

1. Deviation of card-score of whole population from m.c.e.	+15.2	$p > .5$
2. Coefficient of Reliability*	+0.29	$p > .5$
3. Sheep/Goats. T-test.		$p > .5$
4. Birth order, Analysis of Variance between Eldest, Only and Youngest groups		$p > .5$
5. E-score. Correlation coefficient.	-0.34	$0.5 > p > .1$
6. N-score. Correlation coefficient	+0.41	$0.05 > p > .04$
7 Coefficient of Reliability.		
$E < \bar{E}$, 'Introverts'.	+0.82	$0.03 > p > .02$
$E > \bar{E}$, 'Extraverts'.	-0.64	$p > .5$
Significance of Difference in Reliability		$0.03 > p > .02$
8. Coefficient of Reliability		
$N < \bar{N}$. Lower N-scorers.	-0.04	$p > .5$
$N > \bar{N}$. Higher N-scorers.	+0.38	$p > .5$
Significance of difference in Reliability		$p > .5$

* The Coefficient of Reliability r was calculated by the Spearman-Brown formula $r_0 = \frac{2r_1}{1+r_1}$ from the split-half correlation r_1 between runs 1 and 3 combined and runs 2 and 4 combined.

While the experiment generally gave non-significant results it is perhaps worth noting (a) The correlation with N is in the same direction as observed by Green.¹ (b) The 'introverts' show a better reliability than the 'extraverts'.

EXCERPTUM

The following letter by R. A. McConnell, of the University of Pittsburgh, entitled "The ESP Scholar" is reproduced by kind permission of the American Psychological Association from Contemporary Psychology Vol 13 (1968), p. 41.

THERE is need for a factual, as distinct from a rhetorical, response to S. S. Stevens's review (January, 1967) of Hansel's *ESP: A Scientific Evaluation*. Professor Stevens says: 'The scientific community has waited a long time for a Hansel to do for ESP what gets done as a matter of course in other areas where experimental findings are offered for attention. Now, perhaps, the case can rest.' Despite this unreserved endorsement, your readers

¹ Green C. E., 'Extra Sensory Perception and the Maudsley Personality Inventory' *Journal S.P.R.*, 43, No. 727.

Green, C. E., 'Extra Sensory Perception and the Maudsley Personality Inventory: An Experiment using 259 University Students'. *Journal S.P.R.*, 44, No. 732

might do well to ask: 'Is Hansel a believable scholar?' The answer may, perhaps, be found on the one page that Hansel devotes to Haakon Forwald, who is considered by most parapsychologists to be the leading investigator of psychokinesis (one of the two main phenomena of parapsychology).

Forwald is introduced by Hansel (p. 160) as 'of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology at Zurich.' The truth is that Forwald has worked for the Swedish General Electric Company (ASEA) continuously since 1935 as an electrical engineer. He holds several hundred invention patents, and at the time of his recent retirement was Chief of their Consulting Office for High-Voltage Switchgear. His only connection with the Swiss Federal Institute has been that in 1933 he attended there a brief series of lectures on physics and engineering matters. This kind of a scholarly error by Hansel is difficult to understand because Forwald did not begin experimental work in parapsychology until 15 years later and it has all been published in English in a dozen papers in the readily accessible (USA) *Journal of Parapsychology*. At the end of every paper, including the one (1952) paper cited by Hansel, Forwald's address has been given as Ludvika, Sweden.

If Hansel's first sentence leaves one wondering whether he has read any of Forwald's papers, his next two sentences enhance the suspicion that he has not. Hansel states that '(Forwald's) calculations are based on the assumption that if the (falling) object moved laterally a greater distance than the height from which it was dropped, then a psychokinetic force was present.' This is obvious nonsense, and nothing like it has ever been published by Forwald. Forwald's evidence for displacement psychokinesis has always depended upon the horizontal motion of cubes and not upon the height from which they fall. In his method, half the time the cubes are wished to go to one side and half to the other. In his research between 1950 and 1952, he used a chi-square evaluation to show the basic effect. Since then, he has compared the mean difference of cube positions to the standard deviation of their scatter.

Hansel goes on to say that 'Two objections have been raised concerning Forwald's research.' From the tenor of the previous 160 book pages, the reader naturally supposes that Hansel means objections against Forwald's evidence for the *reality* of psychokinesis. Hansel then quotes from a letter by a retired astronomer to a Spiritualist newspaper 150 words remotely relating to Forwald's theoretical attempts to calculate the magnitude of a hypothetical psychokinetic force that might have caused his anomalous data. Ninety-nine out of a hundred readers will

vaguely assume that this somehow constitutes a criticism of Forwald's data as evidence of psychokinesis. The hundredth reader may ask himself: 'For what purpose did Hansel include this misleading and irrelevant quotation?'

The second objection raised by Hansel (by the cautious device of ascribing it to someone else) is that Forwald has worked alone. This is not a valid reason for rejecting, as of no serious evidential value, the work of a reputable and professionally qualified investigator, and, if cited as a reason for doubting his findings, it must be coupled with an honest characterization of his professional status. Even more reprehensibly in this connection, Hansel makes no mention of the important experiment done with a witness by Forwald while on a visit to the USA for that purpose, as published in the *Journal of Parapsychology*, 1958, pp. 1-19.

NOTES AND NOTICES

ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE PARAPSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

September 5-7, 1968

University of Freiburg im Breisgau West Germany

THE Freiburg conference was pleasantly pervaded by a strong air of international bonhomie, Americans determined so far as possible to speak German, and Germans enthusiastically reciprocating in English. At frequent intervals messages of commiseration with Russian and Czech brethren were voiced, though not actually transmitted, except possibly by ESP. Lectures took place in the splendid modern 'Aula' of the University Kollegiengebäude, a hall far better fitted for this purpose than the even more splendid ancient buildings of Oxford where the conference was held four years ago. On that occasion a large part of the proceedings was rendered inaudible by the echoing stone; at Freiburg, despite the superabundance of good will and good intentions, the conference was again only semi-audible. Nearly all the speakers (Professor Bender and Dr Krippner being honourable exceptions) ignored the existence of the hard pressed and frantic interpreters, who could be heard through the headphones from time to time gasping 'langsamer—slower' without having any effect on the speakers. The English representatives at least spoke up in good, clear voices, not with the disheartening rapidity and unintellig-