

# CREATIVE FAITH

*The Ascending Series*

*from*

*Unbelief through Disbelief, Doubt, Belief  
and Faith to Wholeness  
of the Individual and of the Race*

By L. E. EEMAN

# CREATIVE FAITH

THE ASCENDING SERIES

FROM

UNBELIEF THROUGH DISBELIEF, DOUBT, BELIEF,  
AND FAITH TO WHOLENESS  
OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND OF THE RACE

*A paper read before the British Society of Dowsers  
on 12th March, 1952*

BY L. E. EEMAN

Introducing the lecturer, the Chairman said: "It is hardly necessary for me to introduce our lecturer to-day, as Mr. Eeman is an old member of our Society and has been good enough to address us on several previous occasions, the last being June 11th, 1947.

"You have probably all heard of his wonderful system of Co-operative Healing which he has been practising successfully for the last 33 years, and by means of which many people have attained completeness of health when conventional methods had failed.

"I will now ask Mr. Eeman to deliver his address."

Colonel Bell, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is natural that I should be grateful to you for the privilege of addressing you once again. But, it is difficult to understand how you can face the prospect with an air of imperturbable benevolence, and our Chairman's kind remarks do not explain this phenomenon.

I imagine that as Dowsers and Radiesthetists you must often have seen your best founded convictions swept aside without a test; and it may well have been this sad experience which determined you always to keep for others the friendly open mind which had so often been denied to you.

May I first define my subject: "Creative faith, or the ascending series from unbelief, through disbelief, doubt, belief and faith to wholeness, of the individual and of the race"?

May I then put it in perspective by outlining the general theory of "Co-operative Healing," of which system it forms a part? and may I, for the sake of clarity, give headings to the different sections of my paper?

## *Health*

It is normal to want health, to want to be "fit!" But fit for what? Sport, writing, sculpture, marriage, or just "fit" to die? Different fitnesses are adaptations to different objective functions,

and they are, at times, so mutually exclusive that they cannot be integrated into one wholeness! And health is wholeness!

In theory man can reach absolute health, but he can do so only through the perfect function of all his parts in relation to each other, and of his total self in relation to other selves, all more or less adaptable and all functioning in an ever-changing world.

In practice, he is restricted to seeking relative health only, either by adapting himself to his function in his changeable environment, or by attempting to adapt his world to what would constitute, in his present opinion, the ideal state for himself and for the race.

So far we have entrusted the parallel evolutions of the individual and of the race to chance. To plan them intelligently we shall have to concentrate on yet a third evolution, that of our present conception of the healthy man of, say, the year 4000.

Is it too much to hope that with the help of international planning, we should be able to evolve in 2000 years a man so healthy, in mind as in body, that he would deem it insane even to ask a question which, to-day, is discussed with academic composure in all countries: "Should our side kill twenty million of the other side before they start on us, or shall we take a chance?"

#### *The trinity of function*

I do not know how far each one of us can develop his latent powers in this life time, nor do I know how far we may be able to guide the evolution of our descendants of the year 4000 by co-operative planning now. But it is certain that whatever success we may achieve in either field will rest on function, for it is the basic axiom of evolutionary science that it is function that produces the organ, and not vice versa; that it was light that gave us the eye!

All that functions does so on three planes:

- (1) mechanical;
- (2) dynamic; and
- (3) control.

I realise that no analogy is ever perfect, but as it will help to convey my meaning I will compare man to a motor car. The car has:

- (1) its engine;
- (2) its petrol; and
- (3) its driver.

Man has (and I beg you to note the dualism on man's three planes):

- (1) His organs and limbs;
- (2) His nervous and muscular energies; and
- (3) His mind, sub-conscious and conscious.

Since 1919 I have looked for anything which either could function on fewer than three planes or would need more than three, but in vain. I have recently found in Max Freedom Long's *The Secret Science behind Miracles* that the Kahunas have held this view, from time immemorial, and I hold that our concept of the Holy Trinity is a natural interpretation of observed facts.

From the trinity of function it follows that disease can be caused only by dysfunction on the mechanical, dynamic or control planes, or by a compound of any two or all three of these.

It also follows that "wholeness" cannot be found by any one-sided mechanical, dynamic or psychological approach, unless the cause of dysfunction is itself equally one-sided (no such case has ever come to my notice in 33 years) and that it can be found only by an integral mechanical, dynamic and psychological approach.

It further follows that whenever one of the three approaches is totally neglected, no matter how excellently the other two are applied, a cure remains impossible until the neglected third is itself introduced, consciously or unconsciously.

And, finally, it follows that however powerless that missing third, unaided, may seem, its introduction may release wholeness, and that it may do so in a more or less miraculous fashion, or, to borrow Dr. Westlake's definition, more or less "outside of time!"

#### *Use versus repair*

All that functions goes through the cycle: "use—repair."

e.g. The car is run, and then repaired, in a workshop.

The body is used, and then healed, in sleep.

Use and repair are mutually exclusive.

e.g. The mechanic must "switch off" the engine *before* he can begin to repair it.

The patient must relax his voluntary muscles *before* he can begin to heal his body in sleep.

But just as "switching off," though an essential preliminary, is not repairing the engine; so relaxation, though an essential preliminary, is not healing the body!

#### *Healing requires energy*

Doing nothing saves energy. Relaxation is, or should be: "doing nothing!"

(1) It frees functions, such as breath and blood circulation, which muscular contraction, conscious or unconscious, inhibits.

(2) It makes the energy that maintains that contraction available for healing work.

But the subject who does not know how to use the energy so released loses it by radiation, mainly through his hands and feet, the bi-polar terminals of his nervous system. To stop this loss of vital energy by radiation nature gives him the instinct to rest with hands clasped and feet crossed, much as we connect the two poles of a horseshoe magnet with a keeper. Old, sick, tired and cold people thus recover energy which they cannot afford to lose! So do cats and dogs and other animals! And buttercups, daisies, water lilies and other flowers do also connect their opposite poles when the sun goes down. But healthy children need not do so, for, having a surplus for growth, they often sleep with their hands and feet spread-eagled, their poles apart! They can afford the loss incurred!

So far, I have given you in condensed form, the main preliminaries that must be covered in the mechanical and in the dynamic approaches, before the work of healing proper can begin.

#### *The psychological approach*

I must now consider the psychological approach implicit in the title of my paper: "Creative faith."

Let us assume that we have found the body relaxation required for healing work and all the vital energy needed for the performance of that work. We are left with the problem: "What must the mind do, in these ideal mechanical and dynamic circumstances, to promote wholeness either for the individual or for the race?"

I have already suggested that it must plan! I believe that all the frames of mind in which we can plan are implied in our ascending series: "from unbelief, through disbelief, doubt, belief and faith to wholeness" with the innumerable gradations implicit between frustration and fulfilment. The extreme terms of our series, unbelief and faith, are the only two in it single minded enough to concentrate the whole of the available energies in one direction. Unbelief and faith cannot co-exist, for the activity of the one leaves no energy for the manifestation of the other. However, there are ill-defined attenuations of them both which can and do meet within the series.

In faith, energies are integrated in the direction of positive health, and with it, healing which may be logically impracticable is conceived intuitively and performed either super-consciously out of time or sub-consciously in time. In unbelief, energies are integrated not only in the negation of wholeness but also in the affirmation of some opposite of wholeness. Unbelief not only denies health, it affirms un-wholeness, and subconsciously contrives it by dynamising negation. Its basis is a dynamic belief in an imagined inversion of facts. By it, that which is potentially easy to perform is made impossible!

Faith need not create new faculties, nor unbelief destroy existing powers. They, respectively, need only reveal or obscure latent potentialities. But disuse may, in time, wither the mechanical instruments of any faculty that is kept dormant too long.

#### *Common sense and will*

If the planning mind is to achieve creative faith, it must be ready to exceed common sense which is only the sum of past experience. The aeroplane, the jet engine, radio, television, penicillin, the atom bomb and many other commonplaces of to-day, which even some of our school children can understand, exceed the common sense of 1850 by so much that it would have taxed even a Jules Verne to have dreamt of them. Is there to-day one single prophet whose creative faith exceeds our common sense by so much that he could outline for us, now, the wonders of 2000 years hence? And, would he care to do so, not in glimpses of incredible new devices, but in terms of the development of the human personality in goodness, in understanding, in perfectibility, in one word—in wholeness? If there were such a prophet, either his creative vision of the "whole man" would immensely exceed our noblest ideals of to-day or our descendants of A.D. 4000 would be ethically just as disheartening as we are! And if there were not such a seer, could not we together do his creative work and prophecy collectively?

When planning the "whole man," we must not only exceed common sense fearlessly and progressively, we must also forsake both will and hesitation, two factors which though seemingly so different, have much in common. Both operate within our ascending series, thrusting our energies in opposite directions in mutual cancellation. Both lead to exhaustion—hesitation, because its oscillations, though individually small, continue indefinitely—and will, because its conflicts, though they may be short, involve greater masses of energy in sharper clashes. Within the self will is the restless tool of conflict, and abuse of it leaves us brittle when exhaustion overtakes us. If we were integrated instead of being divided against ourselves, there would be no need for one half of ourselves to use will to compel the other half.

Will is restless, and the mind has freedom of choice only in creative rest. In action, pressed by time, we are sub-consciously compelled to behave according to the pattern of ourselves which we have cumulatively conceived in our bygone leisure hours. So, if when promoting "wholeness," whether of ourselves or of the race, we find we are using will, let us waste no more time or energy, but instead, let us still our minds and seek to fathom by what perversion we had come to use an instrument of division, like the will, for purposes of integration.

### *The marks of unbelief*

Before we can achieve creative faith we must overcome at least those of our unbeliefs which inhibit any particular wholeness we may long for.

For that purpose, let us firstly remember :

- (1) that unbelief is not neutral but involves dynamic opposition to wholeness ;
- (2) that creative faith needs for its own use the energy now consumed by its opposite unbeliefs ;
- (3) that when we consciously hold what we firmly deem to be a belief promoting wholeness it may instead be an unbelief inhibiting wholeness.

Let us secondly note that unbeliefs may be divided into groups, roughly, according to whether :

- (a) they are held by the community or race and thus inhibit general wholeness ;
- (b) they are conceived and held by weak individuals against the beliefs and/or unbeliefs of the race and thus inhibit the wholeness of the individuals concerned only ;
- (c) They are held by individuals or groups strong enough to inhibit others not only by ordinary means such as speech and example, but also by methods akin to radiation ;
- (d) they are held at the sub-conscious or conscious levels.

Here, in parenthesis, I will venture upon a speculation which I deem logical though I cannot support it experimentally. Some schools, both Eastern and Western, claim that we have three minds or selves, respectively sub-conscious, conscious and super-conscious and of different competences and dynamisms. Others assert that we have only *one* mind which functions at three levels of consciousness with the competences and powers appropriate to each level respectively. On that point I will not dogmatise. I would suggest, however, that, if we have three minds, whereas the sub-conscious and the conscious are liable to unbeliefs but cannot impose these on the super-conscious, the latter can infuse its creative faith into both the inferior minds. Similarly, if we have only *one* mind, it must be capable of creative faith at all three levels of consciousness, but liable to unbeliefs at the lower two only.

Let us thirdly remember, that whilst unbeliefs seem theoretically curable by reason since they are fallacies based mostly on ignorance, unreason, prejudice or passion, their effects are no more curable by reason than by will, whether they are conscious or sub-conscious.

### *Curing the effects of unbelief*

Unbeliefs and their effects (and both inhibit wholeness) are most easily and radically overcome in the individual, by two methods chiefly :

(1) the conscious observation by the subject of his unconscious muscular and physiological reactions to experience, past or present, a process which I have called "myognosis," from "mye"—muscle, and "gnosis"—knowing, or "diagnosing psychological conditions from muscular behaviour," and

(2) the release of emotion which results from the re-living of the experiences recalled by myognosis.

I would observe that after myognosis and emotional release a miraculous cure is possible, provided a fund of sub- or super-conscious faith-energy is available, irrespective of whether the faith itself is conscious, sub-conscious or super-conscious.

I will now offer you a few examples of the overcoming of unbeliefs and of the cure of their effects in individuals.

#### *1st Example: Race unbeliefs*

Consider the human skeleton, and in particular the ribs. These, apart from the floating ribs, are hinged at both ends to the spine and sternum respectively, at an angle of about 30 degrees to the vertical. They are constructed to move outwards on both hinges and together and thus to expand the lungs mainly laterally, and *not* forwards.

It follows that the position known as "standing to attention," in which the shoulders are drawn back and the chest expanded forwards, and which West Europeans teach their children for good breathing, locks the back hinges of our ribs by holding our dorsal muscles contracted. This forces us to expand forwards, distorts the natural action of our hinges, prevents deflation and thus uses our lung capacity to hold too much residual air! This inhibits function and through it, wholeness.

At ceremonial parades more soldiers per cent. faint falling forwards like ninepins than do civilians, and they collapse like empty sacks. Yet the soldiers have plenty of good air to breathe; and the packed civilians nothing but vitiated air. But whilst the soldier locks his bellows, the slack civilian uses his, and his diaphragm, and his "soft under-belly!" He functions, and the soldier does not!

Anyone can understand the argument against back contraction and forward expansion, and he then resolves to breathe laterally and diaphragmatically in future. He sees intellectually that no man can be miraculously healed whilst he is tensely and even proudly standing to attention! But, test him at rest and you will find that though he is rationally convinced that he needs lateral expansion neither reason nor will can cure the effects of

his now sub-conscious racial "unbelief" in chest forward expansion. To prove this, suddenly drop anything as light as a handkerchief on his solar plexus and, instantly, he holds his breath and then makes up for the shock by unconsciously taking a large chest expansion forwards!

Then, without warning, drop your own body, heavily, across his chest, or press hard with both hands on his sternum. He may panic and scream that you are killing him! But don't yield! Gradually, he will let go his chest, flat, use his diaphragm naturally and expand his ribs laterally!

Patients often even laugh or cry hysterically at their wonderful discovery of natural function! Myognosis and emotional release often do in one sitting what reason and will cannot do at all and what the free association of psycho-analysis may not do in months. Once they have overcome a subject's racial unbelief about breath, you can throw boots at his solar plexus and he will no longer compensate for shock by forward chest expansion. He will, instead, use his "belly" like any healthy dog at rest.

#### *2nd Example: Individual unbeliefs*

In 1926 a doctor friend wrote "he was sending me a patient who, in 1916, had been blasted into a flooded shell hole. Thirty-six hours later a night patrol had found him unconscious, up to his waist in water, but uninjured. Days later, on recovering consciousness in hospital he had found that he was paralysed down the right side. Being young, he had made a good physical recovery and now only dragged his right foot slightly. But, he remained mistakenly convinced that he was still paralysed in the right arm and he supported his forearm by holding his fingers between his waistcoat buttons. Neither analysis, nor hypnotic suggestion, nor any other method had affected this obsession. Nor was it weakened by the fact that he could take his hand out of his waistcoat, raise it tremulously to his chin, drop it to his side, raise it again to his chin, again tremulously, and then return his fingers to his waistcoat."

My friend's letter showed me that neither reason nor will were of any use, and so, as the patient entered my room, I said: "You poor fellow, you are paralysed, aren't you? That's obvious." I thought he was going to fall. His breath came in spasms, and tears rolled down his cheeks. Here, we had relaxation, rest for the will and emotional release. But, what was there on that mind? I asked him to drop his arm. Surprisingly, in order to put it down, he first put it up, and up right to his chin! "Why?" I walked round him slowly, watching him repeat his actions from all possible angles. And, each time, his arm went up trembling violently before dropping down dead. Suddenly, I noticed that after trembling upwards the arm trembled forwards as well, and I realised intuitively that, in his mind he was fixed

in 1916, in hospital, recovering consciousness, finding his arm paralysed and making frantic efforts to get it up and forward; forward out of a sling! This sling was a sub-conscious unbelief which I must on no account attack frontally, but for which I might temporarily substitute a compensating unbelief! I made a great show of searching his neck, his shoulder, and then his upper arm muscles for the cause of his paralysis, and then assured him that I could not find anything in any of them to account for it. Suddenly, I pressed my thumb into the hollow of his elbow dramatically, and hard enough to hurt, and where he could easily do the same with his left thumb, and said: "Good Lord, here it is! This is out of place! Mark the spot, and as long as you hold it in position by pressing it hard enough to hurt you will be able to move the arm up and down, without trembling, quite easily!" He did this at once, and then he said: "To think that it has been out these ten years and that not one of these b.f.s spotted it!" With appropriate humility, I confessed that I had been rather lucky to hit such a small thing. And, no! X-rays would not have shown such a subtle displacement. He shouldn't blame anybody; it was just one of those things!"

I told him to press the spot ten times a day for two minutes a time and to come and see me again in a fortnight, by which time much less painful pressure ought to keep it in place. It did, and there was no sign of tremor. The sling had gone!

Two unbeliefs, i.e., two dynamic negatives, make one positive.

#### *3rd Example:*

*Unbelief at the conscious level, but faith at the sub- or super-conscious*

In 1925 a lady consulted me about a pain in the back which had resisted all treatment. When I asked her to lie down she refused to remove a ruff, similar to that worn by Franz Hals' "Laughing Cavalier." On examination, I found acute abdominal contraction related to a spinal fixation which extended roughly from the 5th to the 9th dorsal vertebra. Having induced relaxation, I broke down the spinal condition and asked the patient to rest with hands clasped and feet crossed. I then sat by her side resting my left hand on her forehead and my right on her solar plexus in order to give her energy.

Her breathing strengthened, she flushed, said she was getting hotter, and when her energy charge was sufficient, she suddenly became hysterical, as often happens, panted for air, went as red as a lobster and perspired profusely. As I already knew that one must not hinder or even decelerate such crises, for they are curative, I resisted the patient's efforts to break the circuit by separating her hands or pushing mine off her head and solar plexus. After a short struggle she rested drowsily for a while. When she left me, the pain in her back had gone, but the Franz Hals ruff, soaked through with perspiration, hung limply around her neck.

At her second visit, she told me that when she had left me the first day, her brother-in-law, who had waited for her outside, had exclaimed: "What's happened to your neck? Your goitre has gone!" For 12 years she had suffered from a large goitre which she had hidden under a ruff. It had been called inoperable, perhaps because of her heart, and she had not mentioned it to me because she had been told it was incurable. But she had always wondered how they could have known it was? "and had never quite believed it was!"

Here we had:

- (1) unbelief, or at least doubt, at the conscious level;
- (2) belief at the sub-conscious level, and belief which might have turned to faith as soon as emotion had dissolved the conscious unbelief;
- (3) potential faith which could in turn have promoted a miraculous cure provided the emotional release had found enough energy to transfer from the negative end of our series to the positive.

For myself, it is obvious that I could not have held any relevant faith at the conscious level since I did not know of the goitre. Further, I confess that had I known of it at that time, I would have considered it incurable!

I have chosen this particular example from many equally difficult to believe because I have recently received unsolicited confirmation of it. A lady asked me out of the blue, "whether, by any chance, I was the man who in 1925 had cured a Mrs. C. of an incurable and inoperable goitre of 12 years standing?" The lady's father, a doctor, had had Mrs. C. as a patient, and one day he had staggered the family by saying: "You know Mrs. C. and her goitre? Well, she has been cured—in one visit—by a quack!!!"

#### *Priority in the treatment of unbeliefs*

I have quoted three cases of three different kinds and have done so in a certain sequence to emphasize that to cure a patient in depth and not merely to displace superficial symptoms, we must temporarily ignore his specific complaint and concentrate first on the transfer of the whole of his vital energy from the negative end of our series to the positive, from tension to relaxation, from unbelief to faith. For this purpose, we must attempt to remove unbeliefs in the following sequence:

- (1) racial unbeliefs which inhibit the functions of most of us even when we are in, so-called, perfect health;
- (2) individual unbeliefs which inhibit the use of our voluntary muscles; and
- (3) individual unbeliefs which inhibit the functions of our organs in their work of healing.

At this stage, Ladies and Gentlemen, you may well ask why I have said so little about faith itself, and so much about the mechanical, dynamic and mental factors that hinder it.

I had three reasons: the first is—

that it is a misapplication of energy to seek faith before tension, exhaustion and unbelief have been dealt with;

the second: that I wished to argue that whilst neither reason nor will can deal with unbeliefs, myognosis and emotional release can; and

the third: that once tension, exhaustion and unbelief have been at least attenuated, if not eliminated, faith becomes progressively easy both to practice and to define.

#### *Creative faith and common sense*

Precisely as common sense uses imagination to plan what *we know we can do*, so faith uses it to plan what *we believe we cannot do!*

It may be true that faith operates out of time; but, when we use normal means of perception only, an act of faith must appear to us to occur in space and to take at least some time, though perhaps less time than do acts of common sense. But, let us observe that when common sense plans even the simplest act it begins by travelling through time in imagination, first forwards to conceive the act desired as already completed, and then backwards to conceive the means to that very act which it has already achieved mentally. Then, and then only, can the common sense mind execute in actuality the common sense act which it has already executed in imagination.

Let us illustrate this with some simple common sense acts which we know we can do. As Smith, who lives ten minutes from the station, finishes his breakfast he imagines himself catching the 8.15. Then, still in imagination, he comes back 15 minutes to 8 o'clock, and he puts on his hat and coat in his mind before he can put them on in actuality to go to the station. He does not first discover himself by chance with hat and coat on and then say: "Ah! that gives me an idea: let's go somewhere! What about the City?" No! First forwards in imagination, then backwards, still in imagination, and, only then, forwards in actuality!

The order is: 1st prediction, 2nd retrospection, both in the mind and 3rd projection, in actuality, or end before means and then execution. It is the logical basis of creative faith as clearly as it is that of common sense, and it can justly be termed: "Retrospective prediction."

Another example: Smith has now reached town. He has found out that his wife would dearly like a certain object. He has imagined her delight as he gives it her for her birthday. He has then found out that it can only be got at Harrods and has therefore imagined getting out of a No. 30 bus, just outside the shop, and buying the article. And now, because he has already got out of a No. 30 bus in his mind, he can get into one in actuality! It is easy to remember a paradox: hold this one: "We have to get out of a bus before we can get into it!"

Let us now take a typical case of insomnia. The patient is always wondering whether he will or not get into the bus we call sleep and never thinks first of getting out of it at its destination: the perfect awakening in the morning. That is, he puts "Means before end," which though it sounds right, is dead wrong, because the way he works it, it amounts to "Means to no end." And only the absent-minded get into buses without first wondering about their destination.

Let the insomnia patient relax in bed, with hands clasped and feet crossed. Let him then repeat 100 times: "to-morrow morning I will wake up rubbing my eyes, yawning and stretching violently," and let him see himself doing, it. In a few days he will sleep naturally! Conceive the end, the awakening, and your sub-conscious will give you the means, sleep! The means do not concern your conscious!

#### *Conscious evolution*

If "Retrospective Prediction" is the logical basis of faith for the individual, it is so also for the race.

To-day we do things that are at the same time scientifically so wonderful and ethically so moronic that the contrast would make our forebears of 100 years ago gasp! Why? Because whilst international scientists have collectively conceived machines that kill in millions (and that kind of conception engenders that kind of machine) we have never yet collectively conceived the man of to-morrow who will naturally love life and foster it for all! Can we collectively conceive him now?

I will close by answering this question with a simple suggestion.

International broadcasting has given us the means to initiate collective conception. The B.B.C. have recently produced a feature called "Letter to posterity," in which some of our best minds under pretence of writing to our descendants of 100 years hence, did in fact tell us what they thought of our world to-day. In my humble opinion the B.B.C. had, unawares, instructed their speakers in terms of means only and without any reference to ends. They should repair this grievous error by inviting some

of our best intellects to write imaginary letters from our descendants of the year 4000 and admittedly addressed to us of to-day. Each creative artist could thus inspire us with his picture of what "homo sapiens" could evolve into in 2,000 years from now; Man himself, that is, not his gadgets. He would tell us also, in stages of say 500 years, how man had shed some of his formerly congenital vices and gained new inborn dispositions. And, year by year, we could collectively improve our pattern of man to be, and thus, at last, learn to think in terms of Conscious Evolution.

Some there are, Ladies and Gentlemen, who though they are descended from fish and take no pains whatever to disguise the fact, do nevertheless assert that human nature cannot change! Though they have flown for so long they have not even yet realised that their fins have become wings! That, Ladies and Gentlemen, is our fundamental and most illogical racial unbelief, THE unbelief which we must overcome before we can collectively conceive the better man of to-morrow. Then, in "Retrospective Prediction" we shall also the more easily conceive the future stages of our "Pilgrim's Progress."

#### APPENDIX

I will briefly refer to a partial confirmation of my views on bi-polarity which has recently reached me from America. In an article entitled: "Is science finding the secret of Life?" published in the Magazine *Pageant*, it is stated that Dr. Harold S. Burr, Professor of Neuro-Anatomy at Yale University's School of Medicine, has proved that in human beings "the right side of the body is almost uniformly positive to the left side by several millivolts, although this bears no discernible relation to handedness."

I offer to Dr. Burr the following working hypothesis: Would he take the head, the sacrum, the right-hand and the left-hand of both a right- and a left-hander as poles. Would he then connect each person first with himself, left hand to head and right hand to sacrum, by means of electrical conductors, and then with the other person? Would he then note the changes in breath-rate and pulse, to mention only two factors, that would be caused by various changes in linkage between the two persons? Statistical evaluation of results would show that polarity does bear a "discernible relation to handedness" (see *Co-operative Healing, the Curative Properties of Human Radiations*. London, Frederick Muller, 15/-). If results remained the same when silk, cotton or linen threads were used as conductors between the two subjects instead of copper wires, this would suggest that body lateral differences were not due, exclusively at least, to electricity in the usual sense of the word, as had been shown by von Reichenbach over 100 years ago.