

The Journal of
Parapsychology

Volume 39

September 1975

Number 3

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH
AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

BY FREDERICK C. DOMMEYER

I

Thomas Welton Stanford presented two substantial sums of money to Stanford University, the first in 1911 and the second at his death in 1918. The donor intended that the income from the earlier gift of \$50,000 would be used to support a "Thomas Welton Stanford Psychical Research Fellowship" at the University. The gift of the 1918 will was \$526,000. Its income *could* have been used by the University solely for the development of psychical science, which would have been consistent with the donor's explicit wishes and also in harmony with his interests of some sixty years in the psychical research field and in spiritualism.

Despite this considerable financial support for the development of psychical science and for the dissemination of the resulting knowledge, Stanford University has officially maintained that none of its psychical research fellows produced any positive results. It has also used the income from the larger 1918 gift for the support of the University's Department of Psychology.

These results have been in such disharmony with the expectations of those friendly to spiritualism, psychical research, and para-

The writer is deeply indebted to Dr. J. B. Rhine (FRNM), to Prof. Paul R. Farnsworth (retired) of the Stanford University Psychology Dept., and to Mr. Charles G. Schulz, attorney, Palo Alto, Calif., for their assistance and encouragement in the preparation of this material, and to the personnel of the Stanford University Archives, who gave every possible assistance to the author.

psychology, and also so inconsistent with the experimental results at the Duke Parapsychology Laboratory and elsewhere in this country, Europe, and the Orient that they constituted an enigma. Suspicions early arose that Stanford University administrators and the Department of Psychology were engaged in a conspiracy against psychical science. Accusations were made that the University had misappropriated income from the two T. W. Stanford funds, and even used it for purposes diametrically opposed to the donor's intentions. It was even claimed that President David Starr Jordan had tricked T. W. Stanford into the inclusion of a provision in his will that had frustrated the donor's real intentions. With respect to these and other rumors, the facts are neither as bad as the critics of Stanford University would sometimes have them, nor are they as good as University spokesmen would assert.

The history of psychical research at Stanford University is worth the telling. It is intrinsically interesting. It may serve to caution future donors of large sums of money to universities to obtain better assurances that their intended uses of them will be realized. It may instruct university administrators not to alter unilaterally a donor's intentions, however reasonable and morally justifiable such changes may seem to them. It may also caution university administrators not to accept funds whose aims they cannot conscientiously support.

II

The Stanford family had come from England to upper New York State in the early eighteenth century. Thomas Welton Stanford was born on March 11, 1832. He was one of eight children of Josiah Stanford. Thomas had six brothers and one sister. Leland, the most famous member of the family and founder of Stanford University, was eight years senior to Thomas. The father, in addition to owning farm properties in the Albany area of New York State, was a leading figure in building a railway between Albany and Schenectady.

It was intended that Thomas would become a doctor. The actual record of his education reveals that he never got beyond attendance at the Troy Conference Academy, a Methodist institution of high-school level at Poultney, Vermont. His name appears only in the 1850-1851 and the 1851-1852 Annual Catalogue of the school. This school, over the years, has changed its character and is now known as the Green Mountain College for Women.

There is no record of Thomas's graduation from the Academy.

He ended his formal education in 1852 in order to join his brothers in their business ventures in California. When he left for Australia about eight years later, he carried with him \$60,000 with which to make a start in this remote land. He landed on March 13, 1860, after a ninety-six-day sea voyage. He set up a business in Melbourne where he remained for the rest of his life, dying there on August 28, 1918, at the age of eighty-six.

The nature of his business was simple enough. He imported items available in the United States, including sewing machines (Singer) in which he had a virtual monopoly and he invested heavily in properties around Melbourne from which he obtained sizable rentals. Stanford lived compatibly with his wealth and income, residing in "Stanford House," a large Melbourne mansion. An aviary, covering two acres of his property and of one hundred feet in height, gave some indication of the manner in which he lived. Some of his apported birds ended up in the aviary.

Despite his business success and wealth, he had few close friends; only two, in fact. The closer of these was undoubtedly his secretary, Mr. Crook, who jealously guarded his employer's interests. Stanford's pleasures were not social. Rather, he enjoyed the role of a "gentleman scientist," pursuing interests in astronomy, microbiology, and psychical science. He was much opposed to the "dogmatic religion" of his day and fancied himself as a member of an *avant garde*. These intellectual activities were on an amateurish basis. Inadequate training and an emotional involvement in beliefs associated with his work in psychical science were the causes of his superficial and sometimes misguided investigations.

Stanford's interests in the United States never waned. Habits of thought and action formed in the pre-Melbourne days marked his personality and character. His membership on the Stanford University Board of Trustees led him to maintain an active relationship with the affairs of the university his brother Leland had founded.

III

It is difficult to date with certainty the beginning of Stanford's interest in spiritualism. The sparse evidences show that, already in his early twenties while he was still in California, he had become concerned over spirit communication. This places the rise of his interest some few years after the famous Rochester knockings associated with the Fox sisters at Hydesville, N. Y., in 1848. It does not

appear, however, that he committed himself to spiritualism until 1871 or 1872, shortly after his wife's death. One can speculate on whether his acceptance of spirit communication was based on this sad event.

In Australia in the latter half of the nineteenth century, there was no dearth of mediums. In 1904 Stanford wrote: "My experience in all kinds of phenomena has been so wide that to enter into details would far exceed the limits of an article—a large volume would scarcely suffice to contain it. All the celebrated mediums who have visited Australia have come under my observation . . ." (Note 1). There are other evidences that Stanford attended many seances and that his claim was well founded. After 1902, he had his own salaried medium, a Charles Bailey, with whom weekly seances were conducted in a special room of Stanford's office building. Bailey specialized in apportioning and brought to the large oval table in this room (or later, inside a cage in which he was placed) literally hundreds of apports from foreign lands. Or so Stanford believed. Stanford sent hundreds of these to the University, where they remained on display until 1937. Bailey also communicated with the spirits, often bringing learned treatises from deceased scholars to the seance room. To his own seances, Stanford would have Mr. Crook, his secretary, invite twenty to thirty of the elite business people of Melbourne, hoping to convince them of his convictions. News of his seances found their way to the spiritualist journal, *The Harbinger of Light*. Spiritualists were delighted to have a man of Stanford's prestige among them and praised his work in their area of interest.

Professor L. M. Terman of Stanford University maintained in his unpublished biography of T. W. Stanford that the latter's belief in spiritualism wavered and that his first gift to the University for the study of psychical phenomena was motivated by his desire to learn the truth—one way or the other—about spirit communication, apportioning, etc. On the contrary, after his commitment to spiritualism in the early 1870's, Stanford never had any doubts about his beliefs. The motivation behind his gift was rather to prove to his Stanford associates that his beliefs in psychic science were both true and very important. Many of Stanford's letters to the Board and to the President of the University testify to the correctness of this view.

It is a fact that Stanford *should* have vacillated in his beliefs about the psychic world. His paid medium, Bailey, was reportedly searched carefully before the weekly seances. From 1907 to 1914, he was placed in a cage during the seances for further assurance that no

trickery on his part would be possible. There are solid grounds for believing that these searches were superficial and that Bailey's location in the cage was not a sufficient obstacle to trickery in his apportioning. President Jordan, when visiting Stanford in Melbourne, witnessed a seance and testified to the incompleteness of the search. And when Bailey was caught in deception by competent observers in Australia and Europe, Stanford would "rationalize away" the evidence of the trickery and would disbelieve what was obvious to any objectively-minded person. There is no doubt that Stanford died a believer in spiritualism.

Bailey was a shoemaker by trade, with a deficient education. He is often described as vulgar and a liar; the term "loafer" was applied to him. In 1898, before Stanford had become acquainted with him and when he was in his middle or late twenties, he admitted guilt at the Melbourne Police Court to a charge of obtaining money by false pretenses. Mr. Crook was very suspicious and thought that Bailey might be part of a plot to relieve Stanford of some of his money. At first Mr. Stanford had great confidence in Bailey's integrity, but as time went on, took a dim view of his morality. He never abandoned belief in Bailey's psychical "powers," however, and always staunchly defended him against criticism or attack. It may have been psychologically impossible for him to do otherwise. He had interwoven with his spiritualism a view of life and a law of progression, i.e., he saw one's progress in this life as a beginning level in the next life. To have abandoned his spiritualism would have been to give up what in effect was a religion for him.

IV

Stanford was undoubtedly a wealthy man. Professor Terman wrote truly, though perhaps ungraciously, when he said of Stanford's money: "When so much money accumulated that they didn't know what to do with it they would send it to the University" (Note 2). Stanford presented gifts of significance to the University, in addition to those associated with psychical science. But it is to the latter gifts that attention will be directed.

The first gift was consummated in 1911 and became effective in 1912, with the establishment of the Thomas Welton Stanford Psychical Research Fellowship at the University. The income from this gift of £10,000 (\$50,000) was to supply the financial support for the Fellows. Dr. John Edgar Coover, the first Fellow, held it

from 1912 to 1937. This was an exception, however, and the pattern after him was a tenure of one or two years.

What led T. W. Stanford to make the gift? An obvious and already-mentioned cause was his long interest in spiritualism and his desire to convince Board associates and others of the soundness of his occult beliefs. A medical doctor from Cullman, Alabama, John E. Purdon, claimed in a letter he wrote to Professor Coover on May 6, 1914, that he was the one who gave Stanford the idea of a Fellowship. He wrote: ". . . I suggested to him more than eight years ago the endowment of a scientific lectureship in psychic science" (Note 3). Whatever the truth of Purdon's claim, there is a letter dated October 11, 1905, from George E. Crothers to Stanford in which reference is made to the latter's desire to learn the views of the University Board "concerning the establishment of a chair at Stanford for the investigation of spiritualism and the dissemination of the knowledge thus obtained" (Note 4). Other correspondence followed, but nothing concrete occurred until January 12, 1911, when Stanford wrote a lengthy letter (Note 5) to Mr. W. E. Caldwell, Secretary of the Board of Trustees, in which he complained bitterly of a new land tax which had led him to sell a block of his buildings. With this letter, Stanford sent a bill of exchange for £20,000. Half of this was to go for the construction and maintenance of a picture gallery and the remaining amount "for the investigation of Psychology, including Spiritualism."

A considerable amount of correspondence followed. On April 28, 1911, however, an indenture was formulated in which the use of the income from the £10,000 was defined. It read as follows:

TO INVEST and re-invest and keep invested in approved securities one-half of said sum of twenty thousand pounds and to credit the interest derived therefrom to a fund which shall be known as the "Psychic Fund," and in such manner, and at such time or times, and under such conditions as shall seem best to said Board, in its absolute and unfettered discretion, to expend and use the said Psychic Fund exclusively and wholly for the investigation and advancement of the knowledge of psychic phenomena, including spiritualism and such other occult forces, sciences and learning, as may be deemed by said Board to be suitable for study and investigation, and in the publication, dissemination and teaching of their results of investigation of such subjects, whether conducted at said University or elsewhere. . . . (Note 6)

On the same day, a resolution in which Stanford concurred was adopted by the Board. In this resolution, it was asserted that the income from the \$50,000 was to be used "as a fund for the investigation of psychic phenomena and the occult sciences" (Note 7). It is

clear that the Board members understood the limitations imposed by Stanford on the fund.

Practically the entire year of 1911 was taken up with correspondence between T. W. Stanford, on the one hand, and the Board and President David Starr Jordan, on the other. This correspondence was concerned with the way in which the University would implement the income from the fund. On January 26, 1912, the Board of Trustees acted to establish the Fellowship on the Stanford campus.

A fellowship to be known as "The Thomas Welton Stanford Fellowship for Research in Psychic Phenomena" was created under a trust made by Mr. Stanford on April 28, 1911. A salary of \$2000 per annum was attached to the position, the balance of the income of the trust to be devoted to traveling expenses, books, and apparatus. (Note 8)

The President of the University was authorized to nominate an incumbent for the Fellowship.

V

The earliest reference to a legacy Stanford intended to leave to the University appeared in a letter of November 1893 (Note 9). There mention is made of a legacy of not less than \$500,000 and probably substantially more. This letter was written approximately twenty-five years before Stanford's death but twenty years after he had become a confirmed spiritualist. No reference is made in this letter to the use of this legacy. Yet, the amount of it suggests a connection with the actual legacy of 1918, which was \$526,000.

There are actually two separate documents associated with the Stanford legacy. One is the will itself, which was signed on June 2, 1911, and the other is the codicil to it, which he added on December 10, 1914 (Note 10). In both documents, one finds statements of his wishes with respect to psychic and psychological science. The intent in each document is substantially the same, though there are slight differences in emphasis. In the will, on page 5, the use of the money is to be for "the advancement of education, learning, and general knowledge in connection with psychical or psychological science study, or research." The changes in the language of the codicil suggest that he wished a more direct application of his money to the two fields mentioned in the will. The words *in connection with* in the will suggest a latitude that he wished, in the codicil, to exclude. The words in the codicil were as follows:

. . . as a special endowment of the said University and as a permanent fund which shall forever be kept intact, but the net income thereof shall

be applied by the said University trustees wholly and exclusively to the following purpose: that is to say, the promotion of such education, learning, and general knowledge as may more directly assist or conduce to the general advancement or development of psychical or psychological science study or research; and I declare that the manner or mode of application to such purpose as aforesaid shall be such in all respects as the said University Trustees, without requiring instruction of a sectarian character or otherwise contravening any of the trusts of the said University, shall in their absolute and unfettered discretion from time to time determine.

The language of both the will and its codicil would seem to make it clear that the income from this sizable legacy could be used for either psychical science or psychological science exclusively, or for both sciences. The University administrators chose to use the income for the support of its Department of Psychology.

There were many, and still are some, who have found this use improper—immoral, if not illegal. With such a clear disjunction, what grounds can they offer for their views? In a letter of January 12, 1911, previously mentioned, Stanford said the income from his Fellowship Fund was to be used "for the investigation of Psychology, including Spiritualism." Though the word "psychology" was introduced here, the Board understood Stanford to have an interest solely in "the investigation of psychic phenomena and the occult sciences." In the same letter, one also finds Stanford writing: "But I need not here express my opinions, or my knowledge, re spiritualism, for it is highly probable that my Co-Trustees, & yourself, are familiar with many books on Psychology by authors of world-wide reputation." At a minimum, Stanford reveals here that spiritualism, in his way of thinking, was included in psychology. When one is studying spiritualism, he is therefore, on Stanford's view, studying psychology. Other letters support this same view. Was Stanford, then, in ignorance of what *academic* psychology was? Did he believe that his will *required* consideration of spiritualism no matter which disjunct (psychical science or psychological science) was selected? With the education Stanford had at the Troy Conference Academy and with his remoteness from the University, it is likely he knew little or nothing of what went on in university Departments of Psychology. His seances, his letters, and his activities in behalf of spiritualism all testify to an interest in psychical science, not in the academic sense of psychological science. Was the diversion of the income from the large legacy to the use of the University's Department of Psychology actually improper, even though the will appears

to make it linguistically permissible? Some have complained along these lines about the misuse of the fund.

There is also another prong of attack on the University's use of the income from the legacy. It has been charged by some that Mr. Stanford was beguiled by President David Starr Jordan into including "either psychical or psychological science" in his will and that, except for that, he would have designated the use of the legacy solely for psychical science. Dr. Louis C. Cornish, President of the Unitarian Society and an active alumnus of Stanford University, "trying to correct the handling of the fund for psychical research," said on one occasion that he had been informed by President Jordan, whose responsibility it was to negotiate the gift, that it was he who had persuaded T. W. Stanford to introduce the words "psychological science study or research" into the will (Note 11). This complaint has been repeated by many, including J. B. Rhine.

On this view also, T. W. Stanford would not have designated the use of the income from the legacy for "psychological science." His natural inclination was otherwise, but he had been "persuaded" by the President to include that term in his will—so the view runs.

What can be said about these two accusations against the interpretation of the will made by the University? In the opinion of the writer, it may well have been the case that T. W. Stanford did think of spiritualism as part of psychology. Nonetheless, the will does make a clear distinction between psychical and psychological science. The will moreover does not explicitly include spiritualism within psychological science. Since the will was, and is, the effective agency for determining the use of the income from the legacy, it seems reasonable for Stanford University to regard its use of the income from the legacy for its Department of Psychology as quite legal.

One must keep in mind also that the University administrators and Board members did not accept the views on spiritualism believed by Stanford. Dr. Angell of the Department of Psychology had expressed his conviction to the President that Stanford was the dupe of a trickster, Charles Bailey. Dr. Cornish, on another and later occasion, approached President Wilbur about the "misuse" of the psychic research funds. Dr. Wilbur is reported as replying to Cornish: "Well, you can't spend the income of a million dollars on spooks, can you?" (Note 12). President Jordan, who was in close correspondence with Stanford and who visited him in Melbourne, was a skeptic, if not a disbeliever in spiritualism, though he was more dip-

lomatic than his successor, Dr. Wilbur, in saying so. With such convictions, there was, as these administrators saw it, good reason for using the income from the legacy for psychology. The negative results of the first Fellow's research in psychical science further buttressed these convictions.

In all of this, there is the question of whether what *actually* happened in the use of the income from the \$526,000 of the legacy fitted in with what T. W. Stanford would have had *reason* to expect. The fact is that the correspondence Stanford received from President Jordan and various Board members was such as to lead him to believe that there was at least an open-mindedness and an interest in investigating psychical phenomena at the University. In a strict sense, these University officials never asserted agreement with the spiritist beliefs of T. W. Stanford; but they certainly did not tell him, either, what they actually believed, namely, that they thought Bailey a trickster and Stanford a dupe. Should the University, under these circumstances, have accepted funds for the investigation and dissemination of knowledge about psychical phenomena? Was there not a form of deception being practiced on Stanford in order not to alienate him? He was not only a potential source of money for the University but, as well, a brother of the founder and himself a member of the Board. Could T. W. Stanford or others believe that the University authorities were other than open-minded about psychical science when they exhibited hundreds of Bailey's apports on the campus for decades? In the opinion of the writer, Stanford would probably not have given either the 1911 or the 1918 gift to the University could he have foreseen the outcome of the University's use of them.

On the matter of "beguilement" of Stanford by the President, Dr. Jordan, one can weaken this accusation of Dr. Cornish by noting that Stanford's will was signed by him on June 2, 1911. The codicil was added on December 10, 1914. Three and one-half years had intervened between those two events. If Stanford had been "pushed" into including in his will the term "psychological science," one would have thought that the codicil, three and one-half years later, would have been used to replace the "psychical science-psychological science" disjunction with a provision that the income from the legacy be used solely and exclusively for psychical science. But Stanford did not do that. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that if President Jordan indeed had persuaded Stanford to include "psychological science" in his will, the latter was, on sober reconsideration, not averse to it.

VI

Having discussed the relatively simple issues surrounding the second gift of 1918, one must now focus attention on the first 1911 gift, which was designed to set up a Thomas Welton Stanford Psychical Research Fellowship. So far, there has been no consideration of the manner in which the income from the gift was administered by the University. It is not easy to deal with this issue, for it involves the work of a number of Fellows who were appointed between 1912 and 1969. This task must nevertheless be attempted.

The first of the Fellows was John Edgar Coover. He was born in Remington, Indiana, on March 16, 1872. His first degree was a Ped.B. from Colorado State Normal School in 1898. He taught school for a time and then went to Stanford University as an undergraduate student around the turn of the century, obtaining a B.A. in 1904 and an M.A. in 1905. His undergraduate work had included an emphasis on philosophy. He thereupon returned to public school teaching until 1910, when he returned to Stanford as a graduate student, obtaining a Ph.D. degree in psychology in 1912. This was just in time for the Fellowship. He was appointed and remained the Stanford Psychical Research Fellow until his retirement in 1937. In 1914, he was made an assistant professor in the University Department of Psychology. He advanced through the academic ranks, becoming a full professor in 1930. No Fellow after Coover was made a permanent member of the Department of Psychology, though some of them taught courses at the University. After 1937, when Coover retired, no one held the Fellowship for more than a year or two at a time.

Was Coover a believer in psychical phenomena? Initially he was—if one can take at face value a letter he wrote to Stanford on March 20, 1913. In this letter, he said: "For this reason those anomalous, or at least, rare occurrences—the phenomena of psychical research—have become disregarded, or have been challenged for scientific proof. Because they occur so rarely, their proof must be correspondingly more complete to be convincing" (Note 13).

Two things might be noted from the passage quoted from Coover's letter. If he was honest in his statement—or dishonest—he was minimally buttressing Stanford's view that there *are* psychical phenomena. Coover's reference to the rarity of such occurrences must have puzzled Stanford, for apportings and messages from the dead were commonplace at Stanford's weekly seances.

In the years 1913–1914, T. W. Stanford invited Coover to come to Melbourne, all expenses paid, to test Bailey. This invitation caused much nervousness on the part of President Jordan, who recognized that Coover's methods of investigation might well prove that Bailey was a trickster. Coover, for example, would not have asked Bailey to apport a bird from India; he would have asked him to do what appeared a lot more simple, namely, apport an object in a small sealed box to another small sealed box. Luckily for all concerned, Bailey—under the threat of Coover's visit—took off for Europe, contrary to Mr. Stanford's wishes. The Coover visit was called off and the test never occurred. It was in 1914 that Bailey broke with Stanford.

The appointment of Coover to the Fellowship led to the establishment of a Division of Psychical Research at the University within the organizational framework of the Department of Psychology. In the President's Report for 1915/1916, the developments within the Division were revealed to be striking. A portion of the report, written by Lillian Jane Martin, then acting executive head of the Department of Psychology, follows:

Psychical Research

The report, which embodies the work of the division of psychical research since its foundation in 1912, is approximately ready for publication. It contains an account also of the work carried on in San Francisco with "psychics". . . . It includes also work in involuntary writing and other automatic subconscious phenomena, as well as an account of the 15,669 experiments in thought transference, 15,458 in subliminal impression and 27,820 in auditory assimilation. A catalog of the valuable psychical research library made possible through Mr. Thomas Welton Stanford's generous yearly allowance of £100 will also be included.

During the closing months of the year a special effort has been made to properly and completely house and furnish this, if not the only, at least the most completely equipped psychical research laboratory extant.

Among the rooms is the special chamber set aside for Mr. T. W. Stanford's extensive collection of "apports" in the cedar cases especially provided by Mr. Stanford.

All the laboratory rooms are supplied with cases, tables, and chairs suitable for laboratory work, and Dr. Coover's office with filing cases for properly preserving the psychical research data gathered.

The electrical equipment, which has been ordered, is complete and modern in form. Through a switchboard the laboratory rooms are connected and supplied with direct current. In the shellacking room a hood and electric fan carry away the smoke produced in preparing the kymograph drums.

The laboratory is supplied with the customary apparatus used in psychical investigations—kymographs, recording capsules, tachisto-

scopes, a dictaphone, a gazing crystal, etc., such equipment having been purchased as needed for use. Typewriters, calculating machines, slide rules—in short, the instruments used in handling expeditiously statistical data where such work is economically done as regards saving time, are now at hand for use in working up the enormous amount of collected psychical research data. (Note 14)

The climactic event in connection with Coover's work as Psychical Research Fellow occurred in 1917 with the publication of a sizable volume entitled *Experiments in Psychical Research at Stanford University*. In a *posthumous* article, partly written by Coover but completed by J. L. Kennedy, Coover described the results of his research that led up to the 1917 volume in the following way:

The monograph conclusions were: (1) No telepathy as a common capacity was found because the general totals did not exceed the chosen chance limit; (2) No telepathy as a capacity of single individuals was found because no totals of single sets exceeded the limit of chance. The same conclusions could have been deduced with reference to lucidity. After Schiller's criticism, both of these conclusions still stand. (Note 15)

There has been much controversy over these negative results of Coover's experimental work in psychical science. In a letter of February 2, 1971, to the present writer, J. B. Rhine called attention to the 4.24 critical ratio that Coover had used in his statistical calculations. Rhine wrote:

... The eminent Professor R. A. Fisher, later of Cambridge University, ... would have disagreed with Coover's absurdly high standard of significance of 4.24 times the standard deviation (that is, as the critical ratio). Fisher would have recommended 2.00. The Parapsychology Laboratory at Duke in its first report used a critical ratio based on the probable error, which is equivalent to 2.5 based on the standard deviation. This was raised slightly to 2.6 by the time Pratt and I published the text book. ... In my book in 1934, ... I made the point that Coover's 10,000 tests on what he called telepathy and clairvoyance yielded 294 successes as against 250 expected from chance. The deviation of 44 is over four times the probable error, which would mean over 2.5 times the standard deviation.

It is clear from the foregoing quotations that Coover, over the years 1912–1917, had seriously engaged in psychical research, despite the negative conclusions he claimed. He had made use of ordinary playing cards (minus the face cards) for telepathy and clairvoyance experiments, treating his results statistically. In that aspect of his research, he resembled J. B. Rhine in the latter's use of ESP cards.¹

¹ Dr. Seymour Mauskopf, a member of the Duke University Department of History, is co-authoring a history of parapsychology, now nearing completion. He was

It is not known whether T. W. Stanford received a copy of Coover's book, though it can reasonably be presumed that one was sent to him. There is no documentation of any kind that enables us to know how the sponsor of this Fellowship reacted to Coover's results. At this time, of course, Stanford was a very old man and only a year away from death.

With the publication of his 1917 volume, followed by the death of T. W. Stanford in 1918, Coover's work in psychical research declined. He did contribute an article to a book published in 1927. The volume, entitled *The Case For and Against Psychical Research*, was edited by Carl Murchison, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts. Coover was viewed in 1927 as a significant figure in psychical research. In his article, consistently with the earlier stand in his 1917 book, he took a negative posture. Coover did continue, however, to offer courses in psychical research at the University in the twenties and thirties. According to one of his students, he would present the materials in a poker-faced manner in the earlier part of the course. The student could not tell what Coover's own convictions were. In this phase of the course, practically all of the students were convinced of the genuineness of psychical phenomena. In the second half of the course, he would present the evidence against psychical phenomena, with the result that his students were confused and had to make up their own minds.

In his later years at Stanford, he was not required to teach classes. He left his laboratory only to attend campus scientific meetings. His interests in psychology were mainly in learning theory as applied to typing and stenography research. Though he published some in psychology, he never gained any real status in this field.

Did Coover fulfill the requirements of the Fellowship? A reasonable view of his activities would suggest he did. Only part of his income came from the Fellowship after he had become an established faculty member. It would therefore have been expected that

kind enough to read the present writer's paper and to comment upon it. Concerning Coover's methods of investigation, Dr. Mauskopf said in his letter to the writer (July 23, 1975) that he would have "liked to see more on exactly what Coover's methods were" and he suggested they were "much more elaborate than Rhine's." The writer agrees with this comment. Coover viewed Rhine's methods as deficient for reasons which he indicated, some of which are mentioned in another part of this paper. (See p. 187, Coover's letter to President Wilbur.) Dr. Mauskopf's more complete investigations into the nature of Coover's methods and the manner in which they differed from Rhine's can only be a very welcome addition to our knowledge of the history of psychical research.

there would be a division in his work between psychical science and psychology. He had decided against the occurrence of psi phenomena on the basis of his researches. There is no evidence that this was an insincere conclusion. He offered reasons for selecting a high critical ratio. His view on this matter was that, since there was only a small probability that the psi hypothesis was true, a *high* critical ratio was a "logical necessity."

It is true that Coover's negative results avoided embarrassment for the Department of Psychology and the University. University administrators clearly felt no need in the face of Coover's results to alter use of the income from the sizable 1918 legacy of T. W. Stanford.

With Coover's retirement scheduled for June 1937, President Wilbur, as that date neared, began thinking of a replacement. In a letter to Coover, he wrote in part:

Have you any suggestion as to the proper person to be selected to carry on the work which you have been doing? So far the only applicants seem to have come from the Duke group. Is there anybody at Duke, or elsewhere, who has a commonsense point of view and who is screwed down tight when it comes to studying fantasies and mathematical possibilities? (Note 16)

Coover responded to President Wilbur in a letter of January 19, 1937. He wrote in part the following:

... Dr. Terman conferred with me on the matter of selecting an applicant for the Psychical Research Fellowship, and the kind of work we should have done. I resisted the suggestion of an intensive repetition of Rhine's work (at Duke), not granting it adequate for scientific attention; he has statistically significant excesses over probability, but he has uncovered no factors that correlate with them, and has no right to any term to name the extra-chance causes responsible for them (such as "Extrasensory Capacity"). (Note 17)

Coover believed that these "excesses over probability"—the positive results that Rhine obtained—were due to uncontrolled variables.

As Coover's retirement approached, a very significant announcement was made. It contained an indication that the stipend for the Fellowship was \$2500, along with other conditions applicable to the grant. What is of special note here, however, is that this announcement also contained a redefinition of T. W. Stanford's purpose in setting up the Fellowship in 1911. This change was instigated by President Wilbur and Dr. Terman. The new statement of purpose follows:

The expression "psychical research field" is used in the broad sense to include mediumistic phenomena, telepathy, clairvoyance, hallucina-

tion, hypnosis, dreams, dissociation of personality, subconscious mechanisms, motor automatisms, subliminal perception, and any other phenomena that may be assumed to have a direct bearing on the psychology of the "occult." There are also possible types of research with electrical potentials of the central nervous system which might be regarded as coming within the scope of the field here defined. (Note 18)

This announcement, so far as the definition of "psychical research field" goes, became effective in 1937 and it remains intact today with respect to the redefinition of the donor's intentions. In the year 1962, certain minor stipulations in the announcement were changed, but they did not involve the above-quoted section.

There are a number of things to be noted about this statement of 1937. In the first instance, why was it necessary? After all, T. W. Stanford had made it clear that he wanted an investigation of psychical phenomena and the dissemination of the knowledge resulting from it. There was no need to say what psychical phenomena were in 1937, before that date or after it. If one went to the *scientific* parapsychology of that date, he would have found that psychical phenomena consisted of ESP (telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition) and PK (psychokinesis). If one went from the laboratory researches to the spontaneous case area, he would find a longer list: mediumistic activity, apporthing, possession, levitation, apparitions, poltergeist cases, materializations and dematerializations, hauntings, table-rappings and tilting, psychometry, thoughtography, unorthodox healings, etc.

No acceptable list before, or in, or after 1937 would have included as psychical phenomena a number of the items that are on the list of the Stanford authorities. They improperly included such things as hallucination, hypnosis, dreams, dissociation of personality, subconscious mechanisms, motor automatisms, subliminal perception, and any other phenomena that may be assumed to have a direct bearing on the psychology of the "occult." Then, in a real broadside, the statement is added that "there are also possible types of research with electrical potentials of the central nervous system which might be regarded as coming within the scope of the field here defined." None of these things just noted as being on the 1937 list conforms with the original purpose T. W. Stanford had in mind for the Fellowship. They are properly studied by psychologists, not by psychical researchers or parapsychologists. This fact can be established by perusing copies of the *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research* or the *Journal of Parapsychology*, on the one hand, and the sorts of subjects studied and researched by psychologists, on

the other. The operational result of this redefinition of T. W. Stanford's purpose was to open up the Fellowship to kinds of research that would interest psychologists, not parapsychologists. Stanford's words were ". . . to expend and use the said Psychic Fund exclusively and wholly for the investigation and advancement of the knowledge of psychic phenomena"

Note also that the 1937 redefinition is for the "psychical research field" in "the broad sense." Here is a practical admission that the purpose of the Fellowship was being widened and that this new definition was not identical with the donor's original purpose. T. W. Stanford said nothing about the "psychical research field" or of a definition of it in "the broad sense." Nor did he say that he wanted an investigation of phenomena that have "a direct bearing" on the psychology of the "occult." He said nothing at all about the psychology of the occult in stating the purpose of the Fellowship.

There was clearly no need for this new 1937 definition *unless* the University no longer wished to follow out the intentions of the donor. There was no reason to suppose that the original definition of purpose was incapable of use, for no attempt had been made to attract a successor to Coover by means of it. The only obvious reason for the new definition was that of making a kind of research possible under the Fellowship that would have been illicit in terms of the donor's original intent. That certainly was its end result over the years after 1937.

Can a donor's intentions, only nineteen years after his death, be so casually and drastically altered? Does the donor have no rights in this matter? Do those who would have used the Fellowship for bona fide psychical research, in harmony with the donor's intentions, have no rights in the matter? Do those who found it difficult to raise funds for psychical research, because of the history of psychical research at Stanford, have no rights in the matter? With the donor dead, no agreement could have been obtained from him to change his purpose.

The Fellowship was legally a charitable trust. Some statements about the nature of trusts follow below.

A trust has been defined as any arrangement where property is transferred with an intention that it be held and administered by the transferee for the benefit of another. . . . (Note 19)

.....

The main characteristic which distinguishes a charitable trust from other trusts is the indefiniteness of the beneficiaries of a charitable trust. (Note 20)

Legally, it is only through a court order that a donor's intentions can be changed. A pertinent statement follows.

Reluctance or unwillingness of the trustee or donee to comply with the donor's specifications, when not based on inability to comply but rather on a desire to change or modify the project, will not sustain court authorization of a variant application. (Note 21)

The present writer searched court records in order to ascertain whether Stanford University had obtained court permission to change the purpose of the Fellowship as stated by the donor; he found no evidence for such permission. He then wrote to Mr. Cassius L. Kirk, Jr., Staff Counsel, Business Affairs, at Stanford University, inquiring about this matter. Part of the reply was:

I have checked our records and have contacted the University's general counsel, McCutcheon, Doyle, Brown and Enersen of San Francisco, and can find no evidence that any legal proceedings were instigated by Stanford University in this matter.

In essence, therefore, this means that President Ray Lyman Wilbur and Dr. L. M. Terman, who instigated this redefinition of the donor's intentions, did so unilaterally. It means further that all appointments to the Fellowship after the first one were made under a restatement of purpose which would have been unacceptable to the donor, had he been alive. It will be observed in what follows that the 1937 "broad sense" of the physical research field permitted Fellows to carry on forms of research that were impossible under the statement of the donor's purpose.

VII

It is perhaps well to begin a consideration of the work of the other Thomas Welton Stanford Physical Research Fellows with a list of them, for it can serve as a ready reference to them and their dates of tenure in the Fellowship.

1. 1912-1937: John E. Coover
2. 1937-1939: J. L. Kennedy
3. 1939-1941: Douglas Ellson
1941-1942: None
4. 1942-1944: C. E. Stuart
1944-1945: None
5. 1945-1946: D. W. Taylor
1946-1948: None
6. 1948-1949: Harry Helsen

- 1949-1950: None
7. 1950-1951: Edward Girden
1951-1952: None
 8. 1952-1953: S. R. Hathaway
1953-1955: None
 9. 1955-1956: J. K. Adams
1956-1958: None
 10. 1958-1960: Edward Girden and David Moulton
 11. 1960-1961: Rosemarie Moore
1961-1963: None
 12. 1963-1964: Bernard Harleston
1964-1965: None
 13. 1965-1966: Charles Imm
1966-1968: None
 14. 1968 (summer): Anthony N. Doob
 15. 1968-1969: Paul Bakan
1969- : None

Let it be said, before any of the work of the Fellows following Coover is considered, that none of them was responsible for the re-definition of Mr. Stanford's original purpose. They had every reason to presume that the acceptance of their research projects by the Psychical Research Committee of the Department of Psychology validated them. They were also supervised, more or less, by permanent members of the Department. The fact of the matter is that all of the Stanford Psychical Research Fellows had commendable academic records both before and after holding the Fellowship. These things are said to make it clear that no moral censure of any of these scholars is intended in what follows.

It might be added also that those who were responsible for perverting the intentions of the donor doubtless did so under the conviction that "one can't spend the income of a million dollars on spooks." What such a view overlooks, however, is the purpose of the donor as well as the interests of thousands of persons who are today either working or interested in the field of psychical research and who do believe that psychic phenomena exist and have been proved to exist.

VIII

Dr. John L. Kennedy was selected as Psychical Research Fellow after Coover. He served in that capacity for the years 1937-1939.

After he had been at Stanford University for a year, *Time* magazine (August 8, 1938) described his work and attitude in the following way:

Second and present occupant is a black-haired tenacious young man named John Kennedy. Both Coover and Kennedy have used the research funds provided by Thomas Welton Stanford to try to expose the phenomena in which the donor believed.

Young Kennedy has set himself the job of exploding the claims of Duke University's Joseph Banks Rhine, inventor of the card-guessing experiments which he claims prove Extra-Sensory Perception ("ESP"), a Rhinism for telepathy and clairvoyance. . . .

The *Time* statement is filled with errors. Such was the impression, however, that was left by Kennedy after a year as Fellow. The fact was that Kennedy had been *instructed* to test the hypotheses, methods, etc., of Rhine. The Biennial Report of the Department Committee on Psychical Research dated August 31, 1939, makes this clear. In the report, it is asserted:

In view of the popularization of ESP by J. B. Rhine of the Duke University Parapsychology Laboratory and his many claims that appeared to be contrary to the best opinions of critical workers in the field of parapsychology, Dr. Terman and the Committee encouraged Dr. Kennedy to test as many of the Rhine methods, hypotheses, and laboratory findings as feasible during his tenure. From the time of Dr. Kennedy's arrival in June, 1937, to the time of Dr. Coover's death in February he was under the immediate guidance and counseling of Dr. Coover. . . . After the death of Dr. Coover the initiative for planning and executing research plans rested almost entirely on Dr. Kennedy; the members of the committee, however, took a more active part in a critical and advisory capacity than heretofore.

It is clear, therefore, that the direction of Kennedy's research was determined by several factors: (a) Coover's counseling; (b) the advice of Terman and the committee; and (c) Kennedy himself.

It is not possible here to review in any detail the research Kennedy did between 1937 and 1939 while he was the Psychical Research Fellow. He produced, in general, papers (which were published) that constituted vigorous criticism of the methods, hypotheses, and claims of the "successful" parapsychologists; he revealed errors in their research. There is no doubt that, among the Fellows, Kennedy can be marked out as a forceful opponent of the claims of the Duke and other parapsychologists.

The impression Kennedy made on Dr. Rhine is brought out in a letter the latter wrote to Mr. Charles E. Ozanne on December 5,

1941. There, Rhine comments:

Following the death of Dr. Coover, who had the title "Fellow in Psychical Research," as well as the title in psychology, a young fellow in Psychical Research was appointed. This was Dr. John Kennedy. He held the position for two years, and during that time did no constructive work whatever, but both in his writing and lectures undertook to cast all possible injurious reflections upon the research being done at Duke. Any neutral observer must surely have recognized him as a bitter enemy to the progress of our own endeavors. To such use had the money for psychical research been put. (Note 22)

The statement of *Time* magazine about Kennedy was largely erroneous, and that of Dr. Rhine perhaps too harsh a judgment. As was noted, Kennedy was led to the sort of research he did by Coover, Terman, and the committee. To suppose that his negative results and his discovery of faulty methods and errors in the work of parapsychologists were conspiratorial or malevolent is a non sequitur. In a letter of January 23, 1970, to the present writer, Kennedy said: "To the best of my recall, I seriously tried to repeat the Duke experiments. When I did not get the same results, I formulated and tested hypotheses as to why. These hypotheses, e.g., recording errors, sensory cues, fraud, faulty experimental controls, etc., seemed reasonable, and I obtained some evidence to support them."

The scientist must accept the warranted results he gets, whether positive or negative, and Kennedy did that. One can nonetheless understand the distress of those with an emotional investment in the psi hypothesis. One can understand also that the research results of Kennedy buttressed the negative conclusions that Coover had earlier reached, which clearly relieved the University of any obligation to alter the use of the income from the large 1918 legacy by diverting some or all of it to psychical research, which the will made permissible.

Dr. Douglas George Ellson was the third Fellow (1939-1941). Four articles were published by him over the years 1940-1942, which were, however, researched by him during his two-year tenure of the Fellowship. Only the first article was actually in the field of parapsychology, and that was critical. It was entitled "A Criticism of Dr. Pratt's Use of Chapman's 'Statistics of the Method of Correct Matching' in the Evaluation of ESP in Drawings" (Note 23). Though not an investigation of psychical phenomena in Stanford's meaning of that notion, Ellson's first paper was minimally on a parapsychological topic. His three other articles were on hallucination. In terms of the 1937 redefinition of T. W. Stanford's purpose, the in-

vestigation of hallucination would be within "the psychical research field." Since hallucinations are not, as such, psychical phenomena, they would be wholly inappropriate data for investigation from T. W. Stanford's point of view. It is noteworthy that these three articles were not published in any journal of parapsychology but in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. Here is conclusive evidence that the widened definition of 1937 was such as to permit research in psychology, which was not Stanford's intention for the Fellowship.

The despair of the friends of psychical research was partially dispelled by the fourth appointment to the Fellowship. Prior to this appointment, there had been vocal discontent on the part of Rhine, Gardner Murphy, and Mr. Ozanne with respect to the administering of the Stanford psychical research funds. It is doubtful whether this agitation influenced the University authorities. In any case, Charles E. Stuart was granted the Fellowship for a two-year period, beginning with 1942. Encouragement to the friends of parapsychology came through the fact that Dr. Stuart had been trained under Rhine at the Duke Parapsychology Laboratory. Hopes were thus raised that Stanford University would now use the Fellowship fund "properly" and that a new era might be on its way.

Stuart found the situation at Stanford cordial, and so described it in early letters to Rhine. As time went on, however, he felt that he had been brought to the University "wholly accidentally" and that actually no clear policy toward the Fellowship existed. He was told on "a friendly basis" by some Psychology Department members that there was opposition to his work and that he would be doing himself a favor if he would do research in another area. In a letter of April 12, 1943, to Rhine, Stuart wrote:

... Actually only a reasonable sense of humor keeps the situation from being really tragic. My psychic research friends are contemptuous of my ESP work, when I should be righteously pushing the survival question as the Stanford gift intended. My colleagues are kindly, but there is steel in their advice that "a lot of opposition exists around here to the sort of thing you are doing, and if you would only take up a problem in an allied field of perception everybody would be more favorably disposed. . . ." (Note 24)

Stuart published several articles as a result of his research at Stanford University. They were not earth-shaking in their results, but they were positive, i.e., statistically significant. Here was the only oasis in the psychical desert at Stanford. But even this oasis was denied existence by a Stanford spokesman. In 1962, on Stanford University stationery, Robert E. Lamar, science editor for the News Ser-

vice, provided a report on the status of psychical research at Stanford University. He wrote:

The most comprehensive work done under this endowment was probably that of Dr. John Edgar Coover, who was the Psychic Research Fellow from 1912 until his retirement in 1938 [sic]. He exposed a number of mediums and gave an occasional course on the history of the psychic research movement. His findings were all negative but he was a most honest worker, in the opinion of faculty members. Some of the first fellows, particularly Dr. John Kennedy, checked many of the claims of the well known Dr. Rhine of Duke University, but were unable to verify any of them. When this had continued for a number of years, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, then President of the University, asked that a man trained by Dr. Rhine be appointed as a fellow. This was done—Dr. Charles Stuart was the man, and he was given a completely free hand. After three [sic], years, Dr. Stuart had to admit failure in verifying the Rhine material. (Note 25)

This report, with slight modifications, appeared in *Fate* magazine (Note 26). It reveals that, almost twenty years after Stuart had been at the University, its officials were taking a public stand that was demonstrably false. Stuart's published articles clearly demonstrate the falsity of Lamar's report.

Dr. Rhine, in talking to the writer in 1969 about the Lamar episode, said:

If they had taken that money and had never made any pretense of using it for psychical research it would be just so much money lost. The unforgivable aspect of this history is the use of the money to destroy the good name and status of the psychical research field. To cap the climax, the misrepresentation of the two years of good work done there by Stuart seems like deliberate falsification. (Note 27)

The fifth Fellow was Dr. Donald W. Taylor. He published nothing as a result of the Fellowship; he held it for only one year (1945-1946). Dr. Hilgard, now retired from the Stanford Department of Psychology, has indicated, however, that Taylor "attempted to produce by hypnosis a visual effect discovered by S. H. Bartley known as 'enhancement effect'" (Note 28). This research topic is in line with the 1937 restatement of the Fellowship's purpose but obviously is incompatible with the stated purpose of the donor.

Dr. Harry Helsen (1948-1949) was the sixth Fellow. He too did not publish any papers related to his year as Fellow. Helsen did, however, have an interest in psychical phenomena, having observed as a child some inexplicable phenomena at seances and some poltergeist activity in his home. He had also been an assistant to Gardner Murphy when the latter was a Hodgson Research Fellow at Harvard. Despite this background, Helsen did no research in the psychical area. He an-

swered a few letters addressed to him which raised questions about psychical phenomena and talked to others who called on him in his University office. His only research involved "some experiments on perceptual problems, one on the role of meaning in raising visual acuity, and some experiments on constancy, etc." (Note 29). Nothing was published of these researches.

It is clear that, over his year as Fellow, Helsen did no investigating of psychical phenomena as the donor intended the incumbent should do. This is not meant to be critical of Helsen, an extremely able psychologist. He, like all the Fellows, was under the supervision of the Psychical Research Committee and the Department of Psychology.

The seventh Fellow was Dr. Edward Girden, who had this status in 1950-1951 and again in 1958-1960. With Kennedy, Girden stands out as one who took a strong stand against the psi field. The first article he published as an outcome of his incumbency was entitled "The Galvanic Skin Response 'Set,' and the Acoustical Threshold" (Note 30). This article obviously has no content that would place it in harmony with T. W. Stanford's purpose. Neither does it appear to have any bearing on the 1937 restatement of Stanford's intentions.

In 1962, however, Girden published an article done under double auspices, namely, the Stanford Psychical Research Fellowship and the John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship. The article's title was "A Review of Psychokinesis" (Note 31). In this long article, Girden noted the deficiencies in the PK research that had been done and concluded that "evidence of PK as a psychological phenomenon . . . is totally lacking." Gardner Murphy undertook to answer the criticisms made by Girden in an article in the *Psychological Bulletin* (Note 32).

Girden represents, again, the negative sort of emphasis that marks many of the Fellows, as well as a use of the Fellowship that is completely irrelevant to the intentions of the donor.

Dr. Starke R. Hathaway was the eighth T. W. S. Fellow, serving in that capacity in 1952-1953. His interest was in "clinical intuition," which he described as follows:

. . . Clinical intuition will denote the inferential process producing clinical inferences made by a percipient or receiver person relative to a target person in which the inferences have their source in cues or cognitive processes that the percipient is unable to identify or specify with satisfactory completeness. This includes examples in which the percipient thinks he uses specified cues, but other evidences show that these cannot reasonably account for the accuracy. (Note 33)

Hathaway's work is not an investigation of psychical phenomena and thus does not conform to T. W. Stanford's requirements for the

Fellowship. It probably conforms to the 1937 restatement in that his work has a tangential relationship to parapsychology. It could be that, on occasion at least, what is taken for an ESP process may be explicable in terms of unconscious inference from cues of which the individual is not aware or not in sufficient completeness anyway to account for the resulting accuracy.

In his work, Hathaway remained, as he said, "serious in my reference to telepathy or some such possible communication as an explanation . . ." (Note 34). There is no reason to doubt what Hathaway says here. As he also wrote, however: ". . . My interest was not in psychic research as a particular field; my interest was in the closely related question as to whether two persons communicate by ordinarily inexplicable means. The applied area of my interest is the nature of rapport between doctor and patient, where many persons have felt that such communication exceeds ordinary explanation" (Note 35).

Hathaway found some members of the Department of Psychology to be very negative in regard to psi. As he added, however, the great majority of experimental psychologists were negativistic, so the Stanford opposition was not differentiated from that outside the University. Hathaway was doubtless a conscientious investigator, with weak interest in psychical research, but had he discovered some evidence of telepathy, he would have said so. He found none.

The ninth Fellow was Dr. J. K. Adams (1955-1956). Adams became interested in the Fellowship through Dr. Ellson, who told Adams that the Fellow usually worked on problems related to psychical research but did not work in the field itself (Note 36).

In the work Adams did under the auspices of the Fellowship, he attempted to lead experimental subjects to respond to cues above the threshold without their conscious awareness they were doing this. His experimental work was ingenious, and some subjects believed they were getting information telepathically when, in fact, they were learning to respond unconsciously to color cues. The result of this research was an article entitled "Laboratory Studies of Behavior Without Awareness" (Note 37). While Fellow, Adams also did research for another published paper entitled "A Confidence Scale Defined in Terms of Expected Percentages" (Note 38). This was "on a different problem," however, and had no relationship to psychical research. In terms of T. W. Stanford's requirements for the Fellowship, neither did the first paper. The first paper, however, doubtless conformed to the 1937 redefinition of the use of the Fellowship.

The tenth Fellow was Dr. David Gilman Moulton (1958-1960).

His training was in physiology. As a result of his research while Fellow, he published an article entitled "Studies in Olfactory Acuity. III. Relative Detectability of n-Aliphatic Acetates by the Rat" (Note 39). Such research has no bearing whatsoever on Stanford's intentions for use of the Fellowship, and it is difficult to understand how it could be in agreement with the 1937 statement. It would be unfair to Moulton and to the University, however, if it were not noted that he also had an interest in the homing capacities of birds. J. G. Pratt, at the Duke Parapsychology Laboratory, had investigated this problem with the idea of testing out the ESP hypothesis as an explanation. Since he was skeptical of Pratt's results, Moulton carried out work on sensory cues involved in spatial orientation. On the whole, his results were inconclusive.

The departmental supervision Moulton got was practically *nil*. His sponsor, then an assistant professor of psychology, provided him no direction. Nor did the chairman of the Psychical Research Committee take any interest in his work. Moulton was happy over this lack of interest; he felt that it enriched his time at Stanford. Moulton's experience in this regard reveals, however, that the supervision over the Fellows varied greatly.

The eleventh Fellow was Dr. Rosemary Klein Moore (1960-1961), who worked collaboratively with L. W. Lauer. In 1963, she published an article on her and Lauer's work entitled "Hypnotic Susceptibility in Middle Childhood" (Note 40). This work was permissible under the "broad definition" of "the psychical research field" of 1937 but would not have conformed with the intentions of Mr. Stanford.

The twelfth Fellow was Dr. Bernard Warren Harleston (1963-1964). This man published nothing as a result of his research. Dean Albert H. Hastorf, Humanities and Science at Stanford, recalled the nature of Harleston's work, about which he wrote:

As a psychologist, he has been interested primarily in the interrelationship between motivational states and perceptual events. It is my recollection that during his tenure at Stanford that he performed some studies dealing with the impact of motivational state on perceptual thresholds and that these included a concern with certain subliminal phenomena. I am sure that he would consider that an all too informal account of his research but it is my best recollection of what he was up to. (Note 41)

It is clear that Harleston worked within the framework of the 1937 restatement of purpose but not within the terms of T. W. Stanford's statement of his purpose.

Dr. Charles Roger Imm was the thirteenth T.W.S. Fellow in 1965-1966. Dr. Hilgard of the University Department of Psychology, now retired, informed the writer that what Imm did as Fellow was simply to extend research he had done at Stanford for his doctoral dissertation. His doctoral thesis was entitled "An Exploration of Repression Through Hypnotically Implanted Conflicts." Dr. Hilgard, in his book *The Experience of Hypnosis*, provides an account of the kind of work that Imm did in his doctoral thesis and during the year following when he held the Fellowship. He describes the work of Imm as follows:

The induction of artificial conflicts through hypnosis has had a long history, and the method is a promising one for the study of many problems, including symbolic distortion in dreams, the engendering of psychosomatic reactions, shifts in defense preferences, and so on. Studies of this type typically produce in the subject a falsified memory (paramnesia) of some distressing event the recall of which produces remorse, anxiety or hostility. He is then given amnesia for his paramnesia, but told that the event will continue to bother him. If, a little later, he is to dream under hypnosis the chance is good that the dream will have some derivatives of the paramnesic experience (e.g., Barron, 1963, pages 231-32).

A study of this kind is now under way in our laboratory as a doctoral investigation (Imm, 1965). (Note 42)

As mentioned above, it was in continuation of such research that Imm spent his year as T.W.S. Fellow. It is obvious that this was not an investigation of psychical phenomena. The research did conform, however, to the 1937 restatement.

Dr. Anthony Doob was appointed a T.W.S. Fellow for the summer of 1968. Doob, in a letter to the writer, said that his main interest as a Fellow did not lie in trying to prove whether psi phenomena exist or do not exist. Rather, he was interested in the fact that some people believe that they do and others do not. His research was designed to find out "what sort of cognitive variables might differentiate between these two groups" (Note 43). One can wonder how this psycho-sociological topic even fits into the 1937 restatement. It is clearly not an investigation of psychical phenomena and would not conform to Stanford's requirements.

Dr. Paul Bakan held the T.W.S. Fellowship in 1968-1969 and published two articles under its auspices. One was entitled "Hypnotizability, Laterality of Eye-Movements and Functional Brain Asymmetry" (Note 44). The other, which he wrote in collaboration with Domin Svorad, was entitled "Resting EEG Alpha and Asymmetry of Reflective Lateral Eye Movements" (Note 45). Bakan

viewed this work as related to ESP. This relationship was explained in a letter to the author (Feb. 27, 1970), part of which follows:

Of greatest interest in connection with ESP is the following set of relationships:

(1) People who make left lateral eye-movements upon reflection in trying to think of an answer to a question have (a) more EEG alpha and (b) greater hypnotizability (these things I found in my research at Stanford).

(2) Krippner has shown that ESP performance is better when subjects are producing more EEG alpha.

(3) This suggests that people who make left lateral eye-movements might score higher in ESP tasks. I expect to check on this hypothesis soon.

J. B. Rhine viewed Bakan's connection of his work with ESP as "far-fetched" (Note 46). Dr. Montague Ullman thought that Bakan's work was not yet "directly in the parapsychological field" but that Bakan was working in an area "which I think will ultimately converge with experimental work in parapsychology" (Note 47). It is likely that Bakan's work would fall within the range of the 1937 re-statement of purpose but obviously not within the stated purpose of the donor of the Fellowship.

Information from the Department of Psychology office at Stanford University indicates that no T. W. Stanford Psychical Research Fellow has been appointed since Bakan in 1969.

IX

One wonders why Bakan and so many of the other Fellows remained outside the field of psychical phenomena when it was clearly the intention of Mr. Stanford that the income from his gift of 1911 be used exclusively and wholly for the investigation of psychical phenomena and for the dissemination of the resulting knowledge. No blame falls on the Fellows. The cause of this aberration would seem to rest with those who changed the purpose of the Fellowship in 1937, making it possible thereby for the Fellows to work in psychological rather than in psychical areas. The cause would seem to lie also in those who administered the Fellowship. In some instances, there was no supervision of the work of Fellows. The general climate of opinion in the Department of Psychology was also unfavorable to research on psychical phenomena. Stuart and some other Fellows reported on this, saying that there existed a negative and unfriendly attitude toward work in the psi field. In any event,

the regularity with which the Fellows took negative postures toward ESP-PK or remained outside the psi area of investigation is all too evident and obvious to be a result of chance. Even official spokesmen, e.g., Lamar, stated publicly what was demonstrably false, namely, that Stuart had got no positive results in his two years of parapsychological research at Stanford. The sum total of these occurrences hardly seems a matter of coincidence. On the other hand, it does not follow that the University administration or the influential members of the Department of Psychology were engaged in any conspiracy against psychical research. Their honest beliefs and conscientious opinions could well have been solely responsible. At the same time, it must be kept in mind that, had there been considerable success on the part of the Fellows in substantiating the Rhine and similar claims, pressures would doubtless have arisen to alter the use of the 1918 legacy, whose income could have been used for psychical investigation exclusively. The actual events associated with the sixty years of the Fellowship's use removed all such pressures from that source.

X

It is not possible here to elaborate on the history of parapsychology outside the walls of Stanford University. Nor is it necessary for the readers of this *Journal* who know it to be vastly different from Stanford's. Parapsychologists are aware of the accomplishments in psi research at the Duke University Parapsychology Laboratory and later at the Foundation for Research on the Nature of Man.² They

² In a second comment in his previously mentioned letter, Dr. Mauskopf noted that the present writer had contrasted "Stanford University's treatment of psychical research with Duke's." He suggested in his letter that a better comparison would have been to contrast it with the Hodgson Fellowship at Harvard University. This could well be the case, though the present writer believes that the same conclusions he drew would have resulted were Mauskopf's suggestion followed. The fact is that Stanford administrators and T.W.S. Fellows saw Duke's work in parapsychology as a challenge to their position; the Duke parapsychologists on their part looked to a "rectification" of the Stanford position. To contrast Stanford and Duke with respect to their treatments of psychical research seemed natural and proper to the writer, for the participants were themselves involved in this process. The Hodgson Fellowship played no vital part in these matters. To make the contrasting of Stanford and Duke reasonable, however, there would also have to be significant similarities between what went on in the two institutions. (One does not sensibly contrast an ink bottle with a tiger.) There seem to have been such similarities. Both Stanford and Duke had laboratories for the investigation of psychical phenomena. The Stanford Laboratory was in the organizational framework of the University's Department of Psychology and Coover was given faculty status within that department. This kind of arrangement was true of the Duke Parapsychology Laboratory for a number of years until Dr. Rhine achieved independence of the laboratory from the Duke University Psychology Department. Like Coover, Rhine was also a member of his university's Department of Psychology.

know of the existence of a number of reputable research centers in psi such as the Center for the Study of Psychic Phenomena at the Rockland State Hospital, Orangeburg, N. Y.; the Division of Parapsychology, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Virginia; the Division of Parapsychology and Psychophysics, Department of Psychiatry, Maimonides Medical Center, Brooklyn, N. Y.; the Institut für Grenzgebiete der Psychologie, Freiburg, W. Germany; the Institute of Psychophysical Research, Oxford, England; the Parapsychological Division of the Psychological Laboratory, Utrecht, the Netherlands; the Parapsychology Laboratory, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa., Psi Communications Project, Newark College of Engineering, Newark, N. J.; the Psychical Research Foundation, Durham, N. C.; the Religious Experience Research Unit, Manchester College, Oxford, and Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, California. In addition, psi research is carried on in many colleges and universities throughout the world, either formally or informally.

With respect to graduate training in parapsychology, one can note that a Ph.D. degree may be obtained for work in parapsychology at Andhra University, India. A Ph.D. thesis topic in parapsychology is acceptable at the University of California (Davis) for the doctoral degree in psychology. A similar arrangement presently exists in the Department of Psychology at the University of Edinburgh and higher degrees may be obtained through work in parapsychology at Freiburg University, West Germany. In the fall of 1973, a Ph.D. program in parapsychology was instituted at California State College (Sonoma) in connection with its Humanistic Psychology Institute.

These are only some of the outward signs of increasingly widespread development of the psi field. Parapsychologists, in common with some other scientists, are not able to produce *strict* repeatability in their experimental work. There are nonetheless many reliable

Coover's long tenure as T.W.S. Fellow (1912-1937) gave him a status comparable in the thirties to that of J. B. Rhine, so that both were spokesmen for a point of view about psi. Both Stanford and Duke carried on their work in what they believed to be a scientific manner. Their methods were similar at least in their use of cards and statistical procedures. Both wanted the support of the orthodox scientific community. Both institutions made use chiefly of investigators who had been trained in the techniques of psychological research.

These similarities would appear to justify the writer's choice of a Stanford-Duke comparison rather than a Stanford-Harvard one. The writer nonetheless looks forward to the latter comparison in the forthcoming book co-authored by Dr. Mauskopf. It should prove illuminating and valuable.

generalizations in parapsychology. Psi researchers have discovered the chronological decline, psi-missing, forward and backward displacement, the focusing effect, subjective attitudes that enhance ESP performance, physiological correlates of ESP, that the psi process is unitary, that the psi capacity is in its essential function unconscious, etc. These are generalizations and information over and above the abundant statistical and other evidences for the existence of ESP-PK phenomena. It is perhaps in virtue of these results and the improved methods that produced them that the Parapsychological Association was admitted in 1969 into the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

XI

In light of the events recounted in the foregoing sections of this paper, one can only hope that the Stanford University authorities will one day take appropriate legal action such that a selected board of American research parapsychologists will choose and supervise the T. W. Stanford Psychical Research Fellow. Under a plan of this kind, suitable Fellows, research problems, and adequate direction could be provided. After a period of years, when the results of these investigations had been fairly evaluated, a decision could be made to use some or all of the 1918 legacy funds for psychical science, a completely permissible option in terms of the donor's will and far more in accord with his wishes than anything that has yet transpired at Stanford in this regard.

NOTES

1. From an article entitled "Passed Within the Veil." *Harbinger of Light*, Oct. 1, 1918. See p. 191.
2. From an unpublished biography by L. M. Terman entitled "Thomas Welton Stanford, a Brief Character Sketch." From notes by Prof. J. E. Coover. No date. Stapled by Stanford University Archives, Sept. 21, 1939. Stanford Collection, 33D, Box 2, 2-17.
3. Stanford Collection 33D, Box 2, 2-14. Stanford University Archives.
4. From "A Legal History of Stanford University" from materials in the George E. Crothers Collection, Vol. I, compiled by Jerry E. Berg. Letter No. 6. Unpublished. Stanford University Libraries. LD3027, B4f. Locked stack.
5. Stanford Collection, 27, Box 2, Vol. IV. Stanford University Archives.
6. Entitled "Agreement. The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University and Thomas Welton Stanford. Dated: April 28, 1911.

Wilson and Wilson, 14 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Cal. Attorneys-at-law." Stanford Collection 27, Box 2, Vol. V. Stanford University Archives.

The use of the word "Junior" in the title is because Leland Stanford named the university after his only son, who died in Florence, Italy, on March 13, 1884 from typhoid fever while the family was on a trip to Europe. The son was only a young teen-ager at the time. The "Junior" is now no longer used in the title.

7. Stanford Collection 27, Box 2, Vol. V. Stanford University Archives.
8. *Stanford Alumnus*, Vol. XIII, (No. 6), Feb., 1912. See p. 191.
9. Letter from T. W. Stanford to President David Starr Jordan. Stanford Collection, 33D, Box 2, 2-13. Stanford University Archives.
10. Copies of the will and the codicil were obtained by the author from the Office of the Registrar of Probates, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
11. "The Sad State of Psychic Research at Stanford University" by James Crenshaw. *Fate*. Vol. 15 (No. 10), Oct., 1962. See p. 30.
12. From a letter by J. B. Rhine to Charles E. Ozanne, Dec. 5, 1941. Manuscripts Division, Perkins Library, Duke University.
13. Published in the *Harbinger of Light*, Nov. 1, 1913. See p. 169.
14. Stanford University President's Report, 1915-1916. Stanford University Library. See pp. 112-113.
15. From "Reply to Critics of the Stanford Experiments on Thought-transference" by J. E. Coover and J. L. Kennedy in the *Journal of Parapsychology*, 1939, Vol. 3, pp. 17-28. See p. 24.
16. From the correspondence file of John E. Coover, 4512, Stanford University Archives.
17. *Ibid.*
18. From a copy of the original document obtained by the author from a member of the Dept. of Psychology at Stanford University. The document was essentially a mimeographed announcement designed to be sent out to potential candidates for the fellowship. It was entitled "Psychical Research Fellowship. Stanford University, Stipend \$2500.00."
19. *California Jurisprudence*, Vol. 48, Series 2, Section 2. See p. 654.
20. *California Jurisprudence*, Vol. 10, Series 2, Section 46. See p. 252.
21. *American Jurisprudence*, Vol. 15, Series 2, Section 133. See p. 142.
22. From J. B. Rhine's correspondence in the Manuscript Division, Perkins Library, Duke University.
23. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 1940, Vol. 4, pp. 329-336.
24. From J. B. Rhine's correspondence in the Manuscript Division, Perkins Library, Duke University.
25. *Ibid.*
26. "The Sad State of Psychic Research at Stanford University" by James Crenshaw. *Fate*. Vol. 15 (No. 10), Oct., 1962. See p. 29.
27. From a conversation in Durham, N. C., on Sept. 2, 1969.
28. From a conversation with the author in April 1970.
29. Letter to the author dated Jan. 22, 1970.
30. *American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 65 (April 1, 1952), pp. 233-243.
31. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1962, Vol. 59 (No. 6), pp. 353-388.

32. "Report on Paper by Edward Girden on Psychokinesis." *Psychological Bulletin*, 1962, Vol. 59 (No. 6), pp. 520-528.
33. In an article entitled "Clinical Intuition and Inferential Accuracy." *Journal of Personality*, 1956, Vol. 24, pp. 223-250.
34. In a letter to the author, Jan. 27, 1970.
35. Ibid.
36. Letter to the author from J. K. Adams, Feb. 28, 1970.
37. In the *Psychological Bulletin*, 1957, Vol. 54 (No. 5), pp. 383-405.
38. In the *American Journal of Psychology*, 1957, Vol. 70 (No. 3), pp. 432-436.
39. In the *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1960, Vol. 12, pp. 203-213.
40. In the *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 1963, Vol. 11 (No. 3), pp. 167-174.
41. In a letter to the author, April 10, 1970.
42. Hilgard, Ernest M. *The Experience of Hypnosis*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968. See pp. 160-162.
43. From a letter to the author, March 8, 1970.
44. In *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1969, Vol. 28, pp. 927-932.
45. In *Nature*, Aug. 30, 1969, Vol. 223 (No. 5209), pp. 975-976.
46. In a letter to the author, Dec. 8, 1969.
47. In a letter to the author, Dec. 15, 1969.

Dept. of Philosophy
San José State University
San José, Calif. 95114