing effects of crystals and gems are very well known. Surely prolonged over-exposure would lead to over-stimulation and subsequent health problems to some members of the population . . . The Society has a Scientific Adviser, Dr. Arthur Bailey. Has his opinion been sought?

I do hope the Council will consider the possible harmful effects on sensitives, invalids and the elderly when exposed to radiation from this device as well as the wider moral and ethical aspects.  
Yours sincerely,  
Fred Boulton.

Dear Michael,

15.12.84

. . . With regard to the third paragraph of your letter (in this paragraph the Secretary asked for evidence to be given of harm being done. Editor), surely Geoffrey King himself acknowledged at the London Lecture that the Beadon Device neutralised the dowsing faculty of people within  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile.

Also the purpose of the machine is said to be to 'correct' the imbalance of some of the Earth's influences. Are we sure that in correcting a situation one does not balance things out but just diverts them to someone else?

It must be ethically wrong to use a machine of this nature knowing that it may affect possibly hundreds of people within its catchment area, without their knowledge or consent.

Yours sincerely,  
Tim Box.

Dear Michael,

24.12.84

**BEADON DEVICE**

Further to my letter of 27th November, I am writing to say I have found a Drown Rate for Crystal Poison, viz, 901588 (Ruth Drown book of Radionic Rates).

May I with respect suggest that any competent dowser using this rate of identification (and treatment) can very quickly detect and evaluate evidence of harm being done to humans by the use of the Beadon device.

Also I am given to understand that Radionic Practitioners investigating this matter would use the Malcolm Rae Simulator Card 'Psychic Interference' in their analysis.

Hoping this will assist the Council.

Yours sincerely,  
Fred Boulton.

Dear Michael,

27.12.84

Thank you for your letter of the 15th November. I apologise for the delay in replying but it seemed necessary to write at some length after suitable reflection and only now have I the opportunity.

First of all, I must emphasise that the four of us who wrote initially did not in any way see ourselves as counsel or witnesses for the prosecution. That model would be quite inappropriate. We saw rather that there was a strong prima facie case for an objective and dispassionate investigation which we therefore requested Council to undertake. This case was presented in our initial letter but is now spelt out in fuller detail.

1. I, myself, first became aware of potential problems at the Oxford Conference, where there was an ironic contrast between the publicity material concerning the device presently under consideration and Inge Brown's lecture indicating the harm that a device with a similar purpose does to the human aura. It is accepted that the two devices are by no means the same. The similarity of purpose does, however, raise the question.

2. Geoffrey King's London Lecture raises three more points which, if my memory serves me right after this lapse of time, were either presented or accepted by the speaker.

- (a) The device suppresses rather than heals the energy pattern, i.e. once the device is de-activated, the original pattern returns.
- (b) There has been no thorough investigation of the effects of the device on human beings either at physical or higher levels.
- (c) The device does affect or inhibit the dowsing response in some people.

3. In addition, there are two broader issues which need to be taken into account.

- (a) The device is undoubtedly powerful and may, therefore, be powerful for either good or ill.
- (b) When used in conjunction with a map or ground plan, the range of the device is well beyond the immediate environment of those who wish to use it. People are, therefore, being affected by it without their knowledge and without their permission. Many would consider this to be immoral.

It was in the light of the above that my colleagues and I wrote our initial letter. I can understand Council's reluctance to take action particularly as the designer of the device in question is a member. I would make the point, however, that alternative medicine is flourishing as never before and that dowsing has an important role to play. Because of this our activities are likely to come under closer scrutiny than ever before. We cannot afford not to have our house in order.

Perhaps I could conclude by making some positive suggestions? Whilst a full-scale investigation could be very time-consuming, it should not be impossible to devise a pilot study to establish whether or not there are grounds for a more thorough investigation. Such a study should be undertaken by three or four members of the Society of suitable reputation who are well versed in medical radiesthesia and who employ a thorough and well-tried method of analysis such as that outlined in David Tansley's latest book. The Society has a scientific adviser in Dr. Bailey and, I believe, a modest research fund. Perhaps Dr. Bailey should be asked to orchestrate this? If there are difficulties, I, myself, have some background in statistics and design of experiment and would be very willing to help. Also, if points in my letter are unclear, I should be happy to talk to Council, if my diary will stand it, or to an appropriate sub-group if thought desirable.

At the beginning of this letter I indicated that it was inappropriate to talk of my colleagues and myself as counsel or witnesses for the prosecution. A better model parallels the development of new drugs. We have a device, on sale to the general public, which is intended to have a beneficial effect on those who buy it. There may, however, be side-effects. This has not been properly investigated and the Council is the only body which is in a reasonable position to do this. It is for this reason that we wrote our initial letter.

Yours sincerely,  
Ken Gardner.

The four signatories and Geoffrey King were then invited to attend the Council meeting held on 22nd January, 1985, to enable them to contribute to the discussions. Dorothy Pickett, Fred Boulton, Ken Gardner and Geoffrey King were able to attend. Tim Box was unable to due to prior committments.

The following letter was received prior to this meeting:-

Dear Michael,

10.1.85

Unfortunately I shall be unable to attend which I much regret as some of the subject matter is not only very close to my heart but involves my professional involvement.

May I add to the material to be looked at, the suggestion that each 'device' and system of using it including the practitioner concerned should be regarded individually and in their own right.

There is a scientific background to this as the Americans have discovered in many items of their NASA programme which has led to statements that the operator is, in many cases, inevitably a part of the experiment however objective it may appear to be on the surface.

I should like to submit for thorough research the system which I have used and taught for a number of years.

I may say that through those years I have invited investigation and comment with particular reference to any adverse side effects on human beings, animals, plant life or soil analysis in several countries in Europe and in the United States, both east coast and west coast.

The system in question is to locate what I term lines of earth energy and identify and chart accurately the centre line and direction of flow of the stream of energy.

Thereafter, if it is producing an adverse reaction, to install suitable metals either in the ground or on or in buildings in order to 'correct' the effect of the energy on animals, plants and the soil in addition, of course, to human beings.

As I have already said, it is difficult to extract the operator from the operation, but I would find it difficult to believe that mares could cease aborting their foals for subjective reasons or that plants could alter their foliage and be restored to what was expected of them again on a subjective basis.

I feel, also, that I would have heard by now all too frequently had there been any suggestions of producing an adverse effect by this system. On the contrary, a large number of people have been able to report not only the improvement which has accompanied the energy correction (including cancer patients) but also to report when there has been a repetition of the adverse effects when it has been found that for some reason, which can be separately debated, the energy line has fractionally altered and has 'by-passed the corrector'.

I am doubly sorry, as I said, that I cannot attend this particular meeting but would be glad of an opportunity when any project is set up to participate in it more as one of those under investigation than the other way round but I do agree, of course, that if the Society is going to pronounce about it or allow these systems to be taught particularly by members of Council, myself included, then at least the Society should be satisfied that nothing of an adverse nature is brought into manifestation . . .

Yours as ever,  
Bruce MacManaway.

At the Council meeting of 22nd January, Fred Boulton said that he considered the effects of the alteration of earth energy patterns to be questionable on medical grounds as he felt that he, himself, had suffered detrimentally from the use of devices. He quoted David Tansley on the indiscriminate interference with energies and he felt that a radiesthetic investigation using a question and answer dowsing technique would be appropriate.

Dorothy Pickett related that she had questioned it using radiesthetic methods and had found that harm at a higher level than the physical had been done. She suggested that the Society's scientific adviser be approached in this matter.

Ken Gardner stressed that they did not wish to form an investigating committee as they feared that such an action might divide the Society in two. However, he understood from Mr. King's lecture that no investigation of this powerful device, with regard to the effect it has on human beings, had ever been undertaken. He and the other writers of the letter, therefore, felt that an impartial investigation into this should be carried out.

Geoffrey King was asked to comment and he apologised for giving an incorrect answer at the lecture. He stated that the devices, which were used to correct energy lines, worked in two ways. Firstly, they correct damage to energy lines within the sphere of influence of the device. When placed on a map of the site being treated, this will make sure the effect is concentrated within the radius of the coil of the device. Secondly, nothing is left to find by dowsing within the circle. It is not that people cannot dowse but it is simply because the situation has been corrected, there is nothing left for them to find. People are quite able to dowse outside the diameter of influence of the coil.

Mrs. Wilkinson put forward that what one is removing depends on the perception of the dowser. One may be removing at a lower plane only to leave problems at a higher plane and this could cause further problems.

Geoffrey King disagreed with this view as he felt he was correcting energy lines and not suppressing them.

Ken Gardner then stressed that as this device is powerful, and by definition this must be agreed by the operators of it and as no investigation has been made on its effect on human beings he felt that their central point should be carried out. An impartial investigation was the only way forward.

The Council members then agreed that Dr. Bailey should be approached and informed of what had taken place and be asked to comment and set terms of reference for any sub-committee which might be formed to investigate the matter and to suggest members of this sub-committee. It was felt that it should be stressed to Dr. Bailey that although the Council was considering this matter most seriously, the Society has always been a forum for discussion and



diverse views as to the nature and function of the dowsing faculty and in no way should this investigation be seen as a trial.

The following letters were received after the January Council meeting:-

Dear Michael, 23.1.85  
Thank you for inviting me to your 'August Assembly'.  
I feel that the Council rank Medical Radiesthesia well below Water Dowsing and Ley Lines!  
I enclose a short memo, which I meant to give you last Tuesday.  
Best wishes,  
Fred Boulton.

**MEMO                      The Beadon Device**

Assessment and evaluation of the effect on humans of the Beadon Device by Radiesthetic Q & A Technique.

Questions.

1. Can it cause 'Crystal Poisoning' on some individuals? The Drown Rate 901588 can be used for identification (and treatment).
2. Does it produce Geopathic Stress or Disturbance? What is its range?
3. Does it cause Psychic Disturbance in some individuals? The Radionic Subliminal Symbol can be used as witness.
4. Does it unbalance Polarity (i.e. C.N.S. and cardiovascular systems) of some people?
5. Does it unbalance the colour spectrum of individuals and the earth?
6. Does it affect and introduce imbalance in the aura?

"We should take care to select gems and stones that are appropriate to the needs of our own fields."

"Indiscriminate selection may well lead to the introduction of imbalances into our auras, something we can ill afford in this hectic modern world".

David Tansley, page 182  
of *The Raiment of Light*

Dear Michael, 24.1.85  
I should like to express my thanks to the President and Council for inviting us to the meeting on Tuesday. As you know, I have been impressed by the ethical standards of the Society, and have tried to live up to them and base my own dowsing exercises on the lines of a lecture given by Dr. Aubrey T. Westlake at Malvern on 5th April, 1972, i.e. "Am I allowed to . . ."

Ken mentioned the lecture by Inge Brown at Oxford as being particularly relevant to the point we raised. On page 184 of Journal 202, she refers to Pohl's 'black box' removing people's auras unbeknown to themselves, and questions whether any human being has any right whatsoever to interfere with the normal functioning of so many people. With Inge, I have had personal experience of 'the heartfelt prayer to God' (page 182) as being a simple and effective way of healing, and moreover of not harming anyone.

At Oxford, too, Terry Ross emphasised the need to be ethical, and for dowzers to ask what is allowed. "Healing is house-cleaning, and you wouldn't enter your neighbour's house of consciousness for that purpose, any more than you would his brick and mortar house without the permission that validates your entry and closes the circuit of giving and getting." (page 195, Journal 203).

On the question raised by Sir Charles Jessel about other methods, I was concerned not to take up more of the Council's time, but this was raised in an article by Jean and John Watford in Journal 205, page 328. "We believe that we can get into balance — correct the pattern which has become displaced, yet we do not pretend either to — or aim to — cure — this is for someone else." When I was in Capetown a few years ago, a dowser was explaining ways of getting rid of black streams, but when I asked her where they went, she said she didn't know!

At the meeting on Tuesday, I began to feel decidedly unwell — heart beating irregularly — and felt sure that there was a device near, and Fred had come to the same conclusion. I would have liked to say so there and then, but was too polite to interrupt, so I brought my own powers of protection into operation, and, thankfully recovered, but I wasn't surprised when eventually Geoffrey King produced one.

It does seem that any enquiry ought to establish the precise effects of the device on the life energy field of Man, which is interdependent with the earth's energy field as part of a whole living system. Disease and damage frequently originate in the subtle anatomy of Man, and later manifest in the physical. As the device seems to exert its influence over a range of a quarter of a mile, it would appear that any investigative approach would need to be circumspect! And if, as has been suggested, it only suppresses and does not heal, can it be said to act in co-operating with nature?

I wish the enquiry every success.

Yours sincerely,  
Dorothy Pickett.

Dear Michael,

27.2.85

Referring to the Minutes of our meeting on 22nd January, may I put on record a little more fully than you were able to do the views I expressed at that meeting? May I also request that these views be included with those submitted to Dr. Arthur Bailey.

I made 4 points, as follows:-

1. That the range of dowsing perception differs widely from one individual to another. That exposure to this device reduces appreciably the range of that perception, particularly in the higher frequencies. The cause, I believe, is attributable to the effect this device has on Man's polarity.
2. That the device changes effects without changing causes. When the device is removed the noxious radiation or disharmonious frequency is seen to be still there. It does not, as has been suggested, disappear. The device merely causes it to manifest differently, moving it to a higher frequency, seemingly outside the range of most dowzers.
3. That to change effects without affecting causes is mere meddling with vital forces outside our understanding. Disharmonious higher frequencies have a more critical and far-reaching effect on the formative forces than do disharmonious lower frequencies. One can't change the Earth's energy field without changing Man's also. The two are inextricably linked, interdependent and part of a unified whole.
4. That these devices exert their influence over an extended area, thus affecting countless people without their knowledge or consent. This raises the question of ethics and the very important principle of individual freedom of choice.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Wilkinson.

Dear Michael,

26.2.85

. . . I also note that no mention (in the Minutes) is made of the fact that during the special session we held with Mr. King and his 'opponents', I re-dowsed the room twice: once before he took the device from its hiding place in his bag, and once afterwards. On neither occasion did its presence make the slightest difference to the dowsable energies of the room which I had plotted out during the lunch hour. This was all the more remarkable because Mr. King placed it right in the middle of an energy line which went across the table in front of him right by where I was sitting. To me this demonstrates that the device is mind-activated and not objectively powerful.

I feel that Arthur Bailey should be made aware of this observation because it has no little bearing on the matter he is being asked to opine upon. I have my record in the form of sketch and notes and would be pleased to send them on to him if you

have already written following the Council resolution. If not, I should be pleased to send you a fair copy for the purpose. Perhaps you would let me know.

The time which has elapsed since our discussion has only served to reinforce my view that there are no experts in this field and much difference of opinion. What I do know is that in his prospectus for the Spiral of Tranquility, Clive Beadon states:

“These environmental energy lines, which appear to be neither electrical nor magnetic . . .”

Well, if they are neither of these, there is precious little left for them to be but psychic and I'm afraid I don't believe that bits of plastic and copper can affect psychic energies without a mind to power them!

Yours sincerely,  
Michael Guest.

Dr. Arthur Bailey was sent details of all correspondence and meetings and asked to report to the Secretary.

The following report was received on the day of the next Council meeting in April.

### Earth Energy Patterns and their Modification

*by Arthur R. Bailey, Ph.D.*

I have received quite a weight of material from Michael Rust and other interested people on the controversial matter of Earth Energies and their 'correction'. I feel somewhat that I have been called upon to 'bell the cat' and know full well that whatever I have to offer will not please everyone.

For me the whole area of Earth Energies is a very important one as it lies at the interface between 'physical' dowsing and the areas of the Occult. Here I am using 'occult' in its true meaning — that of being hidden.

Physical dowsing, by this I mean dowsing for physical objects, is fine as it can be tested by digging or whatever means is appropriate. Even here there is a pitfall that many fall into — that of saying that because dowsing has given a certain answer, then the answer is certain. All dowzers make mistakes, as I know from my own experience. Nevertheless, if we ignore the 'lunatic fringe' who believe that testing one's results is unnecessary, physical dowsing poses little

difficulty. Whether it be underground water, missing objects, or where to manipulate a spine, one is dealing with a physical object and the results of the dowsing can be checked. Agreed it may be that in difficult areas the results can only be shown to work by using statistical methods. Nevertheless the object being dowsed on — even if on a map — has a physical existence and the results can be evaluated on a physical basis.

The whole area of Earth Energies, Ley Lines, Black Streams, Geopathic Zones, etc., are a different thing altogether. These have no existence so far as orthodox science is concerned — in that there are no physical instruments that can detect their presence. Agreed there are areas where anomalous physical readings may be obtained on instruments, but this 'proves' nothing. All it shows is that there are anomalous readings in whatever is being measured. The reason for the anomalous reading is unknown and can only be conjecture. Within the confines of generally accepted scientific theories there cannot be explanations that use such words as 'Leys, Auras, Psychic Frequencies, Spiritual Nature, etc.' because such words and concepts are excluded. This does NOT mean that we cannot use Scientific Method — far from it. Indeed scientific method is our main lifeline in what otherwise can become a morass that can submerge us.

Scientific method has nothing to do with theories — those can come later. Scientific method is about being methodical and precise, about not jumping to premature conclusions. Unfortunately scientific method is often absent in much so-called scientific work, let alone dowsing!

Putting all theories about Ley Lines aside, we must first look for the evidence of any influence on living beings from the place where they live in the world. This is not hard to find and is well accepted by orthodoxy. Our environment affects our health. The next step is the crucial one. **ARE THERE INFLUENCES THAT AFFECT LIVING BEINGS THAT ARE NOT RECOGNISED BY CONVENTIONALLY ACCEPTED THEORIES?** If the answer is NO then we can forget the whole thing.

Looking impartially at the published evidence, it must be admitted that a hard-nosed sceptic would not be impressed. That however is to miss the point. Before adequate theories can be put together in ANY new area, there is normally a long period of information gathering. Only when one has a feel for what is going on is it possible to set up tests to determine the true nature of the phenomenon being examined. Perhaps we are now approaching that time in regard to 'Earth Energies'.

Whatever evidence is there for the existence of these non-physical earth energies? (Non-physical in the sense that they cannot be detected by physical measuring instruments in a non-ambiguous way). Quite a lot, but it must be realised that dowsing results ONLY

are no evidence at all. It is all too easy to produce, by dowsing, totally erroneous results. The subconscious mind can play all sorts of tricks where there is no easy way of checking the results. Also we must appreciate that the areas of the subconscious are something of a minefield. We must not rule out the possibility of such concepts as telepathy, conscious or unconscious. Scientific method means that we must exclude all other possible influences from our tests, **WHETHER WE BELIEVE IN THEM OR NOT.**

People and animals ARE influenced by things that are not scientifically measurable. There have been innumerable reports of these effects and some impressive work done. To convince the world at large is a different thing however. My own experience is that some places have a negative effect on both people and animals living there and that steps can be taken to change the environment. I feel that anyone who has investigated these areas for themselves is most unlikely to come up with a different answer. So far so good. It is at this point that the controversy starts!

First of all what DO we mean by Ley Lines, Geostats, Track Lines, Aquastats, Black Streams, Frequencies (Higher and Lower), Auras, Polarity, etc. etc.? It may be unpopular to say so but these are all mind constructs, all theory based. It IS difficult, if not impossible, to converse without using some words of this type; but it must be realised that they do not describe the phenomenon. It is in this area that the whole thing collapses into an area of 'Academic' debate — in essence just as nonsensical as "How many Angels can stand on the head of a pin?". Let us therefore accept merely the observed facts and be cautious about 'explanations' about what is going on.

So far as I am concerned the following are facts:-

1. Living beings can be affected by where they live or work even though there is no known explanation within scientific orthodoxy.
2. By the use of a variety of techniques it is possible to change the local environment in that the previous negative effects can be removed.
3. Auto-suggestion as an explanation for the cancellation of the effects is unacceptable because there are many instances, some of my own experience, where very young children and animals have been helped by the 'treatment'.
4. It is possible to be influenced at a sub-conscious level by the thoughts of another person. This I have demonstrated on several of the Dowsing Courses that I have run, and it is a fruitful cause of difficulties. There is much published on this, although again largely of an anecdotal nature.
5. One's own beliefs modify the results that are obtained from dowsing. Again I have found this by practical experience. If you believe in devils you are sure to find them! (Incidentally BELIEF means to cling passionately to something).

Putting the above together it is now possible to see the problem that we are faced with. Our own beliefs and even those of others can and do affect the results of our dowsing. If we believe that burying a dead vole, killed at midnight on the full moon, twenty paces from the affected place, will effect a cure then it may well be so. This has been the basis of witchcraft rituals for centuries. We then make the fundamental error of assuming that it was what we did that caused the effect, rather than our state of mind at the time.

The fact that we can find Ley Lines by dowsing does NOT prove their existence. If we find that along a straight line on the surface of the earth people or animals are being adversely (or beneficially) affected, that is a different matter altogether. Now we have evidence that there is something happening. That "something" may or may not be what we conceive of to be a Ley Line — that is a different matter altogether. I know of some work done in the North of Scotland by a dowser who dowsed the line of a so-called "black stream" and then found that the incidence of cancer was far higher in all those houses over the stream. This type of investigation has much more evidential value than most of the work that has been published. It is important that the dowsing should be done first and the physical effects looked at afterwards. It is all too easy to dowse to "prove" what is already known to exist.

How then does this relate to the problem of possible bad effects from "rebalancing the earth energies?" How about the various devices that people have produced for "de-raying" areas, can they have adverse effects? Should we leave well alone and do nothing?

Firstly I feel strongly that a balance is needed between the "eager-beaver" "do-gooders" and the opposite approach of refusing to help those in trouble. This applies to everything in life and not to just the Earth Energy question. Being too full of refining zeal can cause untold damage and misery merely because such zeal, by its very nature is blind. It cannot see that there is another side to the problem. My experience is that there are essential "negative" areas in this world just as much as there are essential "positive" areas. We need decay as well as growth. Maybe our first question in looking to rebalance what appears to be out of balance should be "Is there anything I can do to help matters?". Following on from this we should be open enough to accept a "NO", as an answer! But supposing that we get a "Yes," then what? .

In any uncharted area of one's life I have found it is wise to "make haste slowly". In dowsing the key to accuracy seems to be to have no preconceived ideas of the answers that may come. Far too often we are apt to be influenced by others and what they have said or written. This applies particularly to such things as "de-raying" techniques and concepts. It also applies to Radionic type instruments.

Let me be brutally frank. There are no radiations whatever known

to science that can account for dowsing. No higher or lower vibrations, no magnetic causes, nothing. There is no scientific explanation of “black boxes”, the Radionic box is based on no radiations known to science. The concepts of “resonators and resonance” in black-box terminology are mere mind concepts — they have not been shown to exist. The same applies to systems and machines for reputedly changing the energy of the earth. Scientific bunkum! But yet dowsing does work. People are affected by unknown factors and these factors can be changed. People can do diagnosis and treatment, accurately, using Radionic type “black boxes”.

It is the EXPLANATIONS that cause the problems and also often cause so much opposition and dissention. If one looks at the completely different methods used by practitioners — some apparently contradictory — then it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that it is the practitioner, rather than his methods that matter. I know of many people that have started off using Radionic boxes and finally found that the box had become unnecessary for them and they got equally good results without. I know of one box that just contains sawdust — no “resonators” at all! Yet people still get good results with it.

The same seems to apply to means of “de-raying” properties and areas of land. Past literature is full of systems using coils of wire, magnets, batteries, all sorts. It is perhaps not without reason that they all look a bit “scientific” rather like the “resonators” in the black boxes. It may well be that the belief structures such devices can support helps to give people confidence that the system will work. The overall evidence however is that such devices are only props for the practitioner — the real activating force lies in the person themselves. It is appreciated that such a statement may cause anguished responses from quite a few people. Nevertheless I speak from my own experience and observations. I know many people who now use no more (!) than the power of their own thoughts to affect unbalances in earth energies. In many ways this is little different from so-called “absent-healing”. I have done the same myself working off maps and have never needed to visit the actual site. I am not saying that this should always be the case — merely that it happens.

What ultimately seems to matter is the personal integrity of the person investigating the problem. If the motives are merely to rebalance energies, where this is appropriate, then normally there is little that goes wrong. It appears that where the intention is more ego-based — that of helping the lot of other beings **WHETHER THEY WANT TO BE HELPED OR NOT** — then that is a different matter altogether. I once tried to clear a whole hamlet near Halifax — the results were so frightening to me that it convinced me that one meddles at one’s peril! Seeking guidance is one thing — imposing



one's will is something quite different. This seems to be quite universal, not just in dowsing.

This report, like Topsy, seems to have "grewed". However I felt it necessary to put matters down in as logical a way as possible so as to clear the ground for discussion. I feel that dowsing and the whole of the "psychic" area are often bogged down by terms that people use with scant regard to what those terms really mean. I suspect that too often those that use such words as "radiations" and "auras" have no exact idea of what they mean by those words, and also fail to appreciate that others may have a quite different understanding of their meaning. Basically we are in the area of trying to find words to describe the mechanisms of things whose causes are unknown. When, in addition, we find that the descriptions of "auras" are different by different people, we begin to appreciate the difficulty. We are firmly in the area of "right-brain" perception where there is no language that can convey what is perceived. "It is as if . . ." is often the nearest that we can get to things.

To sum up:—

1. Some aspects of Ley Lines and similar things may only exist within the minds of those who believe in them. Careful DETACHED work is needed to establish more clearly the borderline between fact and imagination.
2. One can be affected by others at a sub-conscious level and it is therefore not proof that several people get the same results.
3. De-raying machines, like "black boxes", appear to work only because their operator is present and believes in them. This should be compared with the work of Maby and others on "dowsing machines", the parallel is very close.
4. What matters is the motivation behind the person attempting to correct what appears to be an unbalanced situation. Seeking to help in true humbleness is one thing, having ideas of "improving the planet" is something else!

I have attempted to be as objective as possible in the above report and also to approach the matter with scientific method so far as it can be applied. I realise that there may well be parts that readers may find unacceptable, but I can only ask them to look carefully at the reasons why they find it to be so unacceptable.

If there are any other points that need to be discussed or clarified, then I will be pleased to assist in any way.

A copy of this report was sent to the four signatories together with this letter from the Secretary.

Dear Fred, Tim, Ken and Dorothy 29.4.85

I have pleasure in enclosing a copy of Arthur Bailey's report on devices to modify earth energy lines, which was received last Wednesday, 24th April.

This was discussed by the Council that day and it has been

decided that his report be accepted and noted but the Council feels that little would be achieved by setting up a working party on the lines you seek.

I should be grateful if you would study the report and, if you wish, come back to me with your comments and any further suggestions you may have.

The whole matter has been discussed by the Council at some length over three consecutive meetings and I feel some comments by me may not be out of place in order to fill you in on the Council's views.

Firstly, in one of my letters I said that the issue was an emotive one. Dorothy took this to imply that I thought your original letter was emotive. This was not so as it is the **issue** that is emotive and had you been present at some of the discussions the Council has had I think you would agree with me.

Fred has remarked that he feels the Council is not very interested in the medical or healing side of radiesthesia. Whatever impression he may have gained when meeting them I feel is inaccurate as no less than five Council members are actively engaged in various aspects of the healing arts. It may be of interest to note that those interested solely in water or site dowsing sometimes feel the Council is not very interested in their aspect either, so I would, with respect, suggest that the interests of members are likely to colour their views of the Council.

Barbara Wilkinson has suggested to the Council that you feel there has been some suppression of your letter and that it should be published to allow free debate on the subject. It is at the Editor's discretion as to what is published in the Journal and there can be no guarantee that any lecture, article or letter will necessarily be published. The Editor felt that your letter warranted attention by the Council and so she drew their attention to it. The Council has since then actively pursued the matter, met yourselves and asked Dr. Bailey to produce his report. None of this precludes any future publication of this subject which the Editor feels suitable in the interests of the Society at large.

As I said, this issue is emotive and although your letter was mostly couched in general terms it did in fact pinpoint the Beadon device as being worthy of investigation. One member of the Council has stated that this device is harmful, but has failed to bring forward any proof of this whatsoever. One can only say then that this is mere opinion.

During discussion it has been suggested that perhaps you might be willing to take part in a simple dowsing experiment to see whether you can detect the presence or absence of an active Beadon device. Barbara Wilkinson reported to the Council that you have discussed this at length and have been unable to devise a

suitable experiment. I would appreciate your comments on this.

I think, without exception, the Council members believe that there is some form of manifestation of earth energy, whether connected with underground water or not, that can have deleterious effects on health.

At the same time, a majority of the Council present at the last meeting felt that the difficulties to be faced in examining the action of any device or method used to modify earth energy lines are similar to the difficulties faced in examining the phenomenon of dowsing itself. At present it would seem that attempts to examine these things using objective, scientific methodology so frequently leads to a breakdown of the phenomena under investigation that it renders such testing fruitless.

*On the other hand results of any investigation carried out solely by the use of radiesthetic techniques do not constitute proof of any sort as to matters of fact.* They constitute an enlightened opinion enhanced by the use of the mind's intuitive faculty that must then be proved or disproved by further investigation. This is equally true of an investigation to see a supply of water as it is of an investigation into the effects of anything on human health.

Although you have stated that you would not wish to form any committee of enquiry yourselves I should be grateful to hear your views as to what techniques a working party charged to investigate the effects of these devices should adopt . . .

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,  
Michael Rust.

The following replies were received and copies were sent to Arthur Bailey and all the Council members.

Dear Michael,

25.5.85

Thank you for your letter of the 29th April and for the opportunity to comment further. I am disappointed that Arthur Bailey has produced a 'state of the art' report rather than suggestions for further progress. There are, however, two major points which may be picked up.

1. He emphasises the personal responsibility of the dowser, criticises the 'blind' adjustment of earth energies and emphasises the need, following the Terry Ross model, of a question such as "Is there anything I can do to help matters?"
2. He also criticises the 'helping' of other people **WHETHER THEY WANT TO BE HELPED OR NOT:** (His capitals).

A device such as the Beadon cube, on fairly general sale at conferences etc., and with a range beyond the immediate vicinity of those who have bought it is vulnerable to both these criticisms.

Your own letter emphasises by underlining that a dowser's views are 'enlightened opinion' rather than proven fact. It is, therefore, enlightened opinion that the Beadon device works at all and is not harmful. It is also enlightened opinion that there are indeed side effects. The situation should, therefore, be open to further investigation and discussion.

Unfortunately you seem to indicate that the Society's establishment is not prepared to undertake the former but is prepared to stifle the latter. It is prepared tacitly to support distribution of a device developed by one of its more prominent members by means of lectures and the circulation of sales materials at conferences but is not prepared to allow the opposite view to be expressed. This approach is uncharacteristic of the Society and I am sure quite unintended. It does, however, look very strange to those of us on the receiving end.

Staying with the 'enlightened opinion' model, this puts dowsing at the 'pre-scientific' stage in derogatory American jargon. In such circumstances it is usual to seek the views of those with recognised reputations in the field but with no vested interest. I, therefore, suggest that two or three people who have a particular expertise in medical dowsing be asked to investigate the matter. I do not see why this should not be acceptable to all concerned. If the device gets a clean bill of health, its sales potential is that much enhanced. If not, I am sure the developers would wish to know.

Perhaps, however, we should seek to move out of the pre-scientific stage. Dr. Fidler's charged stones inhibited the growth of mustard plants (interrupters in Lethbridge terminology). A first step could be to test whether or not a Beadon cube would do likewise. Such an experiment would be relatively easy to design on a sound statistical basis with a control group. I could do this but someone like Dr. Fidler would be a much better bet as someone removed from the conflict and with a background in agricultural research.

The debate has focused on the Beadon cube. It will, however, become much wider as more such devices are developed and marketed. I do not see how Council can afford to dodge the issue. Our American colleagues are apparently concerned. Perhaps the device should be referred to them if Council are unwilling to proceed.

I have made a number of quite precise but painless suggestions for progress at a number of levels. I hope very much that Council will now see its way to taking them up.

Yours sincerely,  
Ken Gardner.

Dear Michael,

12.6.85

. . . I do apologise for not replying sooner . . .

I agree, Michael, that most of what you say in your letter is fair comment.

I was disappointed that the letter didn't get into the Journal, as the non-publication appeared to show some bias in favour of a Council member, who had been given a forum at our meetings, whereas four ordinary members' comments went unheard.

I do feel that there are important issues here which could affect countless people for good or ill without their being aware of the fact, and that this is a matter for concern by the Society.

The four of us are not alone in expressing some concern. The alteration of earth energies is referred to from time to time in the Journals. We are all aware of the difficulties of proof. Maybe we should stick to dowsing for water, as findings can be proved by the sinking of a bore as illustrated in the delightful film by Roy Talbot, although I think that even he felt some trepidation about operating under test conditions. Nevertheless, although I couldn't spare the time at present to participate in a simple dowsing experiment, I would be willing to submit to a test later on. By the way, I am rather puzzled by the expression — an 'active' device.

Turning to Dr. Bailey's report, I am sorry he felt he had been called upon to 'bell the cat'. We suggested him as being our (i.e. the Society's) Scientific Adviser.

I note that he agrees that the whole area of Earth Energies is an important one. In paragraph 7 he says: "there is normally a long period of information gathering". That is what the publication of our letter might have achieved.

Later Dr. Bailey says: "Maybe our first question . . . should be 'Is there anything I can do to help matters?' I entirely agree, and would exclude the 'maybe', and also add, 'may I?'"

The second and fourth paragraphs after this are especially relevant. Is it the device, or the minds of Clive Beadon and Geoffrey King in operation here? And later Dr. Bailey speaks of the motives of the person investigating, and of 'helping the lot of others WHETHER THEY WANT TO BE HELPED OR NOT', and goes on to relate a personal experience when he once tried to heal a whole hamlet near Halifax and the results were so frightening that it convinced him that one meddles at one's peril! I wish Dr. Bailey would give us more details of this. Did he use his mind without asking whether it was right to attempt the task, or what? And how were the results frightening? I would like to know as it seems germane to the issue.

Which brings me back to the starting point and the ethical stance of the Society, and the ethics of dowsing in general.

May I explain here my own personal experience of how I became interested in dowsing. Barbara taught me some 15 years

ago, and with her help I was able to conquer perennial attacks of bronchitis and to get off the runaway train of orthodox antibiotic treatment. Dowsing also helped me to cope with bereavement when my dear husband died five years ago.

Therefore, as a mark of gratitude, I go along to the first of Barbara's classes each year and help her to initiate some 20-25 new students in the art of dowsing, and say my little piece about what dowsing has done for me. From the outset, in her teaching of the subject, Barbara emphasises that dowsing must be used ethically and that you must not impose healing on others without their knowledge or consent, and that each of us is accountable for our own actions. In other words, you meddle at your peril.

Because of a question by Sir Charles Jessel when we attended the meeting at the invitation of the Council, I would like to make it quite clear that our letter was neither motivated, nor inspired, by Barbara, who was not present at Geoffrey King's lecture.

I am grateful to you, too, Michael, and to the Council, that you have left the door open for further discussion. People who buy these devices may not be dowzers, with a dowser's sensitivity, and therefore unaware of the depth, scope and potential of the device.

My suggestion is that some of the Society's funds be devoted to research into this subject, under a team of experts, one of whom is experienced in medical radiesthesia. In Journal 205 at the end of the Watfords' article it says, "before long this aspect will have to be researched and financed".

May I respectfully suggest the time is NOW.  
Yours sincerely,  
Dorothy Pickett.

Dear Michael,

27.5.85

Thank you for your letter of 29th April with copy of Arthur Bailey's report.

I found it interesting but rather academic and semantic and evading the real issue.

For myself, the 64,000 dollar question is: Can radiation from the Beadon device harm SENSITIVE individuals within its range and is it ethical to affect such individuals without their knowledge and consent?

Incidentally, the 'Halifax hamlet' anecdote mentioned surely supports the very point we are trying to make.

There is no mention in the report of the energies of stones and gems which presumably act independently of thoughts or motives of a person.

If Radionic or Radiesthetic techniques are ruled out may I suggest that the device is regarded as a form of Geopathic Stress. This important subject is now rapidly coming to the fore and

there are *OBJECTIVE* techniques for identifying effects in patients. I enclose copy of a recent article\* (Journal of Alternative Medicine) which bears on the matter. There is also much information in Tansley's book "Chakras — Rays and Radionics" page 99.

Finally I feel that the onus of proof as to harmfulness or otherwise to sensitive individuals lies with the maker of any such devices.

Yours sincerely,

Fred Boulton.

(\*It is hoped to re-print this article in another issue. Ed.)

The following letter was received from Geoffrey King in an attempt to clarify that part of his lecture which caused concern.

Dear Michael,

28.5.85

May I correct, or rather make clearer, a statement I made in answer to a question at my London lecture in May last year?

If you place one of Wing-Commander Clive Beadon's energy control units on a map, you will not be able, within the area covered by the spiral, to find any of the things you would normally be able to dowse for — pipes, cables, water and so on. This is NOT because the control has some fearful effect on you as a dowser, but simply because the dowsing influences of the things themselves have been removed inside that area.

I suspect, myself, that this is linked with the removal of the water influences upon which all others are superimposed.

There is no question, whatever, of your ability to dowse being affected; you will still be able to map dowse, as normal, for things outside the area of the spiral and both of us do invariably use a control on a map of our houses, whatever we are dowsing for, to avoid picking up any false information which may be lying around.

Working as closely as I have been with Clive Beadon over a number of years on the development of these controls, it is terribly easy to forget to make quite clear to others what familiarity has made clear to me.

My apologies to anyone who might understandably have found my statement, ". . . you won't be able to dowse inside the spiral" unclear.

I hope this will set things to rights.

Geoffrey King.

In the evening prior to the next Council meeting on 24th July, 1985, Dr. Bailey had spoken to the Secretary and confirmed that he had nothing to add following reactions to his report and that his overall view remained as detailed therein. There was some further

discussion on the subject at the meeting during which Barbara Wilkinson put forward that she was of the opinion that gemstones worked independently of the human mind and that the four writers of the original letter were frustrated and could not understand why they did not get a more positive response from the Council. The use of these devices involves other people without their knowledge and the four were not satisfied that these devices should be sold. The whole matter was a question of ethics.

The following proposals were then put forward:-

1. That the Council notes the report of its Scientific Adviser and in particular the last four conclusions of that report. That it specifically notes item 3 "Deraying machines, like 'black boxes', appear to work only because their operator is present . . ." and considers this relevant to the devices which have been subject of concern by several members.
2. The Council wishes that important issues should be publicly debated and will therefore take the following steps to facilitate this:-
  - (a) These topics shall be ventilated in the pages of the Journal and those members who are concerned about the use of devices are invited to submit well-reasoned articles on the subject, giving evidence to support their views. Such articles and the answers and views of other members will be published over a period of time as an on-going debate in the Journal.
  - (b) The Council will arrange a special seminar meeting at some suitable time and place at which all those who wish to discuss these questions publicly may speak.
  - (c) The Council will collect written evidence from members and wherever possible commission persons having experience in the field to give the Society the benefit of their knowledge. A member of the Council will act as co-ordinator of this material, not to act as judge but merely to keep it in a form which may be useful to the Council in assessing what future action may be needed.

These proposals were agreed with Clive Beadon voting against item 2(a), with item 2(b) being deferred and Mr. Garcin voting against item 2(c).

It was proposed and seconded by Bob Britten and Philip Garcin that Michael Guest be invited to act as co-ordinator of information, and agreed.

I have given as briefly and concisely as possible the course of events over the last 18 months since Geoffrey King's London Lecture. When I received the original letter, I felt it my duty to bring it to the Council's attention before it went into print. When I took on the work as Editor, I knew I had a responsibility to the Council and the members alike to show the world that dowsers are basically rational, thoughtful people with words of substance to share with



others. That does not mean we do not have a grand sense of humour, as can be heard at so many of the Congresses and meetings. Too many times I have heard of splits, rifts and opposing factions in other societies, so most of all I feel the need, as far as I am able, to try to keep the Society as a whole society, working together in a common aim. We can agree and disagree with each other and still work together in peace, but we must listen to the praise and criticism alike and try to build on those praises and criticisms. Most of all, if we are actively involved with dowsing, our ethics and morals must be of the highest standard — always. Despite what our egos try to get us to think and do we must not wander from that straight and narrow path, and the more you contemplate it the narrower that path becomes.

I have heard and read on several occasions that I have actively suppressed publication of the original letter. It has always been my intention that the letter and all that followed be published for everyone to read, but at the appropriate time. I feel that time is upon us.

I was able to sit and listen to most of Geoffrey King's lecture and it was my impression at the time that it was not well-constructed and, for me, did not come across too well. It was a very visual lecture with plenty of maps and diagrams, which was fine, but I decided that it would probably not be suitable, as it was, for the Journal. I felt that the speaker had given thought to the diagrams and maps but not enough to the text. Apart from helping me produce the Journal, a typed or hand-written script does make a speaker think about what he is going to say to produce (hopefully) a well-constructed talk. As I did not have any notes from Geoffrey King, that seemed conclusive.

Lecturers are invited for what they might talk about, if we know their interests, and we try to balance the talks so that those attending at various times through the year will have a variety of subjects to hear. It would hardly be democratic for the lecturers to be told on what they have to speak. However, when potential lecturers are approached we do indicate for how long they should speak, and, as we are a dowsing society, for the subject matter to be related to dowsing. Sometimes we are surprised when a lecturer comes back with a title for his or her talk to find it is on quite a different subject to that we had hoped it would be. I disagree with the idea of tacit support being given to any member, prominent or otherwise. I can assure you it is a difficult task trying to find speakers for the year.

There are one or two comments I wish to make on the subject under consideration.

During his lecture, Geoffrey King did not say that the Beadon device was effective up to  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile away. He actually said that he could feel the effects where the energy lines they dowsed had splintered, up to  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile away. In Clive Beadon's leaflet on the device it states . . .

“Its function is to correct the earth’s unbalanced energy force lines within a surrounding area of up to several hundred feet.” . . .

I think we ought to take into consideration all the types of de-raying systems that are used. I have wondered so often where a ‘black stream’ has gone when it has been diverted from a property. Are we responsible for inflicting its ill-effects on someone else?

Terry Ross, in his article in Journal 203, states that remote healing should begin with the queries — May I? Can I? Should I? — and that if all the answers are not in the affirmative to stop at once. I would like to put forward that *all* our dowsing activities that affect others should be preceded by these three questions, always. And despite what that wretch sitting on our shoulder, urging us on — our ego — has to say.

At question time at the end of the lecture, Geoffrey King was asked why, if he could map dowse, which is a mental activity, that he had to have a physical thing to correct the lines — why was he not able to do it mentally? He said he did not know, but he just couldn’t. He did add that once he had dowsed a flow of water on a map of his garden he had put a pin in the map on the flow. Going out to his garden he could trace the flow until he came to the spot that corresponded to where the pin was on the map. He admitted to being extremely frightened about it. However, before he went to dowse in the garden he thought . . . “if I go out to the garden that stream won’t be there”. . . How much of that was actual, power of suggestion or power of the mind to remove the stream?

I would suggest, as others have, that the mind is a powerful instrument and we do not realise how powerful it can be. When I look round at all the types of therapies that are employed — foot reflexology, hand acupressure, aromatherapy, radionics, colour therapy — to name but a few, I feel there is a strong element of ritual for the healing processes to be brought into action. If all a radionic practitioner needs to do is write the rates in a book against the patient’s name and achieve results, there is no end to what our minds can do. (David Tansley, *Radionics: Science or Magic?*). But we are just humans, trying in our faltering way to help others and it may be that we need a ritual for all the powers to fall into place. Perhaps the device which Geoffrey King uses may be a form of ritual. As with banging rods in the ground and placing gemstones in certain places.

Some years ago now, when we were farming, the local rector wanted to rent some land from us to graze his son’s pony. As we were tenants we felt it would cause too many legal complications to create a second tenancy, so we declined his request. Although he had been a frequent visitor before, we hardly saw him afterwards and he barely spoke. Some time later we heard from his son that “My father has put a curse on your field because you wouldn’t rent us some of it.” That field was outstanding in production that year — the biggest

crop of weeds we had seen in many years and the poorest crop of corn! The power of the mind, indeed!

At several Council meetings the view was put forward that as these earth energy devices in question were sold commercially, it was fair that they be subject to criticism. Although being sold commercially is not the point under discussion, it is essential that the same moral stance should be employed whether we give or sell 'our healing abilities' regarding humans, animals or buildings alike. There is no dividing line at all.

Our intuition and sensitivity grow with our dowsing ability and as we progress we must learn to protect ourselves against oversensitivity and not leave ourselves wide open to detrimental influences. There are some influences against which, perhaps, we cannot protect ourselves, but there are many we can counteract. For instance, we have all met people we do not feel happy with. Set up your protection and let those bad vibrations flow past you. We must be aware of the power of suggestion; it can be a tremendous force.

So, it is all here in print. We would very much like to hear from you, your reactions, your views, your ideas and your experiences, good and bad, of de-raying techniques. It is your Journal, so please use its pages. If you will send your letters and articles to me, I will then photocopy them and pass them to Michael Guest.

---