

gets possession, for a short period, of a power that surpasses by a quantum leap the power of a recognized psychic superstar. That does not make sense. A prosaic analogy at this point may be helpful. Let us suppose that someone like Geller is legitimate and grant that his power is generated solely by his mind. Let us call him the supreme talent, the greatest genius, the Mozart of psychic ability. Would it not be very strange if untalented, untrained psychic bumpkins like my friend Frances and hundreds of other poltergeist victims (or agents, if you insist) should suddenly start composing psychic music not only equivalent to Mozart's *Requiem*, but vastly superior to it? That, I submit, is not the way the mind works. Something else is going on here. Frances was not, I strongly suspect, the composer. Neither are any of the other targets of poltergeist outbreaks. I am perfectly willing to grant that the human mind, including my own, has a very limited, very narrow PK ability. But I am not willing to grant that for a few weeks of a person's life he may be suddenly gifted with an explosive PK talent, and that this talent is the sole source of the poltergeist. I would just as soon expect a great symphony to come pouring out of my unmusical mind at any minute. Genius does not work that way. Neither, in my opinion, does PK.

There may be mini-poltergeist disturbances that are generated by the living mind alone. For all I know, the ever-so-slight fluttering of the curtain last night in my tightly-shut bedroom may have been caused by the same kind of psychic discharge that makes Kulagina's cigarettes move. My point here, and in my first article, is that the kind of poltergeist outbreaks that are studied, that involve *striking* movement or noise or smells or sounds, are probably not generated by a living agent alone. Moreover—and now it seems necessary to invoke the law of parsimony—they are probably all caused by the same sort or thing: what Stevenson and many others, including myself, call, with good reason (because they seem to be present, possess power, yet are insensible), a discarnate agent.

L. S. BETTY

BOOK REVIEWS

SCIENCE AND PARASCIENCE: A HISTORY OF THE PARANORMAL, 1914–1939 by Brian Inglis. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1984. 382 pp. £12.95. Illustrated.

In a previous book, *Natural and Supernatural*, Brian Inglis surveyed the history of parapsychology up to 1914. The present book, *Science and Parascience*, continues the task limiting its coverage to the 1914–1939 period. As Inglis writes on page 345, another limitation of the book is that it covers only material published in English or French. This qualification, which should have been stated in the introduction to provide a better orientation to the book's content, alerts us to the fact that developments in countries such as Germany and Italy will not be covered in this history unless the relevant material was translated into the above mentioned languages. In reality, then, the emphasis of the book is on England, the United States, and France.

Chapter one, 'The Forerunners', reviews developments prior to and circa 1914 as an introduction to discussions of events after that date. Topics such as the work of the SPR and the mediumship of D. D. Home, Eusapia Palladino, Stanislaw Tomczyk, and Eva C. are briefly mentioned.

The second chapter, entitled 'The First World War', covers developments in England and Ireland during the first great war. The cross-correspondences, and the mediumship of Mrs. Gladys Osborne Leonard are among the topics discussed. The most famous mediumistic communications of the times, those related to Raymond Lodge, are also included here. However, little mention is made of the explanations offered for or the controversies surrounding the cross-correspondences, although the attitudes of Oliver Lodge and Eleanor Sidgwick, regarding some of these communications, are discussed.

Also included in the second chapter is a section on the 'Goligher Circle', a mediumistic group in Belfast studied by engineer W. J. Crawford. This research, in Inglis' opinion, 'represented the first attempt systematically to study the physical phenomena of mediumship with the help of engineering techniques and apparatus . . .' (p. 62). Without trying to diminish the credit Crawford's experiments deserve in the history of process research with physical mediums, it should be pointed out that some of the physical measurements reported by him have some precedent in the literature,¹ of which Inglis is aware. Inglis sees Crawford's initial work as a development of great importance to psychical research in England. He writes:

Here was the opportunity to catch up with the researchers on the Continent, in the field where the SPR had so conspicuously lagged behind [physical mediumship]. Lodge would have been the obvious person to review the book [Crawford's *The Reality of Psychic Phenomena*] for the *Journal* [of the SPR], but he could have been expected to give it a favourable notice. Eleanor Sidgwick therefore decided to review it herself; and she dismissed Crawford's evidence with a contemptuous 'the more rationalistic hypothesis is that the cantilever in question is the leg and foot of the medium'.

Her antipathy to the physical phenomena may not have been her only reason for this verdict. Crawford had committed the heinous sin of submitting reports of his work to the editor of *Light*, a journal which leaned too far to spiritualism, and paid too little attention to scientific method, for her taste (p. 66).

In my opinion Inglis, here, speculates beyond the evidence he presents. It is implied that Mrs. Sidgwick reviewed the book to avoid giving Lodge a positive say on it, and that, in part, her dismissal of Crawford's evidence resulted from a negative reaction to Crawford's publication of his early reports in a spiritualist journal. But where is the evidence to support such accusations? Sidgwick's review and a subsequent communication² do not strike me as completely unreasonable in principle (though I find her normal explanation postulating the use of the medium's leg and foot unconvincing for several incidents) as she mainly asks for better controls and evidential conditions before process considerations are emphasized.

In chapter three, 'Post-War Britain', Inglis is of the opinion that: 'The SPR could not look back over the war years with any sense of achievement . . .' (p. 67), since even research with Mrs. Leonard's mediumship was 'offset by the adverse effect which the publication of Raymond had on scientists . . .' (p. 67). Though the war years were certainly difficult for research, it may be argued that Inglis overlooks important publications during this period that show some level of achievement, however modest.³

The chapter includes mention of Mrs. Sidgwick's 1922 compilation of spontaneous ESP cases from SPR publications, and of more controversial topics such as the 'Cottingley Fairies' photographs and the alleged exposure of Hope's spirit photographs by Harry Price. A long section is devoted to the Goligher Circle, since Crawford had continued his investigations. However, Crawford's suicide in 1920 and the posthumous publication of his book, *The Psychic Structures at the Goligher Circle*, in 1921 (which contains what most people consider to be ridiculous and difficult to accept photographs of ectoplasm) did not help the acceptance of his research. Inglis mentions Fournier d'Albe's research with the circle, pointing out problems with d'Albe's reasoning and research methods. Important omissions here are the reports published by Stevenson, which may be considered to present independent replication of some of the phenomena reported by Crawford.⁴

'So long as physical mediumship remained an unfashionable area of psychical research', Inglis writes, 'the full value of Crawford's work was unlikely to be appreciated' (p. 83). Inglis does not mention, however, Dingwall's comment in the *SPR Proceedings* that Crawford's publications 'can scarcely fail to be regarded in the future as the most important contributions towards the study of telekinesis which have appeared up to the time that their author met his untimely end'.⁵ I think Inglis generalises here as to the reaction of the psychical research community to Crawford's work without transcending the boundaries of British psychical research. Admittedly the chapter's purpose is to cover the scene in England, but by limiting his evaluation of Crawford's work to this context, the author may give an incorrect impression of the evaluation of Crawford's work by the world at large. In fact, positive comments about Crawford's work were published outside England.⁶ Throughout the book, I am afraid, too much exclusive attention is paid to SPR research and evaluations. Different opinions from the continent and elsewhere are largely forgotten.

Chapter four, 'The Continental Mediums 1918-24', is one of the most interesting in the book, covering research with European mediums, mainly of the physical type. Work with Eva C., Willy Schneider, Franek Kluski, and Jean Guzik is presented, although attention is also paid to ESP work done by Osty as well as to the studies of Brugmans and Tischner. A short but interesting section on Ossowiecki, who favourably impressed both Geley and Richet with his remarkable ESP performances, is also included in this chapter. The discussion, especially that portion which concerns physical mediumship presents problems and controversies about the evaluation of that type of research in the 1920s. This is particularly true of Inglis' account of research done with Eva C. Inglis is highly critical of the SPR's investigation of this medium, as was Geley at the time,⁷ though again the discussion makes no mention of reactions outside the SPR context. The 'hostility' of the SPR towards physical phenomena, and particularly towards the Eva C. case, is stressed using as an example Schiller's review of a book by Schrenck-Notzing (which the author confuses with *Phenomena of Materialisation*, p. 99). Schiller⁸ criticized the way some authors defend the concept of *ideoplasty* in materialization phenomena, that is, that ideas or thoughts by the medium (especially at a subconscious level) may be exteriorized to give shape of specific features to ectoplasmic formations. Although Schiller's pejorative style may be criticized I think he is expressing a legitimate position,

underscoring the ambiguity and lack of specificity in the concept of ideoplasty. Although an interesting concept—and one that should receive more systematic attention—this is largely a post-hoc explanation for puzzling findings obtained in materializations and other areas of psychical research.⁹

Chapter five, 'The USA', covers activities in the United States from the First World War up to the 1920s. The case of Patience Worth, Coover's research, and the activities of William McDougall and Walter Franklin Prince are among the topics discussed here. Most of the chapter is devoted to a generally sympathetic account of the Margery mediumship, continued briefly on chapter nine (pp. 292–297). The Margery case is certainly a difficult one to evaluate and the reader should compare Inglis' defense of the mediumship to Tietze's less positive account of it.¹⁰ In fact, Inglis and Tietze give different interpretations to the investigations and conclusions of a variety of individuals involved with the Margery mediumship (e.g., Code, McDougall, Prince, Rhine). This disagreement illustrates the complexity and subjectivity involved in the retrospective evaluation of this and similar cases. If anything, Inglis shows how controversial and important the Margery case was for the development of psychical research in the United States and that there are aspects of her mediumship that continue to puzzle us after so many years. On the other hand, it seems to me that the author does not give enough attention to, or place enough emphasis on: (a) the actions of those trying to defend Margery at all costs (e.g., rejection of negative papers about the mediumship by *JASPR*, dismissal of Bond as editor of *JASPR*); (b) the implications of Bird's records of fraud dating back to an early stage of the mediumship and their subsequent suppression by the ASPR Board of Directors; and (c) Margery's supporters' reactions and tactics (i.e., attempts to suppress and discredit detractors) in the face of the thumbprint exposure.

An important omission in the discussion of American psychical research is the contribution of James H. Hyslop, especially in the area of mental mediumship.¹¹

Chapter six, 'The SPR in Decline', is concerned with what Inglis sees as the lack of efficient research and action by the SPR in the 1920s. As he writes at the beginning of the chapter:

The reluctance of the Cambridge nucleus to become involved in the investigation of physical mediums, and the negative nature of the report on "Eva's" London series, again took the SPR out of the mainstream of psychical research in the 1920s. Significantly, the two contributions made by members at the 1923 [1921 is the correct date] Copenhagen international conference both dealt with the mental mediumship of Mrs. Osborne Leonard (p. 197).

Inglis admits that the 'SPR continued to perform one useful function' (p. 212), that of publishing spontaneous ESP experiences and conducting ESP studies with Gilbert Murray, but in general he finds the SPR in a crisis during the 1920s. The Society, to quote the author again, was 'bankrupt of new ideas for research, and increasingly uneasy about involving itself in what had become the major preoccupation of researchers on the Continent, physical mediumship . . . ' (p. 215).

The author goes on to review some of Dingwall's activities with physical mediumship during this period, noting his ambiguous and contradictory stances

regarding the evidential value of diverse reports. Harry Price's activities in the 1920s are also mentioned, including his research with Stella C. According to Inglis, Stella C. 'could produce phenomena reasonably consistently . . . such as a fall in temperature in the seance room of over 20 °F . . .' (p. 218). However, it should be pointed out that only on one occasion was such a marked drop in temperature registered (20.5°). A brief look at Price's only systematic presentation of temperature readings in his research with Stella C.¹² shows that out of eleven temperature drops with a range of 0.5°–20.5°, a mean value of 5.4 is obtained (my calculations).

Other matters, such as the mediumship of Mirabelli and Dunne's *An Experiment with Time*, also receive attention. Of special interest regarding crises in the SPR is a brief mention of Besterman's negative review of Hack's *Modern Psychic Mysteries* and Arthur Conan Doyle's resignation of his SPR membership in protest of the review and as an expression of his long-time frustration with SPR research policies. I wish Inglis had given more attention to this episode of the SPR's history considering the strength of the criticisms he presents throughout the book. Besterman's criticisms are presented in a context that presumably indicates his prejudices and dogmatic attitudes. However, it seems to me that the review¹³ presents several good criticisms, although it can be said that Besterman overdoes his points and presents them in too harsh a style. Also, by omitting the discussions generated by Doyle's resignation the readers of Inglis' book are prevented from knowing how the Society's high officials handled criticisms such as those Inglis and Doyle present. As the SPR officials wrote in relation to physical phenomena: 'If the Society's investigations into physical phenomena have throughout its history been infrequent, this is due to the high standard of control conditions on which the Society has always, and properly, insisted, and to the preference shown by physical mediums for the much lower standard maintained elsewhere'.¹⁴ There is much to be said for this point and I think Inglis does not seem to recognize its full importance. On the other hand, Inglis is right to criticize the SPR's general hypercritical attitude (though this should be qualified with specific examples), and it could be argued that perhaps the SPR should have been more active in the investigation of physical phenomena.

Chapter seven, 'Mind Over Matter', is a most interesting and well summarized discussion of research and controversies on physical mediumship with special emphasis on the Rudi Schneider mediumship. Among the aspects covered are Harry Price's controversial 'exposure' of Rudi, as well as the involvement of Hope and Osty. My only criticism here is that in describing Osty's research no mention is made of the relationship found between the infrared ray occlusions and Rudi's respiration rate. The point is mentioned later, but only in connection with remarks by Brown and Rayleigh, and Osty receives no credit for the original discovery.

Also included in the chapter is mention of an attack on Besterman and the SPR by H. Dennis Bradley, as well as further discussions on Eva C.'s mediumship. Regarding this controversial medium, Inglis focuses on Lambert's 1954 paper in *JSPR* where Mme. Bisson's alleged fraudulent complicity is mentioned again (after having been suggested in the 1920s), and where suspicious unpublished photographs of Eva's materializations are discussed. The mediumship is defended by the author who points out diverse problems with Lambert's

arguments as well as Thouless' reactions to them. However, the discussion could have been improved. A better perspective would have been provided on the controversy if reactions to Lambert's paper by parapsychologists writing in non-SPR publications were considered.¹⁵

Chapter eight, 'Extra-Sensory Perception', comments on the experimental ESP studies conducted during the 1920s and 1930s by Jephson, Sinclair, Soal, Rhine, and Tyrrell. The chapter is a brief but good survey of some of the research that led to the change in emphasis from mediumship to experimental studies. It also includes some European research such as the work of Warcollier and studies done with Ossowiecki and Forthuny as subjects. Omissions in the European scene include the publications of Cazzamalli and Richet¹⁶ which emphasize physicalistic explanations of ESP. These are important for, among other things, the contrast they present with more psychological approaches taken by researchers in England and the United States.

The psychical research scene in the 1930s is reviewed in chapter nine, entitled 'Backlash'. Physical mediumship, argues Inglis, started to be neglected even more than before. Mirabelli is mentioned again, and it is difficult to disagree with the author when he says that the fact 'that no serious investigation of Mirabelli was undertaken by researchers with experience of the continental mediums was indeed a blow . . .' (p. 298).

Chapter ten, 'Balance Sheet', chronicles developments in the late 1930s. As Inglis writes regarding changes in the leadership of the field, 'the last years before the outbreak of the Second World War saw the disappearance from the scene of the old guard' (p. 302). This is a reference to the death of researchers like McDougall, Osty, Richet, and Mrs. Sidgwick.

Interactions between science and psychical research are briefly mentioned, cataloguing the same basic problems of recognition and acceptance of psychical phenomena encountered in previous years. Diverse attempts to relate the field to psychology and physics looked promising, but they were not enough to ensure academic acceptance. The situation, in Inglis' opinion, 'was made far harder by the presence within the SPR of members who devoted much of their time to the demolition of any positive results obtained; in particular Rhine's but also those of British investigators', (p. 319).

In his discussion of hypnosis and multiple personality Inglis overemphasizes the role psychical researchers had in the establishing of the phenomena. In his opinion, the reclassification of hypnosis 'as fact, rather than occult fiction, *was largely the work of psychical researchers . . .* And their role in establishing dual or multiple personality is documented in the pages of the *Proceedings* of the psychical research societies, where the reports *which eventually led to its acceptance were originally published . . .*' (p. 306, my italics). There is no doubt, as argued by T. Weir Mitchell,¹⁷ that contributions by some psychical researchers (e.g., Gurney, Myers, Prince) had an impact on the study and theory development of hypnosis, multiple personality and other dissociative phenomena. However, it may be argued that a look at these subjects in a broader historical perspective shows that what Inglis claims to be the most influential aspect of this branch of psychology is only a fraction (though an important one) of the whole picture. That includes the work of persons outside psychical research (though the borders are sometimes fuzzy and were occasionally crossed) such as Hippolyte

Bernheim, James Braid, Jean-Martin Charcot, Durand de Gros, Pierre Janet, Morton Prince, and Boris Sidis, among many others.¹⁸ Also, and considering that most publications on the topic of dissociated states appeared in non-psychical research journals, it should not be claimed that the reports published in the SPR and ASPR *Proceedings* by Morton Prince and Walter Franklin Prince were the ones that 'eventually led to [the] acceptance' of these phenomena. Again, it should be said that they were important and influential, but they were only a part of a larger interest on the topic in the fields of medicine and psychology.

In his evaluation of mediumship Inglis considers that 'the evidence for psychic communications obtained through mediums . . .' (p. 327) is the only aspect of the work of psychical researchers that skeptics could not undermine. The accumulation of this type of material certainly can be seen as one of the greatest achievements of the SPR. In this context, Inglis discusses Richet's attitudes towards survival of death.

'In *Thirty Years of Psychical Research*', Inglis writes, 'Richet reiterated his materialist case for the phenomena . . . But as Lodge noted in his obituary, Richet had confessed to him in private that "he was sometimes nearly bowled over by the evidence"; and according to Ernesto Bozzano, the last letter he had received from Richet indicated that he had at long last been convinced by it' (p. 328). This quotation, however, should be critically examined. First, the quotation from Lodge's obituary of Richet is out of context. After Lodge's statement that Richet was sometimes 'nearly bowled over by the evidence', the sentence continues, 'but, on the whole, he adhered to his lifelong conviction of the materialistic aspect of the universe'.¹⁹ This diminishes somewhat the positive impression Inglis conveys by quoting only part of Lodge's sentence. I think we should have more information on Richet's conversion according to Bozzano before accepting any interpretation. I am doing research on this problem and I hope to publish a paper in the near future discussing this in further detail with full bibliographical sources.

Some further comments on general issues, mistakes, and bibliographical aspects must be mentioned before closing this review.

In general, the book is geared towards British developments and sometimes misses the international perspective when generalizations are made about the state of the field on the basis of SPR material. Also, the European scene suffers many omissions that weaken the purpose of the book as a general history. For example, it is practically implied that Bozzano was the only active Italian psychical researcher during the period reviewed (p. 328) since no mention is made of other Italian figures such as Bruers, Cazzamalli, Mackenzie, and Marzorati. Another example is the omission of diverse theoretical concepts developed by persons such as Geley, Lebedzinski, and Mackenzie,²⁰ that are of great importance in the understanding of the research trends of European psychical research and its contrast with research conducted elsewhere.

Another general point is that Inglis' discussions (especially as regards physical mediums) are focused on defenses of particular cases or on the exposition of cases apparently considered by him to be genuinely paranormal, while cases generally considered dubious or to have been exposed, such as the cases of mediums Pasquale Erto and Ladislav Lasslo,²¹ are ignored. While we should certainly

concede that the author had to select his material from an immense amount of potential cases to be quoted, it seems to me that it is useful and necessary to give attention in a history to lines of research that proved to be fiascos or, at least, unsuccessful at the time they were conducted in order to present a better picture of the factors involved in the development of psychical research in those times.

In a book as full of details as this one is, mistakes will always find their way into print. The following are some examples. On three occasions English titles of translated books are mentioned with the dates that correspond to the first editions in the original language (*Mental Suggestion*, p. 36; *Telepathy and Clairvoyance*, p. 116; *Clairvoyance and Materialisation*, p. 138) rather than the English editions. Other mistakes include the confusion of Stanislaw Tomczyk for Stanislaw P. (p. 98), and the statement that Fukurai (p. 258) and Thomas (p. 324) were the first ones to deal with thoughtography and to obtain a PhD in psychical research, respectively.²²

Finally, but of great importance in a work of history, is the great number of bibliographical problems in the book. Examples are lack of references for mention of diverse ideas and publications (e.g., Callahan's *Tuning in to Nature*, p. 67; Schrenck-Notzing's response to Dingwall, p. 106; Meyer's quotation, p. 117; Sheldrake's morphogenetic fields, p. 192; Dingwall's review of Holms' book, p. 217; Johnson's quotation, p. 330) as well as lack of page numbers of quotations (e.g., Maeterlinck, p. 39; Lodge, p. 52; Crawford, p. 76; Dingwall, pp. 108–109; Hyslop, p. 143; Driesch, p. 193). Also, regarding a statement on page 356 that states that references indicated on pages 356–369 appear in the bibliography, it should be pointed out that many of them, particularly journal papers, do not appear in the bibliography. I am afraid all this reduces the book's usefulness as a source for further study.

Nonetheless, *Science and Parascience* is very informative in general, especially to those unfamiliar with parapsychology's history. An enormous number of developments and incidents are brought together, providing an interesting survey of some of the phenomena investigated, the methods used, and the problems of psychical research during the 1914–1939 period.

CARLOS S. ALVARADO

Division of Parapsychology
Box 152, Medical Center
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22908
U.S.A.

REFERENCES

- 1 J. Courtier, *Documents sur Eusapia Palladino* (Paris: Institut Général Psychologique, [1908]).
- 2 E. M. Sidgwick, 'Review of *The Reality of Psychic Phenomena*, by W. J. Crawford', *JSPR*, 18 (1917) 29–31; 'Reply by the reviewer', *JSPR*, 18 (1917) 65–67.
- 3 See, for example: G. W. Balfour, 'The Ear of Dionysius: Further scripts affording evidence of personal survival', *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, 29 (1917) 197–243; and Mrs. H. Sidgwick, 'A contribution to the study of the psychology of Mrs. Piper's trance phenomena', *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, 28 (1915) 1–657.
- 4 E. g.: F. McC Stevenson, 'An account of a test séance with the Goligher circle', *Psychic Research Quarterly*, 1 (1920) 113–117.

- 5 E. J. Dingwall, 'Review of *The Psychic Structures at the Goligher Circle*, by W. J. Crawford', *ProcSPR*, 32 (1921) 150.
- 6 J. H. Hyslop, 'Review of experiments in physical phenomena', *JASPR*, 11 (1917) 728-737; R. Sudré, 'La oeuvre de W. J. Crawford', *Revue Métapsychique*, No. 5 (1922) 301-309.
- 7 G. Geley, 'Les expériences d'ectoplasmie de la 'Society for Psychical Research' de Londres avec Mlle Eva C.', *Revue Métapsychique*, No. 2 (1922) 103-131.
- 8 F. C. S. Schiller, 'Review of *Physikalische Phaenomene des Mediumismus*, by A. von Schrenck Notzing', *ProcSPR*, 32 (1921) 144-146.
- 9 On the concept and evidence for ideoplasty in diverse contexts, including materialization, see: E. Bozzano, 'Pensiero e volontà, forze plasticizzanti e organizzanti', *Luce e Ombra*, 61 (1961) 435-460; 62 (1962) 16-67, 101-125, 179-209, 255-282. (This is a revised and enlarged version of a paper first published in 1926-1927).
- 10 T. R. Tietze, *Margery* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).
- 11 See, for example: J. H. Hyslop, 'The Smead case', *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 12 (1918) 1-667; 'A case of pictographic phenomena', *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 13 (1919) 131-204.
- 12 H. Price, 'Stella C.: A record of thirteen sittings for thermopsychic and other experiments', *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 18 (1924) 308.
- 13 T. Besterman, 'Review of *Modern Psychic Mysteries*, by G. K. Hack', *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, 26 (1930) 10-14.
- 14 L. J. Jones, E. M. Sidgwick, & W. H. Salter, 'Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's resignation: II. Reply by the President and Hon. Secretaries', *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, 26 (1930) 50.
- 15 R. Pérot, 'La critique . . . des critiques', *Revue Métapsychique*, No. 13 (1969) 11-18, No. 16 (1969-1970) 33-41; R. Warcollier, 'Opinion d'un témoin', *Revue Métapsychique*, 1 (1) (1955) 55-57.
- 16 F. Cazzamalli, 'Phénomènes télépsychiques et radiations cérébrales', *Revue Métapsychique*, No. 4 (1925) 215-233; C. Richet, *Our Sixth Sense* (London: Rider, [1929]). (First published in French in 1927).
- 17 T. W. Mitchell, 'The contributions of psychical research to psychotherapeutics', *ProcSPR*, 45 (1938) 175-186.
- 18 H. F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (New York: Basic Books, 1970).
- 19 O. Lodge, 'In memory of Charles Richet', *ProcSPR*, 44 (1936) 4.
- 20 G. Geley, *De l'inconscient au conscient* (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1919); P. Lebidzinski, 'L'ideoplastie comme hypothèse directrice des études métapsychiques', *L'état actuel des recherches psychiques* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1924) 286-300; W. Mackenzie, 'Supernormal phenomena from the viewpoint of biology and relativism', *JASPR*, 18 (1924) 489-503.
- 21 A good short summary of these cases is presented by R. Amadou, *Les grands médiums* (Paris: Denoël, 1957), pp. 117-128.
- 22 Fukurai's work was preceded, among others, by the investigations of Commandant Darget, as summarized by P. Joire, *Les phénomènes psychiques et supernormaux* (Paris: Vigot Frères, 1909), pp. 335-338. Regarding Ph.D. degrees obtained through work on psychical research preceding the 1933 dissertation of Thomas, mention should be made of the dissertations of Albert Coste (1893), Charles W. Waddle (1905), and M. L. Peerbolte (1932), as seen in R. A. White (Comp.), *International Directory of Persons Granted Degrees for Work in Parapsychology* (Dix Hills, NY: Parapsychology Sources of Information Center, 1984, third edition), pp. 6, 21-22, 30.

SURVIVAL? BODY, MIND AND DEATH IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHIC EXPERIENCE by David Lorimer. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1984. ix + 342 pp. £5.95 (paper).

This is a sparkling book which does not fit easily into any of this reviewer's pigeonholes. It is neither an insider's book by a psychical researcher, nor that of a detractor. Although it is witty, it certainly cannot be described as a light paperback written to pander to popular tastes. This book conforms to some, but not all standards of an academic work, yet it appears in scholarly attire with its full index, nine-page bibliography and 16 pages of reference notes.

Each chapter begins with three or four quotes: gems taken from some of the great luminaries. These may reveal more about the real Lorimer than anything I may be able to say, therefore, I shall present some of them for those gem-loving readers.

'Man is not come into the world to solve the problems of the universe, but to find out where the problem begins, and, as a consequence, to keep within the bounds of the accessible'—Goethe (p. 9). Well, Lorimer certainly regards as 'accessible' materials produced by philosophers, anthropologists, theologians, psychologists and parapsychologists; the author critically sifts through such literature for that which is relevant to the mind-body problem and the mystery of death. Lorimer convincingly demonstrates that the stance taken on the mind-body issue most often determines which position the great thinker will assume on the survival question. The author has a knack for getting behind the pretenses and rhetoric of the luminaries he reviews: often it seems that first their philosophical orientations form and later that they find the facts which are subservient to their positions.

Lorimer begins by reporting on the findings of early anthropologists and their descriptions of how primitive cultures viewed death and the mind-body issue; he then proceeds to discuss the great thinkers from ancient Egyptian to contemporary times. Part II of this book is described as 'empirical': it contains a review of case studies relevant to the survival issue and extends from such early work as *Phantasms of the Living* to the near-death accounts presented by Sabom and Ring. The views of psychics, as well as those of contemporary thinkers, are also presented in this section.

'The mystery of creation is like the darkness of night—it is great. Delusions of knowledge are like the fog of the morning'—Tagore (p. 9). Lorimer delights in pointing out where the fog is just fog, even when it arises from the desks of the most famous philosophers. The following quotes depict his critical attitude, which is so different from that of the skeptics from our own ranks.

'There is nothing like a theory for blinding the eyes of a wise man'—Sir James Baillie (p. 109)

'Our desires attract supporting reasons as a magnet the iron filings'—McNeile Dixon (p. 166)

'Human reason was not given strong enough wings to part clouds so high above us, clouds which withhold from our eyes the secrets of the other world'—Kant (p. 293)

'We have more knowledge than our predecessors but no more understanding'—Toynbee (p. 109)

Lorimer's home-base is in the humanities, a realm in which he is bright and insightful. He loves the experiential materials of psychical research and makes good use of them. Experimental parapsychology, however, he walks by, unconcerned and seemingly uninformed. How else could a pearl of wisdom like this occur: 'Only laboratory controlled metal-bending and card-guessing type experiments are amenable to the rigorous scientific approach' (p. 176)? His outlook extends from towers built upon the grounds of the humanities, a perspective which I found both interesting and rewarding. However, the