

lished (which are related to the *Proceedings* under discussion). One article appeared in *Tomorrow* (Autumn 1963) by Mr Trevor Hall, the other, by myself, was published in a series in *Psychic News* (Winter, 1963-4). In both instances, as far as I know, there was no breach of the laws governing copyright, and if there has been a breach, either of copyright or customary acknowledgment, then I, for my part, deeply regret such breach.

MOSTYN GILBERT

The 'Rosalie' Case

SIR,—I welcome Mr R. J. Hasting's letter (*Journal* Sept. 1964) as it echoes the doubts in my own mind concerning the 'Rosalie' case and that of Borley Rectory. The similarity in the technique employed in 'The Spiritualists' and 'Four Modern Ghosts' is obvious; and in the Borley case I have always considered the S.P.R. Report, (Vol. 51 Part 186) to be the worst ever published under the auspices of our Society.

Whilst in general I feel that the re-opening of old case books is often a rather fruitless exercise; in view of the methods of criticism used in 'The Spiritualists' I agree entirely with Mr Hastings that a re-examination of the 'Rosalie' and Borley Rectory cases is indicated. If he has available any evidence so far unheard I certainly think he should have the facilities to give it an airing.

RICHARD K. SHEARGOLD

SIR,—Mr R. J. Hasting's letter about 'Harry Price and the Rosalie Case' came as a welcome breath of clear, fresh air. His thorough research and unbiased conclusions deserve the widest possible hearing. His work on the allegations against Harry Price, with which I have some knowledge, reinforced my own conclusions reached after extensive personal investigation; namely, there is no foundation in the mischievous allegations made against Price and if R. J. Hastings is allowed to be spokesman for Price's defence, I hope that he will call me as a witness.

A. PETER UNDERWOOD

SIR,—I read with perturbation of Mr R. J. Hastings' treatment by Dr E. J. Dingwall (*Journal*, Sept. 1964). Surely he should have honoured Mr Hastings' letter with at least an answer.

I have written a book covering most of the pertinent facts of that enigmatic 'Rosalie' seance which should be published early 1965. Mr R. S. Lambert, Price's closest confidant at the period of the

'Rosalie' seances, has written the foreword. He knew all about this case before Price attended the seance and urged Price to undertake the investigation after it had been treated with some levity. This took place at their lunch engagement mentioned in *Fifty Years of Psychical Research* (p. 132). After the seance Mr Lambert urged Price to press for a second seance, he to accompany him as an independent witness. It was Mr Lambert who finally persuaded Price to include the 'Rosalie' chapter in his book.

Yet Messrs Dingwall and Hall accused Price of 'fabricating this seance to provide a sensational chapter'. R. J. Hastings' treatment by these authors seems the same as that of R. S. Lambert, who after reading *Four Modern Ghosts* wrote an article in the *International Journal of Parapsychology* (Spring 1960) in Price's defence. There was no comment by either Dr Dingwall or T. H. Hall. Again, that letter of the correspondence (referring to Brockley) was written by Mrs Clarice Richards who, when questioned by Mrs Goldney, declared that 'it had no bearing on the "Rosalie" locality whatever'.

I was interested to learn that Dr Dingwall admitted 'that he told Trevor he was claiming too much, but it is too late to do anything about it now'. Surely it is never too late for honourable investigators to remedy a wrong against a fellow researcher.

Let me confess, prior to the urge to write this book, like possibly most members of the S.P.R. I was indoctrinated by the allegations made posthumously against Price, accusing him of charlatanism. I believed them to be true. Since then, like Mr Hastings, after personal investigation, I have found little or no substance in these accusations. When in doubt let us, at least, suspend judgment.

Before his death, Dr Nandor Fodor expressed to me in a letter his fear that fresh denigrations of dead researchers would follow after those of Price and Crookes. And now F. W. H. Myers has been included in this most disgusting form of denigration. Who will be next on the list? Mr R. S. Lambert's final words in his foreword should be heeded by all investigators: 'We need more tolerance, less cynicism and greater respect for human nature.'

DAVID COHEN

SIR,—Mr R. J. Hastings, in his letter, written in 1958, and reproduced in the current issue of the *Journal*, makes so bold as to suggest that because Price and his wife had once lived at Brockley it is therefore to be expected that he would know many people in that district.

A more unwarranted assumption, on a completely unsupported