

likelihood of ESP occurring in a similar hypnosis experiment with a small group of subjects was 'too little to warrant the considerable amount of time and labour involved'.

N. P. MACAULIFE

41a Maclise Road
London, W.14

Harry Price and 'Rosalie'

SIR,—It is most embarrassing for an author to find himself in almost complete disagreement with the evaluation of his book by a reviewer (*Journal*, Dec. 1965, pp. 201-9). Especially when the reviewer is a man like Mr Medhurst, with whose views I have often been in sympathy.

Mr Medhurst says (p. 205) that I 'make no acknowledgment of Mr R. J. Hastings's prior publication and discussion' of the letter by Mrs Clarice Richards. How Mr Medhurst can have missed my brief reference to this (p. 119 of my book) I do not know.

Mr Medhurst observes that though I complain of Mr Trevor Hall's book *The Spiritualists*, I make 'only the barest reference' to his own and Mrs Goldney's long paper in the *S.P.R. Proceedings*, Part 195, refuting in detail some of its more blatant errors. I remember Mr Medhurst remarking after he perused the manuscript of my book in 1963 that he could not see any publisher accepting it in its present form. He was perfectly right. Before my book was published three sets of proofs had to be passed; and there were printing difficulties, and legal points to consider. It was during this protracted process of publication that Mr Medhurst's and Mrs Goldney's article appeared; and I was naturally able to include only a brief reference to it.

Mr Medhurst remarks (p. 205) that the correspondence in my book adds 'nothing crucial' to the 'Rosalie' story, and that I missed everything of importance among the documents in the Harry Price Library; this I find hard to understand. There are seven letters reproduced in my book (pp. 120-7). These include important correspondence between Price and Mr R. S. Lambert. There can be no doubt that Mr Lambert was Price's closest confidant in the period of the 'Rosalie' case. For instance letter No. 1 (13th Dec. 1937) contains this important sentence: 'I have decided to go to B. on Wednesday in order to witness the marvels, about which I told you. I have asked the lady concerned if she will permit me to include you in the invitation as a witness. I have asked her to telephone or telegraph tomorrow (Tuesday morning) in case they are agreeable. If you do not hear from me by 1 o'clock tomorrow, you will know that I cannot manage it.'

Letter No. 4 from Price to Frank Whitaker (Editor, *John O'London's Weekly*), expresses his reluctance to include the 'Rosalie' story in his book *Fifty Years of Psychical Research*. Messrs Dingwall and Hall accused Price of including his 'Rosalie' seance in order to provide a sensational chapter in his book. This letter disproves the accusation.

Letter No. 5 from Whitaker to Price expresses Mr Whitaker's view (in my opinion) that Price should pay particular attention to his 'Rosalie' story in case a suggestion of fabrication might one day be levelled against him. According to Mr Medhurst this letter makes it clear that Price did a certain amount of editing of his original account before its publication in *Fifty Years of Psychical Research*. I fail to understand how he formed this view.

Letter No. 6 from Price to Mrs Richards; this is an appeal to Mrs Richards to contact any M.P. interested enough to pilot his *Psychic Practitioners (Regulation)* Bill through Parliament. This letter might be a reply to the Clarice Richards letter¹ which Dingwall and Hall claimed *proved positively* that the 'Rosalie' seance must have taken place in Brockley.

Letter No. 7 from Mr Whitaker to Price mentions a review by Clifford Bax (*John O'London's Weekly*, Nov. 17th 1939). This review refers to 'Rosalie' as the 'Kensington Ghost Girl'.

I must pay tribute to Mr Medhurst for his discovery of the carbon copy of Price's letter to Mrs X. How I missed that one I shall never know.

In any case Letter No. 1 covers most of the main points of this letter. I found the assiduous investigation of 'Mrs Mortimer' most interesting, but I was not surprised that it failed to discover any of the 'Rosalie' participants. Price would have been guilty of breaking his terms of secrecy if he left in his files Mrs X.'s true identity. The name 'Mortimer' was only a pseudonym, and no doubt when Price visited Mrs X. and used this phrase 'I arrived at M', the letter M stood for 'Mortimer'. In Letter No. 1 Price stated 'I have decided to go to B'.

I was surprised that Mr Medhurst did not comment on my strong criticisms of the methods which Dr Dingwall and Mr Hall use in attacking such a dedicated researcher as Harry Price.

In spite of my most detailed consideration of the most probable reasons for the continued silence of all the 'Rosalie' sitters (pp. 68-9 in my book) Mr Medhurst still finds their reluctance to reveal their true identities inexplicable. Since the date of the 'Rosalie'

¹ This letter has no date, but letter No. 6 is dated July 28th 1939, some 19 months after the 'Rosalie' sitting. Cp. Mrs Goldney's view, p. 57 n. my book.

seance (Dec. 15th 1937) two appeals asking the X family to reveal their identities have been published. The first was published in *Light* for Jan. 1949, and as this appeal was only a letter in 'Correspondence' it had limited impact on the casual reader. The second appeal, in Paul Tabori's biography of Harry Price (1950) would have had greater impact, but of course few members of the general public are interested in Psychical Research. In any case Mr X., described as a well-known business man, would most certainly think twice before he revealed to the public that he was involved in paranormal phenomena.

D. COHEN

The Crisis in Parapsychology

SIR,—Allow me to reply to Mr Zorab's review of my English book *The Crisis in Parapsychology: Stagnation or Progress?* (*Journal*, Sept. 1965).

1. The emotional tone: The grave indignation of all real parapsychologists at the formidable denigration of so famous an English scientist as Sir William Crookes, a founder of modern Parapsychology, and his medium Florence Cook, is a very natural reaction; such unfounded denigration is quite beyond the pale in any academic-scientific debate.

2. My survey of the development of Parapsychology over nearly 100 years gives a picture which has been deplored by many serious researchers, such as Professors Murphy, Thouless, Ducasse, etc., whose verdicts I have collected under the title *Self-Criticism of Modern Parapsychology*. A cardinal point is that the failure to investigate physical-biological phenomena and mediums has led to a 'Crisis', demonstrated by the tendency to deny them and to calumniate the great founders and pioneers of Parapsychology in a most evil manner. It is most deplorable that persons without any experience of this field (and therefore incompetent to pass judgment) should discredit the experts and deny their competence, without any desire to learn from them! Thus Mr Zorab, whom, as a person, I appreciate highly, believes himself 'unbiased' and me 'so partial, so much limited by heavy blinkers, that my judgment in these matters is very much a question of doubt'.

3. Mr Zorab's suggestion that I have never heard of 'fraudulent physical mediums' is surely a joke! My experiences, over the past thirty-four years, with about seventeen mediums, twelve of whom were physical-biological ones, were always positive, because I very soon made the necessary inner contact with them, and thus obtained their confidence; which resulted in the production of