

An Anomalous Legal Decision

RICHARD A. BLASBAND

*The Center for Functional Research
2 Lincoln Drive, Sausalito, CA 94965
RABlasband@sbcglobal.net*

Abstract—In 2003 the Veterinary Medical Board (VMB) of the State of California brought a complaint against Dr. Gloria Dodd for what they alleged was false advertising for the use of homeopathic remedies and the use of radionic devices for the diagnosis and non-local treatment of animals. Unsatisfied with Dodd’s compliance the VMB brought the case to court in 2006. There, through in absentia testimony as to Dodd’s abilities and my testimony as to the evidence for non-local man-machine interaction and remote viewing and the failure of the complainants to rebut our evidence Dodd was almost completely vindicated. Full vindication came with our appeal to a superior court, which permitted Dodd to continue to practice without the need to personally examine her animal patients. If sustained through appeal by the VMB the case might serve as a precedent for all practitioners of non-local healing.

Keywords: radionic treatment—Veterinary Medical Board—legal decision

In the winter of 2003 the Veterinary Medical Board (VMB) of the State of California brought a complaint against the veterinarian Dr. Gloria Dodd of Gualala, CA, for what they alleged was false advertising in her claims that homeopathic remedies and non-local diagnosis and non-local radionic treatment could help sick animals. Radionic treatment usually involves the practitioner utilizing a “black box” as an intermediary device for establishing non-local contact with the patient. In essence the box consists of a well which holds something such as a drop of blood on a paper strip, a hair, or a sample of saliva or of some other substance of a previous living nature from the patient. The surface of the box also holds a rubber strip set onto a Bakelite frame which is screwed into the surface of the box, numbered dials, and metal wires connecting all the aforementioned items. The practitioner lightly rubs the rubber strip with a couple of fingers while simultaneously thinking of the various possible causes of the ailment. By rotating the dials, which correspond to certain “frequencies”, one can fine-tune whatever one is thinking of. When the finger spontaneously sticks to the strip, this is a “yes” response. In this way, one can make a diagnosis and figure out which “frequencies” of “energy” can be used to broadcast to the patient to cure his problem. Radionics is very much like dowsing, where one must think various thoughts regarding the target. When resonance is established

the dowsing branch or L-rod will spontaneously move, thus signaling a “yes”. Another similar device is in the practice of medical radiesthesia where a pendulum provides “yes” or “no” types of answers to thought questions. In my opinion based upon anecdotal experience with all of the devices mentioned above, the devices serve to support the practitioner’s belief system in establishing a state of resonance with the patient.

Dr. Dodd claimed that she had complied with previous demands of the VMB to stop advertising the way that she had, but the VMB thought otherwise and requested a hearing before the courts of the state with the intention of revoking Dr. Dodd’s license to practice. Through their evaluation of the records of Phido, a canine patient of Dr. Dodd, the agents of the VMB concluded that, “Its a smoke and mirror power of magic type of practice” . . . “bizarre”¹ . . . “no medically scientific basis for the idea that she can detect disease in a patient who is 3000 miles away . . . ludicrous that she can broadcast therapy across the same distance . . . claims defy basic established principles of physics”², and so on.

The case was heard in mid-winter of 2006 at the Oakland, CA court before Administrative Law Judge Steven C. Owyang, a Chinese gentleman. While I had originally been pessimistic about the outcome of the case based on my knowledge of previous similar cases, when I saw that Judge Owyang was Chinese I thought that we might have a chance since the judge well may have been familiar with Chinese medicine and the functions of “chi”, which, in the Chinese system, is a kind of “vital fluid” or “force” operating on a non-mechanical “subtle” level. Hans U. Stucki was the attorney representing Dr. Dodd. In absentia expert witnesses and satisfied lay clients of Dr. Dodd testified to the efficacy of Dr. Dodd’s assistance to them in the treatment of some very sick, refractory animals. As a putative expert in the knowledge of the non-local transmission of information I testified in person. I had been referred to Mr. Stucki by Brenda Dunne of the PEAR laboratory in Princeton, NJ. Brenda had been contacted by Mr. Stucki because of PEAR’s well-known research on man-machine local and non-local interactions. In my testimony I suggested that the operative agent in non-local healing was of a non-physical nature, something like chi. None of our testimony or any of the cases were rebutted by the complainants. I believe that the complainants thought that the case would be a slam-dunk in their favor because Dr. Dodd’s mode of practice and beliefs were so thoroughly different than those of the official position of the VMB and that rebuttal would not be necessary because the judge would readily see how ludicrous Dr. Dodd’s method of practice was, and rule for the VMB without argument.

To my surprise and our great pleasure Judge Owyang appeared to ignore accepted “theory” and go for the clinical evidence which favored Dr. Dodd. I left after testifying and before the other clinical evidence for Dr. Dodd was presented. Mr. Stucki called me at home and reported that after all the evidence was presented Judge Owyang turned to the complainant and stated that Dr. Dodd seemed to be doing as good a job as traditional veterinary practice in caring for

her patients. In his decision, several months later, Dr. Dodd was placed on probation with the proviso that she rectify a few minor problems relating to her practice and that she establish physical contact with her clients in her practice.

Dr. Dodd through Mr. Stucki appealed the proviso that Dr. Dodd had to make physical contact with her clients given that the nature of her practice made this exceedingly difficult, especially since many of her animal clients lived so far away and were so seriously ill and could not travel. The appeal was heard in Superior Court of CA before Judge Gary Nadler and on May 16, 2008, Dr. Dodd was granted a stay of the prior administrative order. The grounds for the stay were that its granting would, first, not cause suffering of the public interest and second, in view of the fact that Judge Owyang made a clear and unequivocal finding that Dr. Dodd should be permitted to continue to practice her profession and in view of the fact that her work was non-local in nature, that it would be “internally inconsistent” with the ruling to force her to physically exam her patients. As Judge Nadler stated, “To strictly impose the physical examination requirement where no violation based on past practice has been determined is to effectively prevent Petitioner from practicing her profession and, further, to deny her clients the opportunity to select the apparently efficacious alternative treatment modalities which she employs in part”.³

Of course the VMB could not let it go, so on May 24th they submitted an order of remand questioning in many ways whether testimony in the original hearing by the defense was by “qualified experts”. A final hearing on Dr. Dodd’s overall appeal is coming up, once again before Judge Nadler in Superior Court. This hearing will involve issues virtually identical to those previously decided by Judge Nadler on the Motion for Stay which he granted. If the decisions of Judges Owyang and Nadler are sustained then Dr. Dodd will be free to practice as she always has. This could also be a precedent for those of us practicing alternative forms of medicine which involve non-locality.

Notes

¹ Division of Investigaton of VMB, Case #2004-09-1097, 2/16/2005, p.4.

² R. C. Spickard, DVM Consultant to VMB, Complaint Review Worksheet #SV 2005 53, 6/24/2005, p. 3.

³ Stay of the Enforcement of the Board's Order, 5/16/2008.