
SOME CRITICISMS OF EDUCATION IN PARAPSYCHOLOGY

D. SCOTT ROGO

Everyone professionally associated with parapsychology realizes that no science can either develop or win acceptance without some organized attempt to educate both the public and the scientific community, and train students of science in its history, literature and methodology. Education in parapsychology is in its germinal stages and it is of the utmost importance for us to organize education in parapsychology; decide what the pertinent issues regarding education should be; who should educate and who needs to be educated; and how this can be done responsibly and unbiasedly.

These opening remarks may sound rather sophomoric, but I have outlined this problem because I think education in parapsychology has been approached incorrectly. Education should not be messianic in nature, but education in parapsychology has often taken that mode. Max Planck stated it succinctly years ago when he argued that new facts only win acceptance when a new generation grows up familiar with them, and not by convincing opponents. I doubt if many of us would disagree that the resistance to the notion of psi is more often emotional than rational.¹ Should we then try to force the acceptance of parapsychology? Is our attempt to educate the already existing scientific establishment a fruitful way of approaching education in parapsychology?

Biasing my own viewpoints very much upon "Planck's Law" I would tend to believe that trying to convert the dogma of orthodox science, while certainly opening certain inroads, is not the proper way for parapsychology to instate itself in the scientific community. At this time let me also note the writings of Thomas Kuhn.² Although citing Kuhn has become almost a cliché in parapsychology, some of his basic propositions support my viewpoint. As is well-known, Kuhn's basic argument is that a scientific revolution is not a startling, dynamic

process, but rather occurs when a group of anomalies challenge a science over a period of time. A secondary point, and one not fully explored by Kuhn to the extent I would wish, is that it is usually only when science for philosophical or cultural reasons, is ready for a change that these new facts will be incorporated into its framework via a paradigm clash. I see a natural parallel here to Planck's principle. However, these viewpoints are not only applicable to science. The concept of change as being dictated by cultural readiness has independently been suggested by Donald Grout, a musicologist, who has found a similar process inherent in artistic climates and revolutions.³ Kuhn's principles then speak not only of the scientific establishment, but also of a very basic constituent of our cultural consciousness.

The epitome of Kuhn's concept is the slowness of scientific change. Our whole educational program—bombarding the media, forcing scientists to evaluate our work, and so on—while efficacious to some degree may be self-defeating. This type of education may be attempting to force a paradigm clash prematurely, instead of allowing the clash to be a natural outcome of science's own dissatisfaction with its generally held notions and models. Today, with so many scientists from outside our field entering our ranks with research projects and claims, we have found that some part of the scientific establishment is open to parapsychology. Yet, from an educational viewpoint, is this good? The work they turn out is often faulty, as witness the furor over SRI's research with Uri Geller.⁴ Here we are faced with a deadly problem. These scientists will be getting more publicity for their work in parapsychology than conventional parapsychologists have ever had. Yet, this work will probably be the type of research, with all its inadequacies, based on a low level of understanding of parapsychology proper, that will reach the public. And this work will be most easily "shot down" by the establishment. Again, witness the surge of "key-bending" PK coming out in Great Britain and supported by physicists who have been making ridiculous claims about their work in books⁵ and in the media. For example, in a recent issue of *New Scientist* a group of physicists stated that it is well known that PK will not occur under controlled conditions, so conditions must be lax!

To illustrate that we must not be overly eager to allow outside scientists to barge boldly into our field as newborn champions in order to convince their colleagues, let me outline a true incident. A physicist informed me that he would be very eager and willing to carry out a large testing program on ESP. After this announcement, I asked him if he would be just as eager to spend one year just studying the literature

and history of ESP research before attempting his experiments. I received a frown in reply. I wonder who needs the education more—this type of scientist, or the die-hard skeptic?

The key point here is that we must not necessarily educate people only *about* parapsychology. We must start educating people *in* parapsychology at the same time. This naturally leads to the type of educational programs and courses being offered at the undergraduate and graduate level on U. S. campuses. While many may applaud the breakthrough of parapsychology into the academic curriculum, I would question if these courses are really not doing more harm than good. I began by stating that trying to educate the scientific establishment may be a lost cause. To me the most important aspect of education in parapsychology is to educate college undergraduates where minds are open and eager. And it is here where our educational status is most deficient.

To begin with, it is rather clear that we cannot expect our university psychology departments to educate students about parapsychology. In 1972 I conducted a survey of five hundred college psychology departments in the U.S. to get an idea of exactly how favorable the academic climate for parapsychology, basically at the undergraduate level, really was. While 61.4% of the departments felt that parapsychology should be given some good coverage, only 50% of those departments which have an experimental psychology orientation were favorable to exposing students to parapsychology. A full 25% of them felt it should definitely not be taught to undergraduates. Clinically oriented departments were more favorable, with only 6% being negative. What is even more disturbing, though, was that the three basic objections to teaching parapsychology were all questionable and two were complete value judgments: (1) that parapsychology is not important to psychology and that (2) parapsychology had no credibility or evidence for it. The third objection, lack of time in the semester, seemed to me a legitimate one. When these departments were asked if they would sanction a course in parapsychology, a full 71.3% were strongly against it. Again, the main resistance came from experimentally oriented departments. The five major arguments against conducting such a class were: not enough content for a course; that other areas of psychology had priority; no faculty qualified to teach it; no evidence for psi; not important enough to psychology. When asked if they would allow graduate students to carry out research in parapsychology to qualify for a graduate degree, 69.1% said, Yes. Once again, clinical departments were greatly more favorable than experimentally oriented departments.

These few statistics point to the inevitable conclusion that although our colleges seem more accepting of parapsychology, we cannot expect any true attempt at education in our field through the existing academic channels. The obvious solution is, of course, the provision of undergraduate and graduate courses specifically in parapsychology. As we all know, a great number of courses are now being offered, but let us not fall into the old pitfall of mistaking quantity for quality. I would now like to take a look at these courses to determine if they really are educationally constructive.

First, consider exactly who are teaching these courses. By the end of 1974 there were 115 courses or very similar educational opportunities in parapsychology offered in the U.S.* For these courses there are 127 instructors. Thus at this present time the entire academic educational effort in parapsychology rests with a little over 125 people. Now, one might ask, what qualifications do these people have to teach parapsychology at the graduate or undergraduate level? I think the statistics are rather a shock. Unfortunately, because of the state of parapsychology today, it is very difficult to make firm commitments about who is and who is not qualified to be considered a parapsychological professional. But for the purpose of this brief report, I shall define any member of the Parapsychological Association to be qualified to present education in parapsychology. As for the statistics: of these some 127 people educating others in parapsychology, only 36 (or 28%) hold PA affiliations as either full or associate members. Thus, we have no assurances that there is any quality in nearly three-fourths of all U.S. courses in parapsychology. These rough percentages are accentuated when one realizes that, according to the last membership list of the PA, 45% of the members have university affiliations (of which 67% are full members).

There are several rather disturbing conclusions one can draw from these general attempts at evaluating the level of instruction in courses in parapsychology. (1) Most college parapsychology courses are being offered by people who very likely have no background in parapsychology, either in its methodology or history. (2) It is doubtful whether such instructors, who have little training themselves in parapsychology, could hope to responsibly train others. This is the dichotomy I drew earlier between teaching people *about* parapsychology and training them *in* it. (3) It would seem to me to be overly optimistic to think that

*These statistics are based on the ASPR publication *Courses and Other Opportunities in Parapsychology*, which I have freely revised and amended before making these breakdowns.

education in parapsychology is fulfilling a cogent role in readying students in parapsychology, when indeed we have no way of telling whether or not the majority of these courses are in any way constructive.

Another problem which requires noting is that there seems to be little attempt by the universities to assure the academic legitimacy of these courses. A notable exception to this rule has been the University of California, Santa Barbara, which went through a screening process before choosing a lecturer in parapsychology. Usually, though, courses on our campuses are taught by existing faculty members and neither the administration nor the departments themselves seem at all willing to "police" their quality, nor are they even qualified to do so. For example, of the 100 and more courses presently being listed, several of these, although accredited or adult education, do not cover mainline parapsychology. The Georgia State University's course is devoted to personal psychic development, the University of Kansas undergraduate course is on the "Psychological Future of Human Beings," Oakland University offers a course on "Mediums, Mystics, and Mountebanks," while the University of Nebraska gives a course on parapsychology and dream interpretation. Fairleigh Dickinson's introduction to parapsychology is a course on "Nature and the Occult" and other colleges have offerings on such topics as psychic healing, ESP and the Bible, magic and the occult, and so on. One must remember that in many instances these are the only courses devoted to parapsychology being offered at these institutions. One must wonder what type of distorted view of parapsychology students will get at the hands of those offering these types of courses. None of the above cited courses, I might add, are offered by PA members or associates.

Earlier I asked the question as to whether education is doing more harm than good. In light of the discussion I have just made, I think this question is now rhetorical. Although many parapsychologists are trying to get worthwhile programs underway, these attempts cannot outweigh the potential damage being done by the unqualified, especially at the undergraduate level. Until some sort of quality control is imposed on parapsychology courses in the United States, I feel the entire educational status is dismal despite the superficial evidence that we are progressing on the college campuses. Unless we can be sure that parapsychology is being taught as science, not as occultism or dogma, all of us here should not applaud the new courses in parapsychology that are popping up over the country, but see them as a source of utmost concern.

What of the other 28% of the U.S. parapsychology courses—those being taught by PA members? Even here I cannot end on an optimistic

note. I think it is time that every parapsychologist should ask whether or not he really is qualified to teach parapsychology. Because there was little educational training for our generation of workers or those before us, there is very little quality control as to how well one really knows the subject before he is elected to the PA or is classified as a parapsychological professional. Generally, one becomes a PA member by having contributed worthwhile research, usually experimental, on a parapsychological topic before the scientific community or his colleagues. But there is much more to parapsychology than merely a practical program in experimental parapsychology. What about its literature, theory, and history? I am afraid that I have been constantly surprised at how many parapsychologists are deficient in any indepth background not only in the history and literature of the field, but even in those areas of parapsychology not within their own limited experimental interests. For example, one noted parapsychologist, who had published dozens of reports on his ESP experiments, admitted that he did not understand the Quarter Distribution effect in PK research. This example is not cited to embarrass anybody, but only to illustrate the fact that many parapsychologists, while competent experimenters, often have little comprehensive background in anything but very limited areas within the field. These people are really not qualified to teach others.

If parapsychology had good general survey textbooks, the problem of teaching competence among parapsychologists would be less serious. But we have no guiding texts. Before any of us here steps before a class to teach parapsychology, each should go through a self-examining process: Do I know the history and literature of parapsychology, both European and American? Am I versed in all areas of parapsychology from ESP to PK to the survival controversy? Can I present the work of others without biasing it? Can I aid a student in a research project in an area of parapsychology in which I have had little personal experience?

I wish I could say that, on surveying the academic scene, PA members are doing a splendid job in educating a new generation of parapsychologists, but I am afraid that I cannot. I see little evidence that any but a few parapsychologists really have the background *themselves* to give students a comprehensive background in the entire range of topics and issues covered by the subject. Before educating others, perhaps we should spend more time educating ourselves.

I would now like to pass on to an evaluation of another area of education in parapsychology which should be of growing concern to us: graduate degrees in parapsychology. So far there are few institutions offering graduate degrees specifically in parapsychology,

but a trend to do so is becoming evident. These degree programs are basically external programs. That is, the student does not maintain residence and education at the campus offering the degree, but carries out his work independently, supervised by a committee. At the present time, two institutions are offering doctorates in parapsychology. The Humanistic Psychology Institute now has an external doctorate program in parapsychology and although the program is accredited in California it does not have national accreditation. The Ohio based Union Graduate School offers a general doctorate and will offer the degree for work done in parapsychology. This program is not yet accredited and at present holds only candidate status. Also, it should be noted, one student at the University of California, Berkeley, is independently working specifically toward a Ph.D. in parapsychology.

Again, instead of applauding these "breakthroughs," I see them as a cause for great concern, because of the public image of parapsychology. Anyone sporting a doctorate in parapsychology is automatically going to have greater prestige before the general and scientific public than any of us who have degrees in related or even unrelated fields. This specialized doctorate will give a rather unquestioned credibility to these people as they are presented to the public and this can lead to certain difficulties. For instance, a few years ago the University of California at Berkeley gave an undergraduate degree to a student in "magic." No sooner was this degree conferred than this young man was paraded before the public in lectures, TV appearances, etc. as an expert on the subject and he eventually wrote a book on it. Anyone with a background in traditional occult literature could see that this student had absolutely no conception of the history and literature of the subject for which he was awarded his degree. Yet, the degree was exploited to the fullest both by the young man, his publishers, and the media. I can only agree with Dr. Bob Brier who in reviewing this student's book stated, "In principle there is nothing wrong with offering such a degree, but judging from its first recipient, the University clearly does not have the faculty for supervising students interested in such a course of study. Under the circumstances, offering the degree was irresponsible."⁸ However, the harm had already been done.

Frankly, I fear that we might have to face a similar problem in parapsychology with this wave of interest in granting doctorates specifically in parapsychology. My own trepidations have been even more aggravated by examining the particulars of these programs. I would now like to bring to your attention just what types of programs are being offered at both HPI and the Union Graduate School.

The UGS program is the type of advance degree plan which I feel has practically no method of evaluating the competence of its doctoral

candidates. As in all doctorate programs, the student is supervised by a committee of educators who will eventually grant or deny the degree. But who makes up this doctoral committee? The committee consists of six individuals. The first is a core faculty member who should be a Ph.D. but does not necessarily have to be educated in the field of the student's doctoral interests. The second committee member is an adjunct professor who will more directly supervise the student's apprenticeship in his specific area. This committee member is, of course, supposed to be an expert in the subject's field. The third committee member should be a Ph.D. but again need not have any training in the student's area of concentration. The remaining three members are the subject's peers. All are pretty much chosen, in the case of a doctorate in parapsychology, by the student himself. Let us analyze this committee. First of all, of the six members, only three need have any advanced educational training. Further, only one member need have *any* background in parapsychology. Yet this member is chosen by the student, so the additional committee members have little way of judging the competence of the only person who has any right to evaluate the student's work. In other words here we have a group of people granting a doctorate in parapsychology where the majority of committee members need have no familiarity with the field.

After the committee is set, they in turn set up an internship for the student. At this level the student is expected to get practical experience in his field. While this is enviable, there is no set period for this internship. This lack of control severely limits its potential function to equip the student with the necessary skills and knowledge for a doctorate. After completion of this internship, the committee holds a certification examination and if the student passes he goes on to work on his major doctoral project. There, too, the program runs into a snag. The doctorate is granted after the student carries out what is called a "Project Demonstrating Excellence." The project does not necessarily have to be a thesis or an experimental project, but can be anything approved by his committee. If it is accepted, the candidate is given his doctorate.

Frankly, this type of degree program strikes me as a travesty of the Ph.D. There is no quality control over the requirements for the student and even the committee is set up in such a way that it can give a doctorate in an area it is totally incompetent to evaluate. This type of degree is only as good as what the candidate wants to make of it. This is dangerous business and in this type of program there is the potential that UGS will be churning out Ph.D.'s in parapsychology who have no academic or empirical training in the field. It will be easy for us to weed out the incompetents, but again I worry about the credibility these

people will have when discussing parapsychology before the media and before the general public.

I am a little more at ease with the HPI program, which attempts to more formalize the Ph.D., although here, too, there are certain criticisms that can be leveled. These, however, are not as serious as my arguments against the UGS degree. Again, awarding the actual degree is under the auspices of a doctoral committee, which includes both a dissertation committee and a special resources committee. The constitution of the dissertation committee includes one home faculty member from HPI with expertise in parapsychology and three field faculty members, preferably within the student's area of concentration, but this is not required. The problem here is that the quality of the degree is based on whether or not, at any given time, there is a qualified HPI staff member with a background in parapsychology. Although, as of now, Dr. Stanley Krippner maintains an affiliation there, we have no assurance that, at some future time, Ph.D. candidates will not be supervised by a home faculty member who is not versed in parapsychology. The three field faculty members are again chosen by the candidate with no assurances that they have the proper background in parapsychology. The special resources committee acts in an advisory capacity to the candidate and it is suggested that this committee include peers much in the same manner as does the UGS program. The same criticisms apply here as I directed to the other program.

The actual degree program for the first year requires the subject to be versed in the following areas of parapsychology and conventional psychology: history of parapsychology; experimental parapsychology; neurophysiology; personality theory; psychophysics; and one elective. (The elective in the case of one of the students enrolled in this program is sleight-of-hand.) This requirement does much to insure some quality control over the student's academic level, but I fear that these requirements are not structured enough. For example, on what basis is it determined if the candidate has a working knowledge of these areas? The program itself is vague as to whether the students must pass a qualifying examination, or merely an oral examination. (One student presently in the program received certification in the psychological areas merely on the basis of having an M.A. in humanistic psychology.) Certification in these areas should be further structured to insure the quality of the doctoral students. This, however, is really a minor point which I feel can be easily remedied. As of now, competence in these areas must be shown before the dissertation committee. But, since the very structure of the committee

is rather suspect, this requirement becomes non-operational. After a year's work, the candidate goes through a certification examination and, if he passes, he then goes on to begin his dissertation.

Generally I believe that the HPI program, while flawed, does have potential. If those in charge of the program severely tighten, structure and set up more rigid and clearly defined requirements for the doctorate, the program could be a very useful contribution to education in parapsychology.

This entire presentation has been pessimistic. Perhaps I have overreacted to what I feel to be the potential dangers of unsupervised education in parapsychology—the harm it can cause, not only to the students, but also to the parapsychological community and the general public. There is little clear resolution to these problems. I would hope that eventually the P.A. can act as an organized body to help control the quality of education in parapsychology. Today, the PA has little power academically. However, it seems plausible that, by a strong organized attempt, the PA could be able to clean up much of what passes for education in parapsychology. To reach this goal, the PA should first set up a task force on college education. Secondly, this task force must contact university administrations and departments where education in parapsychology is going on. They must work with these institutions, conveying to them the need for higher quality educational programs. The ultimate goal of this dialogue would be a voluntary form of certification of courses as "PA approved" and, if necessary, "PA not approved." Just as the American Psychological Association lists approved graduate programs in psychology, it is up to the PA to engage itself in certifying parapsychology programs. If there is large scale cooperation with colleges and universities offering such programs, then perhaps the status of obtaining PA approval will force quality control over education in parapsychology.

I would also hope that parapsychologists would hold themselves open to act as trainers or adjunct educators to students at universities, offering education opportunities in cooperation with the students' home campuses, which now do not have a qualified faculty member. In addition, such research centers as the Maimonides Medical Center's Division of Parapsychology and Psychophysics or the Foundation for Research on the Nature of Man could set up educational programs in experimental parapsychology where students could get hard core training in research methods.

In conclusion, it must be apparent that I cannot be very enthusiastic about the educational status of parapsychology at the present time. In fact, with only a few exceptions, such as the wonderful program now

underway at the University of California, Santa Barbara, my attitude towards education in parapsychology is that it is very likely doing more harm than good.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Eisenbud, Jule: "The Problem of Resistance to Psi". *Proceedings of the Parapsychological Association*, #3 (1966)
- ² Kuhn, Thomas: *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 1962.
- ³ Grout, Donald: *A History of Western Music*. New York, W. W. Norton, 1960.
- ⁴ ——— "Uri Geller and Science". *New Scientist*, 64, October 17, 1974, 170-207.
- ⁵ Taylor, John: *Superminds*. London, Macmillan, 1975
- ⁶ Brier, Bob: Review of *Real Magic* by I. Bonewits. *Parapsychology Review*, Jan-Feb. 1972, p. 25

DISCUSSION

DOMMEYER: I thought I might begin by commenting about your suggestion of PA approval and disapproval of courses. What occurred to me was that we don't have that kind of situation in philosophy. We don't have that kind of situation as far as I know in the sciences, English literature, or any of the recognized fields, and I wonder why there should be an exception here in parapsychology. This strikes me as somewhat peculiar. I give what courses I wish to give, and I teach them as I choose to teach them. I have complete freedom, and the reason I have that freedom, I presume, is that someone thinks I am competent enough in philosophy to teach the courses in question. And I wonder, just why, in parapsychology there should be someone looking over the professor's shoulder and telling him whether he is teaching the course properly or not. It seems to me if that is required, you're admitting right to begin with that the instructor is not competent—that he's got to have outside supervision, and it seems to me you put yourself in a very peculiar position under such circumstances.

ROGO: I disagree on several grounds. For instance, the APA does issue bulletins about the level of graduate programs in psychology and they publish a publication, *Graduate Programs in Psychology*, which is meant to dissuade students from going into certain programs and persuading them to go into others.

DOMMEYER: Well, I've been teaching for forty years and I can tell you this: if anybody from the American Philosophical Association told me how to teach a course you can well bet what I'd tell them.

ROGO: Well, in an area like philosophy, which is very old, you have your textbooks.

DOMMEYER: No we don't. We're in a worse situation than you are.

ROGO: But a person teaching philosophy or psychology has credentials in that field. Basically when you have your doctorate in philosophy, you have gone through a very rigorous program. We don't have that type of background in parapsychology.

DOMMEYER: Isn't that the kind of background you should get first before you start teaching courses in parapsychology?

ROGO: Absolutely, but that's not being done!

DOMMEYER: Well, it ought to be done.

ROGO: I agree.

RAO: I have a question to ask you. You mentioned a survey you made, but you didn't tell us what percentage of people had replied. You sent 500 questionnaires. What is the percentage of returns?

ROGO: O.K. We received slightly under 50 percent returns, and I did analyze to see whether there was a bias in those returns. Were people unfavorable or favorable more likely to send back that questionnaire, and also was there a geographical bias? Did certain areas of the country have more of a tendency to respond?

RAO: How did you test that?

ROGO: I gave it to my brother, who is a statistician to check.

RAO: Another question is that you have picked 115 courses that were being taught by these different colleges. What criterion did you use to say that one is a parapsychology course?

ROGO: That was based on an analysis of the ASPR course list that you can get from the ASPR for two dollars. I used that as my source of courses being offered in this country, since Mrs. Nester does try to keep abreast of all currently taught courses at the college level.

RAO: May I ask Mrs. Nester on what basis she had included a particular course as representative of parapsychology? If one is giving a course on witchcraft, somebody might think it is a course in parapsychology, but I don't consider it parapsychology.

NESTER: We've always maintained it was a non-evaluated list and it is partly my own feeling that it is a good course—that it probably has

some usefulness. That's all I can say. If I know the instructor and if I have any information about him, of course I use that. I certainly do my best, but nobody has ever pretended that it's evaluated. It's really an indication that there is some interest on that campus—that one person has an interest in parapsychology. It's more that, than a final list of what's evaluated and what isn't.

STANFORD: I first of all want to agree with Mr. Rogo that the PA should, and I believe will take, as time goes on, a larger and larger role to somehow or other augment and improve the structure of parapsychological education. I think it's going to have to do that, or we're going to have chaos. Now with regard to Dr. Dommeyer's remark, I want to respond there. Yes, it's true that nobody literally looks over your shoulder and says, "This must be included; this shouldn't be," but there are certain areas where there is a great deal of filtering of what goes into the training. Now take one example, medicine. Well, your immediate reaction is going to be that medicine isn't relevant because you're working with somebody's body there as a practical application to the individual. But I would maintain that many of the parapsychology courses that are being taught have practical applications for the individual. They're claiming that they can train people's psi abilities—that they can train all kinds of things in them. They're giving them ideas that can feed a paranoid delusion and all kinds of things of this sort. We have an ethical and social responsibility. This is recognized in organizations like the American Psychological Association, which carefully examines doctoral programs. The APA comes right to the schools and they look at the credentials of every faculty member. They look at the syllabuses for all the courses. The same thing is done by the state organization that certifies programs, and similarly for accrediting organizations. So, while there isn't anyone literally standing over your shoulder, there is this kind of quality control, but we have no institutions to perform this in parapsychology and the only one I can see up in front that could do it would be the PA. We have to take the initiative.

ROGO: I would like to answer Dr. Rao's comments. I should have given you a fuller answer on the analysis of bias in the sample, and I'd like to do that now. On the geographical bias, it was easy to send out an equal number to each part of the country and then judge the statistics on the percentage returned. On the issue of bias in responding, I kept a week-to-week record to see what percentage came in negative and what percentage came in positive each week, and to see if there was more of a tendency to respond immediately or to respond at all. They kept on

coming in week by week at the some proportional ratio of favorable-to-nonfavorable, which leads me to believe that there was not a bias of one group answering more readily than the other.

CHILD: I think that Dr. Dommeyer's reaction is one that would be very common, and it conveys a useful warning in connection with attempts to police education in parapsychology in universities. The reaction is very common even in psychology, which has for several decades been used to constraints from outside. As you may know, a number of universities have abandoned their graduate curriculums on clinical psychology and one reason is precisely because in this area of psychology alone a university department does not have the privilege of deciding for itself its own standards and policies. I think that if the Parapsychological Association were to set out on a policy of policing education in parapsychology, it would be a significant influence in causing universities not to offer courses in parapsychology, because that's at least one way that they can avoid outside interference. It seems to me that a program ought to be carefully restricted to offering assistance to universities that want some guidance in a field not yet adequately represented in their faculty.

ROGO: Well, my feeling is that before the program is even set up, the Parapsychological Association should be working with the administration. Now if we can work with college administrations before the programs are set up, then once the programs are set up there would not be any need for any type of outside policing of these courses. I think we really have to work more with the college administrations than with the instructors.

PALMER: Just one quick comment on this business of "policing." I'm having trouble following this discussion because nobody has defined what "policing" is. It almost sounds like you are developing the idea of somebody with a billy club standing over a teacher in a department and if he doesn't say the right thing he gets bopped on the head. I don't think that's quite what the PA has in mind. Maybe somebody else might be able to comment more definitively on this. Just one question about the survey. Were these responses from the department chairmen and how representative of the departments were they?

ROGO: Maybe I asked a very naive question when I sent out the questionnaires. In the covering letter I explained the nature of the survey and I asked them to please speak as well as they could for their department and if they felt that their own bias was against that of their department, to please stipulate that in their returns. This caused some

problems. For instance, one was sent back which was very negative, and apparently his secretary or someone got hold of the questionnaire and gave it to somebody else and I had two different answers. I also had one man who proceeded to say he was very pro-parapsychology and that he wanted to use Koestler's *Roots of Coincidence* as a textbook, but he was afraid that his faculty wouldn't believe in physics either. There were a number of comments like that; some of them couldn't be presented before a scientific body nor committed to print.

MORRIS: Dr. Palmer made a comment and raised a question, but I have another comment. It seems to me what would be most useful would be, perhaps on the college level or the graduate level, something like what we were attempting for the secondary school level, a PA-approved course, or at least guidelines for the development of a syllabus.

ROGO: Well, actually, I thought your high school syllabus would work very well at the college level.

TART: I want to reinforce Dr. Child's comments. You can't police anybody in a negative way. I might want to offer a course on witchcraft myself some time; it might be fun. What you can do is offer help in developing a good, solid, PA-approved course in parapsychology—maybe a video-tape series. You can offer the positive side of it, but I think it's a waste of energy to try to police instructors because the students want courses on witchcraft, etc.

BELOFF: I think there is one point that's being overlooked in this discussion, and that is that people who teach philosophy or psychology—one of these traditional disciplines—have a degree in that subject. As I understand what Mr. Rogo was saying, one of the difficulties here is that the people who are teaching parapsychology today have no professional qualification for doing so, and I think that is where the talk of policing comes in. I mean, what form it takes, of course, is another matter and this is open to discussion, but I would not accept Dr. Dommeyer's point that, because philosophers are free to devise their own curriculum, that anybody therefore can call himself a teacher in parapsychology and get away with it.

KRIPPNER: Well, I certainly have to commend the program committee for placing Mr. Rogo right after lunch. Most other speakers would allow us to fall asleep after that huge meal. One of Mr. Rogo's special talents is to present controversial material, so this was very well timed in terms of the hour of the day.

Now I think that the issue of PA policing of parapsychology is not too difficult to resolve. I feel that the points of view that have been brought forward by several people are not mutually exclusive. I certainly believe that the main emphasis should be positive in terms of helping potential instructors to prepare good courses. Most instructors would appreciate this, as many of them are just grasping at straws; they take what little they know about parapsychology and do the best with it. If there were some place for them to turn to for assistance, I think most of them would do so. I think that the PA would not have to use the word "approval," but it could say "listing of courses in parapsychology," and put on that list only those courses given by people who a PA committee feels have had special training in parapsychology. This, of course, would include PA members and associates and maybe some other people who may have gone through some of the educational symposia the PA has been sponsoring over the last few years.

I think there is one additional process which could be instigated. I would propose that the instructors could submit course outlines, texts, and examinations. Again, a wide latitude should be given in the name of academic freedom for what these people want to teach. But if some blatant example comes up, such as if a Jeane Dixon or Hans Holzer book is used as the main text in a parapsychology course, this would indicate that something is a bit awry in the person's judgment, and that course wouldn't have the best recommendation. So I do see a number of ways in which this can be handled in a very genial way, but still with some greater degree of direction than is happening right now in the field.

The second thing I want to comment on is Mr. Rogo's very thoughtful critique of the external degree programs. The basic facts that he gave you are worthy of your consideration, and they are very fairly stated. First of all, I would say that perhaps the main difference in the Union Graduate School Ph.D. degree and the Humanistic Psychology Institute Ph.D. degree is that we look upon the Ph.D. as representing a research-oriented program. I have no objection to people wanting to give degrees for building a geodesic dome or organizing a commune, or whatever—but we should not call these Ph.D. degrees. I think that the Ph. D. degree has a history and tradition behind it that is worthy of respect. It implies some sort of contribution to academia, some sort of contribution to human knowledge, and also, from the HPI point of view, a contribution to human welfare.

Now, in terms of the name that we give to our degree, we do not call it a Ph.D. in parapsychology. As I mentioned before, only two people are

going through a parapsychology sequence among our 250 students. They will receive a Ph.D. in psychology from the Humanistic Psychology Institute. Once the transcript is inspected, it is apparent that the student's program emphasized parapsychology because the transcript covers all of the areas that Mr. Rogo discussed with you.

Also, there is a new development. No longer does the HPI student have sole responsibility for his or her field faculty members. He nominates members. These are approved by HPI, and then letters of invitation are sent to the prospective field faculty members. So now there is more control over that aspect of the program. In fact, some HPI students dropped out of the program, claiming that I refused to let them work with a religious leader who was their first choice as a field faculty member. At H.P.I. we are moving ahead, toward more control and more structure. This, I might add, is also very controversial. Some of the students who advocate "educational freedom" do not want the degree of discipline that we are integrating into the program. On the other hand, for this type of a program one needs to add structure. I think that one can have both discipline and freedom at the same time in this program. I think that without discipline there is a risk that the student will not learn in depth.

ROGO: I'd like to say something very general about that. This may have been one of Dr. Stanford's psi-mediated instrumental responses, but right before getting on the plane, I grabbed the current issue of *Psychology Today*, which has a little article in it reporting on the status of open education. Basically, it reports that there are now some severe problems with these alternative education type of schools at the high school level, and they are finding that students are not responding educationally or even psychologically to this type of unstructured work. These schools are actually closing down as students leave to go back to a more mainline, traditional type of educational program. And I'm wondering if that eventually might not filter in even to the college level when students find that they can't do it by themselves; that they do have to be structured from outside.

WHITE: I would just like to reinforce what Jim Morriss said, and Charlie, and also Stan to some extent. I think, practically speaking, the PA is just not set up or properly equipped, it doesn't have the money, and its people are all full time workers elsewhere and have very little time, and they can't possibly go around the country evaluating courses and programs. But I do think it is within the realm of possibility or practicability to develop a recommended course, recommended readings, and also, as Stan suggested, a listing of schools and courses. I think those are the areas in which we should try to concentrate.