Journal of Scientific Exploration
Anomalistics and Frontier Science

# Reply to Hiener Schwenke

CORRESPONDENCE

**William Bengston**
wbengston@sjcny.edu

https://doi.org/10.31275/20233175



Indeed, we agree with Schwenke that in the perfect world there ought to be full disclosure of method in a scientific paper. But, in the real world all disclosure has boundaries when there are proprietary technologies in use. When there are proprietary technologies in use disclosure is achieved by some sort of balancing of competing interests, hopefully to the satisfaction of as many parties as possible.

We believe we have struck a fair balance in our paper, providing several ways that interested parties could produce the healing effect to create "informed water" that contains healing properties.

Schwenke objects to the lack of accessibility of the healing technique we used in this study.

The references actually do describe the preparation of the water. That description sometimes has been posted in peer reviewed journal articles, and sometimes published in a way to disseminate the information more widely. So, the 2007 and 2010 references, for example, were peer reviewed by scientific journals as providing sufficient information for replication. I also published a lengthy, multi-hour tutorial on how to replicate the production of water for a healing experiment. This has been widely used around the world at virtually no profit to me so that researchers could replicate, and non-researchers could experience. I submit that these two references alone present more than sufficient detail of what is necessary to replicate or experience the healing method. There is virtually nothing else that would be needed by an outside independent agent to continue the research. The fact that our 2010 reference is commercially available in no way detracts from its legitimacy as a stand-alone approach for reproducing the healing.

In many in vitro and in vivo healing studies the methods presented in my publications are sufficient for independent replication. Anyone at this point can easily learn, practice the technique, and produce treated water themselves for experimental or personal purposes.

The water preparation used in this experiment is adequately described. As mentioned in the paper:

> "Approximately 6 oz of filtered tap water was treated by Bengston, using the techniques that he developed, for one-half hour. . . . That sample of water was serially diluted and succussed numerous times, and the end water product of that procedure became the basis for scaled production."

The water is then scaled using a proprietary device. Schwenke is correct, that the device used for scaling is not fully described though the paper contains the following:

> "This device was made of copper, had a hose fitting for water input and output, and a central cylinder into which the material to be duplicated was placed. The output water moves around the central cylinder."

And while the copper scaling device may be proprietary and not sufficiently described to easily replicate, note footnote 4.

> We will be glad to supply researchers with the informed water should they wish to replicate or collaborate.

Takers, anyone?