

attack from contaminated fill or subsidence due to mining — but there is unlimited scope for surprises. Sometimes (most difficult of all) there may be a surfeit of identifiable causes of trouble, yet the actual damage is slight. It is very easy to be attracted by a complex, obscure theory and overlook the real, simple cause lurking under your nose.

I mention these facts because they are traps for the unwary dowser. It is most embarrassing to identify underground springs etc., as the likely cause of a problem if the primary cause is actually poor foundations or leaking house drains. It is as well to be sure that these have been properly investigated and eliminated before getting too deeply into a dowsing survey, seeking more obscure explanations.

It would be a mistake to assume that the problems outlined by Robert Denton crop up in the majority of cases — usually something more humble and elementary is to blame. I use dowsing in the course of my work, though results to date have been mixed, but find it difficult to combine dowsing and analytical methods within one investigation — the frames of mind involved are so different that each tends to confuse the other. I find it best to stick to one at a time, rather than jumping from one to the other and for difficult investigations it is probably best if the dowsing and normal investigations are carried out by different people, so that a critical input can be maintained without confusing the dowsing.

My purpose in writing is not to deny Robert Denton's promotion of dowsing in investigations of building problems — he is certainly right about its value — but to remind dowsers in this area about the need for caution and the need to always try to establish direct proof of what dowsing has found.

*Alasdair Beal, Yorkshire.*

Dear Editor,

On this snowy February day I have been back reading in some of my journals. Vol. 31, No. 208, pages 85-6 you made a comment "dowsing on its own is no proof". Even stories of successes are not proof. Claimed events may contain evidence, even then verification is important. I am familiar with at least one case where enthusiasm, illusion, or perhaps unverified claims of dowsing results of a great water well appeared in a National Journal (not BSD). Most likely, some dowser, sure that the dowsing response could not be anything but valid, had found all this information by remote dowsing. I was sure it could not be correct and went to the site to double check. The

well was not pumping water, was not and had not ever been connected to the house as the story suggested.

Dowsing provides opportunity to study our imaginative forces. Dowsing permits us to study invisible polarized sub-atomic fields and paths in the subtle, invisible, natural earth environment. Dowsing provides a system for communication between conscious self and deep mind, and subtle forces hidden by the force of invisibility.

There is no proof that any of the above is true. I believe, though, that it is true. There must be an abundance of evidence that might support each of the above beliefs. Proof, if such exists, is built on a foundation of good evidence. A question then, is how to extract good evidence that might support any of the more valid dowsing categories? Logic suggests most such evidence would come from practising dowsters. If most or many such dowsters have a learned belief that an experience is proof, then it is no wonder dowsing remains a questionable activity in the eyes of the general public.

It will be through the wisdom, the efforts, the ability and nerve to quest and enquire for evidence that dowsing will advance, if it ever does. That wisdom, that questioning, that enquiry, if it is to have any real force, will come from Editors of Journals and News Letters such as the BSD, Canadian Society of Questers, American Society of Dowsters, The Rod and Pendulum, and like periodicals. I had been thinking about this when I read the comments you made on proof, or the lack of it, and your quest for documentation or feedback. Your thoughts on this, your comment is appreciated.

Now I know you must dowse polarized energy lines. I have a silly ridiculous experience, must be nutty, and wonder if you would dowse and let me know that it is all just my imagination. I was wondering if there was a system in the particles worlds that carried elements, like the body does blood. Horses, cows, animals, people, so many things use calcium, atomic No. 20, so I dowsed and found channels about 9' apart. These could only be found flowing east and west. Some were slightly less than 9' apart.

Illusion? Unprovable? Imagination at work? Comments of any kind would be appreciated. I appreciate your concern related to proof and know even evidence is hard to come by.

*Mike Doney, Oregon, USA.*