playback no sign of radio interference then this is most unlikely to be a problem during efforts to receive the EVP. Incidentally, I should also point out that since by far the greater number of EVP voices picked up by most people using this simple 'microphone recording method' are non-tonal in character, i.e. 'whisper voices' they are totally dissimilar from broadcasts from radio stations.

Richard K. Sheargold

113 Connolly Drive
Slade Valley Park
Rothwell, Kettering
Northants NN14 2JT

Madam,

Dr. D. J. West in his fine review of C. E. M. Hansel's *ESP and Parapsychology: A Critical Re-Evaluation* (1980) (*Journal* No. 787) seems to accept too readily the implications of Professor Hansel's alleged discovery of discrepancies in the reporting of the Pearce–Pratt experiment in various places. Since the Pearce–Pratt experiment is one of the highly evidential studies we have in parapsychology and since Hansel is apparently successful in creating the impression—even among such unbiased scientists as Dr. West—that there was something seriously wrong with it, I wish briefly to examine Hansel's arguments and his credibility as a responsible critic. The points made against the Pearce–Pratt experiment are: (1) that it was not reported in adequate detail at the time it was carried out; (2) that there were discrepancies in its different published versions; and (3) that the experimental conditions were such that the subject, Pearce, could have cheated in a number of possible ways.

Let us consider the fraud issue first. Neither Hansel, or anyone else for that matter, presented any evidence or circumstances that suggest even remotely that Pearce did cheat. The best Hansel (1980) was able to produce was his concluding statement in the book, 'A further unsatisfactory feature lies in the fact that a statement has not been made by the central figure, Hubert Pearce. The experimenters state that trickery was impossible, but what would Pearce have said? Perhaps one day he will give us his own account of the experiment' (p. 123). This statement does not tally with the facts. Contrary to Hansel's remarks, Pearce did make a statement in which he unequivocally asserted that he did not cheat (Stevenson, 1967). Pearce is now dead, and therefore will not be able to make another statement more to the liking of Hansel, unless Hansel believes in the ability of the deceased to make statements!

The hypothesis of fraud to explain away the results of such experiments as the Pearce–Pratt series is essentially sterile and non-falsifiable. As I pointed out elsewhere (Rao, 1981), the argument that it is more parsimonious to assume fraud rather than the existence of 'impossible' phenomena such as ESP is as logically false as it is historically untrue.

Much was made of the fact that the original report of the Pearce–Pratt experiments did not give all the details of procedure and experimental conditions that we now consider necessary. West and some other parapsychologists appear to be ready to blame Rhine for this failure. Stevenson (1967), for example, writes, 'Rhine had already published informal reports [of the Pearce–Pratt experiment] in two of his popular books and it is doubtful procedure in science to announce one's results first to the general public and then (in this case many years later) present a detailed report for scientists' (p. 259). I believe these accusations are unfair.

It is not the case that Rhine announced his results first to the public. The results of the Pearce–Pratt experiment were first published in *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (Rhine, 1936) and were only subsequently mentioned in his popular books. (The first of these, *New Frontiers of the Mind*, appeared in 1938.) *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* is a respected journal in mainstream psychology and Rhine had no editorial control over it. Does this not clearly imply that the additional details that we now consider necessary were not considered so then by the psychologists who refereed his paper and the editors who published it? If the *Journal of Parapsychology* was in existence then and if Rhine published his report in it with inadequate details, we might have had some reason to blame him for not giving them all. The truth is that details of the sort that we now require of parapsychological reports were simply not found necessary then. When it became increasingly clear that further details of the experimental procedure were called for, Rhine and Pratt published a detailed report in 1954.

Now, the more serious of the criticisms relates to the discrepancies between various published accounts of the experiment. Several of these are trivial and none is sufficient to call into question the veracity of the experiment or the credibility of the experimenters. Interestingly, Hansel makes more errors in his very brief review of the experiment than do the authors. Here are some examples.

He writes, 'The scores published in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* disagree with those in the *Journal of Parapsychology*. They give total hits for the four subseries as: A, 179; B, 288; C, 86; D, 56. The individual scores quoted are also in a different order for subseries B and C from those given in the *Journal of Parapsychology*' (1980, 120–121). Here Hansel gives the total scores as reported in one journal and not in the other. Therefore, the reader does not really know the magnitude of the discrepancies. More significantly, neither report actually gives the total number of hits in each of the four subseries as Hansel implies. These totals, it appears, are computed by Hansel from the footnote on page 222 of *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (1936). He found they differed from those obtained by adding up individual scores as given in the *Journal of Parapsychology* (1954) report. I did the same and came up with different figures. Hansel gives the total hits for subseries A as 179. Actually, the total score that one would obtain by adding up individual scores given in footnotes in both reports or by computing from the average and deviation scores given in the main body of the reports is 119. So Hansel in his computation makes an error much larger than anything that he finds in the reports he criticizes. Again, as far as this score is concerned, there is no discrepancy between the two reports.

As for subseries B, the individual scores as given in the footnotes add up to 288 and 295 in the 1936 and 1954 reports, respectively. Recall that totals are not given in the reports, but can be computed by us from the footnotes as well as from the results presented in the main body of the reports. In the table on page 222 of *The Abnormal and Social Psychology* report, we find that for subseries B there are 1100 trials and the average score for 25 trials is 6.7. From this, it is clear that even in this report the total number of hits for subseries B is 295, the same as that given in the *Journal of parapsychology* report. So there is no discrepancy here.

It would appear that a few of the individual scores as given in the footnote for the 1936 article were misprinted and that one score was inadvertently left out. The footnote gives only 43 scores when there should have been 44.

Hansel leaves the impression that Rhine and Pratt were unmindful of the errors in the first report. This was not so. A footnote in the *Journal of Parapsychology* article (Rhine and Pratt, 1954) reads: 'In the two reports . . . in which the run scores of the series were published, the scores of subseries B and C were not given consecutively, and there were two other minor errors. It seems worthwhile, therefore, to list the complete run scores in chronological order here' (p. 171). Here is the explanation of the discrepancy in the sequence of the scores as given in the 1936 and 1954 reports. Surely Hansel cannot be unaware of this: he gets the individual scores from this footnote only.

While it is regrettable that there were errors in the first report, though inconsequential in themselves, I wonder how many of us can honestly say that we make no such errors. As I have pointed out, Hansel himself commits a few. To give a few more, reference 8 on page 119 which has to do with *Extra-Sensory Perception after Sixty Years* refers on page 123 to (The) *Reach of the Mind* (incidentally, *The* was omitted); reference 9 to *The Reach of the Mind* on page 119 is listed in the notes on page 123 as *New World of the Mind.* On page 121 Hansel mentions *Frontiers of the Mind* by J. B. Rhine. He obviously means *New Frontiers of the Mind.*

In evaluating Hansel's critique, we should bear in mind that the records of the Pearce–Pratt experiment are still in existence, and that they were examined in the past by others and re-checked by Stuart, Greenwood and Murphy. Again, Hansel himself was at Duke with Rhine and Pratt and they would have easily clarified these matters, if Hansel had raided them then. Hansel (1961) did not refer to these discrepancies in his first critique of this experiment published in the *Journal of Parapsychology.*

In summary, then, Hansel's criticism of the Pearce–Pratt experiment is not entirely reliable. But the fact that his words have been taken seriously by such persons as Dr. West makes me wonder whether there is some truth in the saying that if someone shouts long and loud enough he will be heard without regard to what he says.

K. Ramakrishna Rao, Ph.D., LittD
Director, Institute for Parapsychology

Durham
North Carolina 27708

REFERENCES

C. E. M. Hansel, 'A critical analysis of the Pearce–Pratt experiment', *Journal of Parapsychology*, **25** (1961), 87–91.

C. E. M. Hansel, *ESP and parapsychology: A critical re-evaluation*. Prometheus Books (Buffalo, NY, 1980).

K. R. Rao, 'Hume's fallacy', *Journal of Parapsychology*, 1981 (in press).

J. B. Rhine, 'Some selected experiments in extra-sensory perception', *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **31** (1936), 217–228.

J. B. Rhine and J. G. Pratt, 'A review of the Pearce–Pratt distance series of ESP tests', *Journal of Parapsychology*, **18** (1954), 165–177.
I. Stevenson, 'An antagonist's view of parapsychology: A review of Professor Hansel's *ESP: A scientific evaluation*', *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, **61** (1967), 254–267.

Madam,

I have just returned from a lengthy trip to discover that Prof. C. F. Osborne, of the Caulfield Institute of Technology in Australia, has misrepresented my tests of dowsers in the pages of your *Journal*.

I hardly know where to begin. First, I at no time referred to my tests as 'experiments'. They were tests, agreed to completely in form and content by the subjects and all other participants. The object was to determine if the subjects could perform *in accordance with their firmly stated claims*, in which case I was prepared to surrender my cheque for the sum of US$10,000, offered for any demonstration of a paranormal ability within stated limits. Osborne's claim that I must now forfeit my cheque is made in spite of the fact that everyone knew what the terms were. The terms were widely publicized. I cannot understand why Prof. Osborne ignores this fact.

All the dowsers claimed results of 85 per cent to 100 per cent success, and all fell miserably short of these estimates. Thus, none deserve the prize. That is an incontestable fact.

All participants agreed that dowsing for *any* substance is part of the same phenomenon. That is in the record. Thus, all agreed in advance that the results of any one test were to be included with all the rest. I, too, agreed to abide by this rule. If we cannot take the opinion of the dowsers themselves, whose opinion are we to accept?

I did *not*, as Osborne reports, '(dismiss) dowsing as a genuine phenomenon'. Until I have seen *all* dowsers, I cannot make that statement. Similarly, confronted with such miserable performances as I have seen in all the years I have investigated these matters, I have no reason at all to accept the claims. My statement is only that dowsing does not seem, on the basis of present evidence, to be a genuine phenomenon. That statement was made in the TV film from which Osborne quotes. No significance level was quoted in my tests, since that was not their purpose. I displayed no 'ignorance of scientific method' as claimed by Osborne. *He* was not ignorant of the design and purpose of my tests.

Dr. Osborne tells readers that I was able to 'obtain successful results'. Really? I am at a loss to discover them. Contrary to what Osborne claims, I *did*' (avail myself) of the scientific expertise of members of (my) experiment . . .' (again, his use of that term, 'experiment' is incorrect) and consulted with Prof. Persi Diaconis of Stanford University, California, Department of Statistics. Dr. Diaconis points out a fact that escaped Osborne: *None of the dowsers, in any tests, performed at a significant level! None of them!* Diaconis, Stanford's professor of statistics, says that Osborne's techniques point to the need for 'a good introductory course in the statistical facts of life'. He goes on to say that such *ad hoc* methods were discontinued in parapsychology long ago.

To select out some data and prove a point with them is not a scientific