GENERAL DISCUSSION
DAY TWO

HEINZE: I agree fully that we women should be more skeptical in every respect, and I think that it is very necessary. I want also to respond to what Rhea was suggesting about approaches and including research objects. In anthropology we already use the method of triangulation. I want also to suggest that, if possible, we should try to study different cultures. The best way to learn something about your own culture is studying a different one, and this would then, as you suggested already, imply that you live in the other country and stay with the people, and really try to blend in as much as possible. When I have a research grant, the first three up to four months, I don't ask a single question. Other anthropologists come with superimposed views and never get the right answers. After three or four months of waiting, and it never failed to happen, somebody says, "You never ask us questions." I reply, "What should I ask?" You see, then I have them at the point where they tell me what should be asked, and then I can come in with my own questions. The point is that they really wanted to relate something, and it gave me a door I could walk through. Have the patience to wait for this moment when they ask you and tell you what you should have asked. It is very hard to wait in anthropology and in every other science. When you read anthropological reports about research in the same village, the famous Redford, and what was the other man's name?, you think they are talking about two completely different villages. I don't know what they did. You have to use this triangulation method. You have somebody self-reporting on whatever experiences he or she had, then you use a different person from the same culture to comment on this self-report, and then you have your own observations, as an outsider. You will eventually find a more objective truth in the middle. It's the Rashomon effect: You know, the Japanese film where the samurai has been murdered, his wife has been raped, and both as well as the robber report on exactly the same incident. The three reports sound very different. Even when the spirit of the murdered samurai talks, you are not sure if he has an objective truth about the incident himself. It is very hard to do this, but if we have the patience to really listen to different cultures, we will also know much

more about our own. I can recommend this triangulation method; it works quite well.

SCHLITZ: I really want to respond to Nancy's quotes from people, and then to Jessica, who said that we victimize ourselves and subordinate ourselves within the field. In many quotes that Nancy read, it struck me that there is a lot of victimization going on. One of your informants said that men were placed in a certain lab and if they moved, then they placed them in another lab, but nobody placed the women. There is this self-empowerment issue: We need to take responsibility for our own behavior. And then there was this quote from a woman complaining that nobody suggested to them that they write an article. Well, few people have ever suggested to me that I write an article. To presume that somebody else should guide my actions subordinates me to somebody else.

ZINGRONE: I think that both of those respondents were in their late 40s, early 50s; but I think the bottom line is that basically boys are brought up to ask for and get what they want. Somehow that happened to me too, and I've always gotten in trouble for asking for and getting what I want. But for very many women, this is just not so. I mean, certainly for people like Louisa Rhine and her generation, and even women of our own age and younger, this is just not something you are socialized to think. To ask a woman who has been brought up in a milieu in which she is never given any encouragement to look inside and say, "What do I really want? Or, how am I going to get what I really want?" is unrealistic. To recommend being more assertive is basically unfair. The woman becomes both self-victimized and victimized by a system that never even thinks of the possibility of encouraging that person. A lot of the rhetoric you hear about racial improvement frequently will go to that point where people will say, "Well, why don't you just go out there and stop acting like a victim?," when the point is you are socialized as a victim. It is extremely hard for some people to see that's what is happening and to have the courage to say, "Hold it a minute. You don't have to ask me to write this paper. I'm going to write it myself." There are a lot of people who just cannot do that. I don't think it's hard-wired; it's not biological. This is socially conditioned. I didn't grow up with that so much, and yet at the same time I have suffered from being able to walk into a room and say, "Excuse me, I'm going to do this now." You know, so there are different levels.

I had the same experience listening to these informants in the context of doing the interviews. It was very hard for me not to say, "Well, why didn't you just go ahead and do it?" Or, "Why didn't it occur to you to just say to your boss, `Well, if he can get his Ph.D., I'm going to get mine too.'" Really, what I would have been doing is putting my experience and my sense of empowerment on someone who just may not have had that built into their socialization, for whom that would have been a real reach beyond their sense of self. So, I think that at the same time that we can react this way and encourage people not to allow themselves to get into that victim mode, we also have to see that in very many cases this is not a way that they choose to be. It's a way that they are conditioned to be.

SCHLITZ: Jessica made the point about the victimization process. It is a big concern to me. Both men and women have issues surrounding intrinsic motivation: How is it that some people are highly productive while others are not? I find myself feeling kind of angry with people for putting themselves in a position where they expect other people to do it for them. I mean, nobody's going to do it for you. If you're going to do it, do it; but don't complain that somebody else didn't do it for you.

ZINGRONE: But it also has to be in the realm of possibilities. If it's not in your realm of possibilities you're not going to think about it. I think when you look at the history of women scientists, the ones that came along in the 19th century and the early 20th century, although it would be nice to say that it was their mothers, in general these were women whose fathers and brothers and husbands said to them, "You can do this. You can do anything that a man can do." Or who encouraged these women to know their own minds and to act on their own minds. In the case of Elizabeth Blackwell, who was the first woman physician in the United States, her father literally put her in medical school because he felt it was time for a woman to be a doctor, and she had no clue at that time that that was something she even wanted to do. So I can understand, although I felt both those ways too: anger at the person who was saying she was a victim and anger at the system that limited that person's sense of their possibilities. You still have to cut someone some slack. You know, you don't want to add to someone's lack of empowerment by saying, "But you could have had the sense that you should have done thus." If it wasn't in the realm of possibilities for them, then it wasn't.

BLACKMORE: I'd like to take up Ruth's comment about altered states of consciousness. You said something like, "You have to get out of an altered state to talk about it." And that goes against the whole...

HEINZE: Wait a second, you misinterpret completely what I said.

BLACKMORE: I wrote it down.

HEINZE: You have to experience the state first so you have the experience, because during the experience your discursive thinking is not working. And then you have to step out of the state and look at it; you can reflect only after the experience.

BLACKMORE: Yes. There is an alternative approach which has not got very far and I'm sorry...

HEINZE: How do you know? I went pretty far with this approach.

BLACKMORE: Can I try and say what I'm trying to say?

HEINZE: Yes, but you are judging something you don't know; you don't recognize what I'm doing.

BLACKMORE: That is Tart's state-specific sciences, which is the idea that with enough expertise in the altered state and enough people who can do it, it is possible to communicate and actually do scientific work while in those altered states.

HEINZE: I did not say this at all.

WHITE: But I think *she's* saying it.

BLACKMORE: I'm just making a very simple point. I totally agree with you, as I'm sure you know, about the need to get into altered states oneself, to learn how to move about in them, to have personal experience of where they are and to do some mapping. I just was surprised that you implied that it was necessary to get out of them to do the discursive thinking, to do the analysis, to do the talking. Different kinds of thinking are available in different states—different kinds of logic apply, state-specific logic, state-specific memories. And I don't think one should be so defeatist as to say that you have to get out of the states in order to do the work. I would like to build on it further and say that it's possible to stay in the states, to work within the states, to do science within them. It may go against a lot of our normal state-confined science, but I think it is possible. And I think Tart thought it was possible, and I think a few people around the world are actually doing it.

HEINZE: You see, this is exactly what I find in Western science. I always have this image of a little guinea pig in a cage running on a treadmill, getting nowhere, and I strongly resent that something is

superimposed on what I said at all. There are certain states of consciousness that do not lend themselves to the scientific approach you want to apply to them. So you have to design techniques first that would apply to these state-specific conditions. I said this very clearly. We are not that far developed; we have to develop these techniques. You see, this is something that in Asia never would happen: to attach value judgments to something you don't know. You have no idea of the full extent of my work at all. And I think you have to be really careful with it.

BLACKMORE: I'm very sorry. It was a small point. I was simply trying to be encouraging about what is possible in altered states.

HEINZE: You said I'm a defeatist, and those were pretty strong words. They're absolutely unnecessary. If you do research on spiritual techniques like I was talking about, highly mystical states, you will see that there is a lot more involved than the techniques we know right now. And to do research in mystical states, you should know, if you have any idea about mysticism, is just not possible, my dear, because you are far beyond discursive thinking. You are far beyond because discursive thinking presupposes the presence of an ego that is aware of itself and aware of what it's doing. When you get to a mystic state, you go into the union with the divine where your ego is completely dissolved. You still retain some awareness; it is almost a body memory, a cellular memory of that state, which you can recall later on, when you leave the state. You cannot stay in a mystical state for long because it interrupts biological functions if you stay too long. There are meditators who have stayed in deep meditation for a couple of days, and their bodily functions ended, and they died. People who took up Transcendental Meditation were taught that after 900 hours of meditation, they would be enlightened. They were foolish enough to sit there 900 hours, and it blew their mind, of course. So, this is not the way it works. The mystical state is the highest spiritual state you can actually achieve. It is a state of complete being where discursive thinking falls away, being unnecessary because you are everything else. It is not this little ego who is observing, who can work scientifically in this state. It is just absolutely impossible, because this beautiful feeling of being united, the mystical union with everything else, is an intuitive knowledge, a completely intuitive knowledge, which can be described only very poorly in a normal daily

language. So, I would strongly plead to really try to envision what a mystical state is, *unia mystica*.

WHITE: It seems to me that between the highest state of consciousness, the deepest and highest mystical state, and the ordinary state of consciousness, we have many other altered states of consciousness. I think that Tart's point, and Sue's point too, is that there are altered states of consciousness in which, I don't believe you were talking about using discursive consciousness, right, Sue? You were talking about using something within that, something integral to that state of consciousness. The altered state that you are in will still enable you to study it to some extent while you are in it.

BLACKMORE: Exactly.

HEINZE: Didn't you listen? I described the sort of driving which is a conscious method to get you in a different state of consciousness in which you can work because you retain a certain degree of consciousness that is still possible. And you can retrieve the information that is very deeply situated in your unconscious mind and can then work with it and bring it out gradually into the daily conscious language and communicate it to other people. This I was talking about, and I was describing it. I have been working with it for three years, and I very successfully retrieved information from a very deep level.

HUGHES-HARTOGS: This is bringing us from heaven down to earth, I think. In any case, I wanted to make a couple of concrete comments and suggestions, particularly in reference to some of the things that Jessica said in her paper as far as what an ideal research program might include. If you remember, she suggested that we include both hard-edged sort of research and a soft sort of research. I had hoped she would go a little bit more into what she meant by soft research. She did mention also the possibility of field studies and so on as becoming quite important. If you are thinking of structuring programs like that, I'm wondering how many of the programs in any of our countries also have advisory committees from the community? If it happens to be a university setting, people from other departments, for example, or from the community: neurologists, mathematicians, physicians, SPR members—could meet on a regular basis and offer some fresh air in relation to what is being planned and what is being set up in the department. I don't know how many programs already have this, but it's simply a suggestion. Also, if we're thinking about change, whether it's in

relation to the subjects we've been discussing or anything else, I think we might like to remember the three stages of change in a simplified form. In the first stage, the response is: "It simply couldn't possibly happen here and we don't want it." The second stage is: "Yes, it might work over there, in Duke University or some other place, it might work there, but it wouldn't work for us." The third stage is: "This is something I've been thinking right along." I leave that with you.

Also, for any of you who are interested—one of the areas we have not touched on at all, but which seems to me offers some real hope, possibly for funding and certainly in theoretical terms, is the possibility of connecting parapsychology research with chaos theory. Some of you may be interested in that and know about it. We haven't done this. It requires a certain expertise that perhaps doesn't really obtain in the field at the present time. However, if you have mathematicians, physicists, and so on involved, you could possibly structure something. And in considering chaos I don't want us to leave thinking of chaos as chaotic. I would like you to see what a student in one of the university departments constructed out of chaos. I'll pass this around. It is one of the most beautiful depictions of chaos that I've ever seen.

HÖVELMANN: Beverly, you said something to the effect that, I'm trying to quote literally, the predominant masculine paradigm is to be blamed for the lack of progress in the field of parapsychology. I would appreciate it if you would explain to us what the term "progress" means in this sentence, or rather, what progress might have been made had the feminine paradigm been the ruling one?

RUBIK: Well, it is extremely difficult to answer the latter because I don't consider myself the sole spokesperson for the feminine...

HÖVELMANN: Simple questions are the boring ones.

RUBIK: I'm just saying that I really can't answer your question about what the field of parapsychology would be like if the feminine approach had dominated. First, we would need a feminization of all of science for it to be successful. Nevertheless, I see that the frontier sciences—including parapsychology—need to risk going outside of the paradigm in order to encompass all relevant parameters. Because they challenge the dominant paradigm, they cannot succeed within it. They are moving beyond notions of mechanism because they must. It has been the conventional argument that because psi does not yet have a mechanism, one cannot fully make sense of the statistics or truly evaluate the data.

However, I think that we have been stuck with this notion of mechanism, of measurement, of quantification, of pushing participants to their limits to get numbers, without attention to the inner realms. I'm sure that we are destroying the phenomena doing this, as Rhea put it so well. The butterfly is dead, and then we are analyzing it beyond death. I have that sense when I do my own experiments. I give you the example of Terry Ross. In one special moment he produced an enormous anomaly in the REG, three standard deviations above the mean, never again achieved. I also studied a man from Mongolia. I asked him how he could relate to this device and make it the most enjoyable, pleasurable thing, just for a single trial, and he also achieved a very high score for that run. And after that there were no more high scores. We can average all the scores and do statistics, and the result will be barely above chance. Maybe there is something significant, and maybe there is not. That is what the masculine paradigm has done. There seems to be an occasional psi effect, but when we push it to the limits of getting lots of runs, which we need in order to do statistics, then we lose it. This is related to habituation, which is well known in conventional psychology. When a task is repeated over and over again, the person is not in the same state. For example, this has been shown in perception experiments and in learning.

HÖVELMANN: Well, I tend to agree with you that if we had adopted the feminine paradigm that you are suggesting we would have had the chance to learn things different from the ones that we have learned. But I don't see in which sense this might be progressive from what we have achieved already. So, there is a difference between the things we might have learned, but I cannot distinguish between them in terms of progressiveness.

RUBIK: I don't think a feminine paradigm would be, or will ever be, progressive in itself. I think a gender-balanced paradigm would be progressive. But a feminine approach is a stepping stone toward a more appropriate way of measuring psi and taking stock of the fullness of the phenomena. I think that either a masculine or feminine methodology or paradigm in themselves would be limiting. But I think that psi phenomena may be among the most elusive, subtle phenomena, and to study them by a sheer masculine approach seems most ludicrous to me. That was my point in saying I think there will be no progress if we continue in the present paradigm. It's like studying a fragment with a

sledgehammer. Using such a tool, one can only break it up further, and by then, one can't find it anymore. I think that parapsychology could take enormous leadership among the frontier sciences by stepping forward and developing an appropriate paradigm and associated methodologies. That would be a very brave step. If taken, I envision the coming together of other frontiers sciences, perhaps along with parapsychology, to help build a whole new paradigm for a new science that will address the human realm as well as other subtle realms that presently are not adequately addressed in science.

BLACKMORE: I want to take up Gerd's point about progress. I think there are some people here who think that we shouldn't even define what we mean by progress or perhaps can't. I think parapsychology has inherently defined itself in such a way that progress means something like understanding psi phenomena. Understanding might be taken in many different forms. I think this is doomed to failure, and the issue of feminine versus masculine approach is neither here nor there. I think if we try to understand psi phenomena, we can never succeed, in my opinion because I think there probably aren't any psi phenomena. The whole business of setting them up in the first place has created a nonsense and a nothing, and so we can never have progress that way. To answer your question, Gerd: If we had set about it in a different way in parapsychology, in a way more like Rhea is suggesting—experience-oriented rather than lab-dissecting oriented, we would have ended up understanding much better things about the place of psychic experiences (I'm not saying necessarily paranormal but psychic experiences, as defined by the people who have them) in their lives and their altered states and the progression through life and personal development, and so on. But that also would not have been progress in the terms parapsychology has set out for itself. That would be progress in psychology, in anthropology, and so on.

HÖVELMANN: Parapsychology would have disappeared by now, would it?

BLACKMORE: Yes, exactly; that puts it most clearly. If we had done that, there wouldn't be any parapsychology. But what we did do in fact, is keep parapsychology, but it doesn't go anywhere.

BISCHOF: If you allow me some remarks that may be relevant to the topic of the conference. First of all, I would like to see much more emphasis on the large number of women, many of them also in my circle

of friends, that are exploring experientially the possibilities and the laws of the paranormal. And all of them are doing it in the natural context. Most of these women are working completely outside of the academic world, and I think this is especially important to say because mostly this kind of work is not considered to be research.

In this connection, there are some points I wanted to mention concerning a possible special relationship of women to psi. One thing you certainly all know is the idea about the connection between telepathy and the mother/child symbiosis or relationship, or maybe I should say union. I think there's a book by Ehrenwald about it, and this also points up that these phenomena should be studied in their natural context. Another point is the relationship between psi and the female cycle. There are certain indications that menstruation is a time especially good for the development of psi faculties. For example, see *The Wise Wound* by Shuttle and Redgrove (Grove, 1986). There also seems to be a connection with rhythms in general, not only menstruation. Some authors also suggest that in very early cultures, psi faculties were more strongly active in women. For instance, the Chinese word for shaman, I think it's "wu," originally only denoted female shamans. Later, it came to stand only for male shamans, interestingly; and this corresponds, of course, to a cultural change. Another point is that shamans as well as Catholic priests are very often transvestites. Actually, Catholic priests still wear female clothes. The scientific approach may be considered as an attempt to develop something to replace and devalue the earlier supremacy of women in a number of areas, among them the psi faculties. Interesting in this connection is that the rise of the scientific worldview seems to have happened parallel to the receding of psi faculties, at least in the Western world.

SCHLITZ: I don't want to end the meeting with the feeling that we haven't made any progress. My feeling is that parapsychology has made progress. I think certainly Jessica's article on the meta-analyses gives us a tremendous amount of room for optimism. However we define these paradigms, the fact is that the "male" paradigm has been successful. And, we have made progress. I would not argue, Sue, that there is nothing there, because I think that there clearly is some kind of perturbation in the random generators; there is some kind of correlation between an agent and a subject in the remote-viewing experiments. The Ganzfeld experiments have been extremely productive. The value of this

conference is in recognizing that this is not the whole picture. There is a lot of evidence that the male paradigm has been productive, but there's a lot more to learn from this "female" paradigm. I'm sorry about the stereotypical terms, but there is a lot more we can learn.

ALVARADO: The point I would like to discuss is the issue of what is coming next or where we are going? I certainly like Beverly Rubik's idea of having a task force later, you know, people that meet on this cause, maybe even less formal than this. I think it's a good idea. But it seems to me that we should also try to go out and infiltrate the people that form the majority of the field. I would like to see discussions of this at the Parapsychological Association convention. There could be a hostile reaction, we know that. But there was a hostile reaction first to J.B. Rhine's work, and there usually is one to any other type of work. So, I think we have to start someplace. I would suggest also placing some of the papers such as Rhea's not only in the proceedings of the conference, which would be very valuable and a great first step, but also in places like the *Journal of Parapsychology*, which is considered to be one of the main journals and will be read by a lot of the people who really need to know about all these issues, about biased science, sexism, and gender relations. The other point I would like to make is that though I'm very open to all these approaches, I feel there's still a lot of fuzziness and lack of specific ideas. I hear a lot about, "Well, let's do more female science, or field investigations," but what I would like to see, especially when we go out of here, is more specific things. What's wrong with the field investigations of Ian Stevenson that make them biased in the male way? They are good. They produced a lot of evidence, but maybe we could complement them with new approaches. I would like to see those things studied in greater detail and with more specific ideas of how experiments should be conducted to avoid the androcentric bias. How should reincarnation cases be studied? Because the people that we are going to talk to later do that type of research, and we cannot go on saying, "Oh, yeah, we have to be less biased." That's not enough. I'm not saying that we are doing something wrong here. I agree this is the way to start. This is great, but I would like us to think in more specific ways in the future. I don't have specific suggestions except that I would like to see focusing, especially from people like Rhea. I know she is doing this in other papers. I know other papers of hers have not been published, and she discusses a lot of approaches to spontaneous phenomena that I

think address, and answer a lot of the problems that we have been discussing here. You know, I still lack understanding on a lot of these issues. It's in part due to my lack of understanding that I'm asking for more information, more specific things, because before coming to this conference, one of the things that I did was read more about the issue. Rhea's paper was very valuable. I got several books that were very basic, the ABC introductions to the topic. Even in those books I found there were a lot of generalities and not very specific things. Maybe that reflects that the field of feminism in science or gender issues is still basically starting and these are very difficult issues, but I fail to see many of these specific issues addressed regarding how to really do the thing. We hear about McClintock's work, but I don't know how she did it—what it means not only see the thing from one angle but to blend with the whole corn or whatever she was studying? I agree that's very valuable though. I think we need more in order to make this a successful paradigm, to go in and convince people, if that is what we want to do.

WHITE: I think that you're very right, Carlos. I've been saying that the feminist approach is very practical, but we still have not really come up with nuts and bolts suggestions. And I think that we are a step or two away from that. I hope they will be forthcoming, and I hope this conference will really set the ball rolling so that we'll be thinking in ways in which we have not thought before and maybe come up with some concrete suggestions. With the permission of the Parapsychology Foundation, I would be happy to submit my paper to the *JP*. I question very much whether it would be accepted, but I'm willing to try.

SCHLITZ: Send it to *JASPR*; you've got connections.

O'DONNELL: Three things: first, the feminist approach to science. I think of a reply to, say, physics, I don't think it would end up very much different from the physics we have now. In other words, if you imagine there had been no men in the world since 1500, I think the physics we would end up with would be pretty much as it is now. On the other hand, with fields like psychology, I think a feminine approach would be a definite advantage, and parapsychology too, by extension. That's the first thing. The second is: as regards parapsychology itself, I have never liked the name since the first three months I heard it. It seems to me the wrong tool. You don't take psychology to study creativity or higher math or something, because it doesn't get very far. The third thing is that in parapsychology, I don't think people will talk much sense, as

investigators or skeptics, until they have adequate, and I stress the word *adequate*, firsthand experience, and only then. Otherwise, they are like people outside an office with frosted glass windows, and they're trying to look in and say, "That's a shadow, no it's not; that's a chair, no that's a table." Whereas, if you had adequate firsthand experience, it would be quite clear that that's a table, that's a chair, and so on. And I would point out, as I said yesterday, that proof is right under your nose and is very easily attainable with about 20 hours of hard, slow work. And I know there are some skeptics, and rightfully so, but as I said, try it. That's all I have to say.

RUBIK: I disagree with you about physics.

O'DONNELL: How?

RUBIK: Well, yesterday I pointed out some of what I consider to be masculine features in physics. The notion of laws, for example, that nature obeys might be reconsidered as patterns or habits in nature, something a little softer. I think the words, the very language used by physicists, such as that of boys' games elevated to war games, would be replaced by a very different language. As an example, I have often used the phrase "cosmic egg unfolding" instead of "Big Bang" theory in my own teaching.

O'DONNELL: Oh, that one—yes. And surely Boyle's Law would have emerged as Mary's Law or something.

RUBIK: As what?

O'DONNELL: Mary's Law. Or Jessica's, or whatever.

RUBIK: No, it is more than just language. I think the notion of laws and hierarchical thinking of orders of reality from quarks all the way up is very much a male way of seeing and conceptualizing. That's very much a part of conventional physics.

O'DONNELL: But wouldn't that mean ...

RUBIK: In a feminine view, I think we would have the spiral, the dance of Shiva. We would not embrace climbing Jacob's ladder as a metaphor for levels of cosmic order.

O'DONNELL: I mean, let us assume that physics as it is now is largely a complete body of knowledge. We know that it is, in its present state. Would it be much different?

RUBIK: That's been the illusion of many men over many eras that our physics is nearly complete.

O'DONNELL: I can't see it as any different.

RUBIK: Well, I think it would be extremely different conceptually. We might have come to similar, let us say, patterns in nature, but they would not be considered as rigid laws and hierarchical orders. We would not have Newtonian billiard ball models of things. Physics would be extraordinarily different.

BLACKMORE: What about technology?

RUBIK: We might have technology based on implosion, for example, instead of just explosion. Presently we have no technologies based on implosion, which is a feminine principle, like pregnancy. All of our technologies reflect the male principle of pointing outward or exploding. They're penetrating. We have no technologies reflecting the feminine.

O'DONNELL: I never thought of these things.

RUBIK: We have no technologies that utilize an inner unfolding. At Ruth-Inge Heinze's shaman conference earlier this year, the notion of *soft penetration* arose. I think it offers some gender balance.

O'DONNELL: All right, you've got me thinking.

HEINZE: I want to soften it up a little bit. I think there are laws, but what we know presently as laws are highly overrated because we have left out so many other elements that play into these laws, as well. So, we shouldn't overrate the known physical laws.

LUKE: All this talk leads me to my next question. It's really sort of a comment generally about women in science. I wanted to express a little bit of surprise at what Jessica was talking about yesterday in her paper about there not being a positive correlation between childbirth and women not getting higher positions in sciences. Because it's been my personal experience that after a woman scientist has a baby and comes back to work, it's assumed that she's going to be less productive and unable to travel, and so on. And I often hear women colleagues saying, "Gee, I'd like to have a family, but I'm really afraid that it'll destroy my career," and I never hear this from male colleagues. So I just thought some members of the panel might be able to talk about that a little.

BLACKMORE: Yes, I'm glad to be given the opportunity to say something about that. I think it's certainly so. What you said, I think, is typical in many sciences, and there are at least two approaches to take to that. One is to say, "Well, I should be like a man." But where is a woman going to find a wife?

I outraged 300 medical students when I was teaching recently by saying, "To get anywhere, and certainly to get to be a top surgeon in this

country, what you need is a wife." And it's absolutely true. That is the main reason why men get there, because they have everything done for them, and very few women can actually have that.

I don't think that is my preferred route at all, to try and become a man and ignore the children. I like to bring my children up myself and to spend a lot of time with them and integrate that into my work as a whole life; I don't actually want to be treated like a man in that respect. And, therefore, I have quite enjoyed the big change that came about in my life by having children—to take them into the lab and see how that goes down, which has actually gone down quite well; to use them as subjects in my experiments; to change through having them.

I think your question relates to something else. I'm not wandering away from it, but in a way I think we have touched on it several times here. And it touches on something that Rhea asked as well, and no one has answered, about where does your work come from? Where does the inspiration for parapsychology come from? So I could perhaps be allowed to ramble on a bit more and answer that question in the same context. Just outside at tea, now, Rebecca said to me something like, "Oh, what do you do down there in the South, then?" And I answered in what seemed to me a natural way to answer, but she looked surprised. I said, "I dig my garden. I bring up my children. I give lectures at Bath University and Bristol University, and I do research." And that is how I see my life, I put them in the order of the things that are central to my life. Funny that I put my garden first, but perhaps not funny, because to me that is the center of cyclicity. Many people live in a supermarket world of vegetables all the time, but I don't. I mean, it's important to me that the shallots are ready before the onions and the broad beans are ready before the runner beans, and the strawberries are ready before the raspberries, and my life is geared around that process. And the children, the same. They're growing. They're not cyclical; they're growing; they're changing. It's all in the process of letting go.

Letting go of children is marvelous practice at letting go of the past moment, in terms of practicing awareness. A large part of the job is letting go of the moment that has just been, and letting go of children as they grow up and say, "I hate you, Mommy," letting them become whatever they want to become. Now, that may not sound like the kind of parapsychology I do, but it is. To me, it is all part of asking the questions: What is this awareness? What are these sort of states? What

has gone out of them, if anything has gone out of the body in an out-of-body experience. What is this tunnel? It's all about what is this moment now, and very often for me that is digging the garden. So I like a life in which research is part of the whole of the rest of the life. And therefore, I would rather take, personally for me, that route rather than the route saying, "Why can't I be like a man and carry on doing the same things I did before?" My life was transformed utterly by having children, and fine and fine for people who don't want it like that. I hope that answers your question. It was rather a long answer.

L. COLY: And there is career after childbirth.

BLACKMORE: Absolutely. Absolutely; but it's different. To me, it would be a denial of what all of my research is about, which is about everything, if it didn't change from something as dramatic as having children.

ALVARADO: Just a brief point. It is true that most of those studies and publications about children have not shown any relationship. I remember a recent one that came out in *Social Studies of Science*, a British journal of the sociology of science, in which, for the first time, they found a relationship with the output of publications to see if it changed. They tried to see if the variable of the age of a child had something to do with it, not only having children. What they found out was—I forget the exact ages—that the ages where usually the woman had to pay more attention to the children, you know, for a particular period—was a time of lower productivity. So there was kind of a period where the publications went up again. It seems that, looking at it that way, there is an effect that can be shown by that type of method, and this was the first one that had considered the issue of the age of the children and the period of their development.

UTTS: Well, in the study I quoted there—I'm sorry to say, as a statistician I should have all my statistics intact—but I'm not sure whether or not they included women who completely dropped out of the work force after they had their children. And I can see where that could be a biasing factor. Also, as far as married women getting promoted at faster rates than single women, I can see where there might have been other biases at work. For example, more of the single women are likely to be lesbians, and if that's obvious to any extent, then I know that would create another form of bias that would hold those women back. So I can see explanations for the statistics I quoted.

I have some other comments I want to make, but I want to make sure we were done with this topic. I just want to tie together a few things we have been talking about, because fortunately Marilyn stepped in and brought us a little bit out of the doldrums. We were getting into the, "Gee, we haven't made any progress and we don't know where to go from here," because we are talking about all these wonderful ideas, but we don't know what to do with them. I agree that we have made substantial progress, and the paper that Marilyn referred to that I wrote documents all of the meta-analyses that have been done. But I think that what we have done so far is proof-oriented research, and that is what statistics is useful for doing. I would like to make an analogy with the smoking and lung cancer controversy that was around in the 50s and 60s. I don't want to point fingers too much, but I know that the cigarette companies or the tobacco companies were saying, "But, it's just a correlation. That doesn't show anything: You have to come up with an explanation. You can't just go with a statistical correlation." It sounded very familiar when I read Ray Hyman's comments on the meta-analyses and on the statistics. He said: "Well, all you have demonstrated is a statistical anomaly." And I think that's right. I think where we are right now is that I think we have demonstrated a statistical anomaly, and that is where proof-oriented research will get you. I think that what we are talking about now is moving away from proof-oriented research and even, to bring in Sue's perspective, that what we are really talking about here is that people are out there having experiences, and we would like to know more about those experiences. Whether they are what we think they are or not, statistics is not going to tell us. We need other methods for doing that. One of the things I was struck with immediately when I first got involved with parapsychology was that parapsychologists absolutely did not discuss their own psychic experiences, if they had any. It was really obvious to me that except maybe after midnight and several beers, it was a taboo subject. Similarly, I have seen parapsychologists in the company of other people in public where they don't want to discuss individual psychic experiences with the people that they are talking to. I think that has to change. If we are really going to understand this, we have to discuss our own experiences and those of our friends and family and so on, and maybe even get out and just observe people who claim to be having these experiences out there in the world—whether it is quietly visiting psychic fairs or whatever. But visit

the culture, get involved in the culture, as you have clearly done. I don't think we are going to learn much more by simply bringing people into the laboratory and saying, "O.K. now perform."

BLACKMORE: I would like to make a comment about that. Parapsychologists don't talk about those. I know what you mean, and I'm not saying it's not true, but one of the most exciting, early memories of mine was going to the Parapsychological Association conference in St. Louis, and that was a long time ago, and meeting William Braud for the first time. It was after midnight, with a couple of beers, or whatever you say, but I had done quite a lot of magical training at that stage and to hear him talking about different kinds of rituals, different ways of dealing with different kinds of entities, and all this. It was marvelous, and I thought this is where I want to be because these people here are in the same kind of world that I'm in. Yes, on the platform they are talking about other things, but it is coming from the same place that I'm coming from. So it was a marvelously encouraging experience.

UTTS: But you see, I think that's the well-kept secret of parapsychologists.

BLACKMORE: Is it best kept? Should it be kept as a secret or should we put it out?

UTTS: I don't think it should be kept, well, you might want to keep it as a secret in terms of your individual experiences. I can see where people might be reluctant to talk about their personal experiences, but to separate the personal side, or the experiential side, from the experimental side is the mistake that we are currently making no matter whose experiences we are talking about. To say that unless we can bring them into the laboratory and figure out how to test them, it's not important to discuss them. I think that's where we need to make a change.

BLACKMORE: Perhaps we are already making it.

UTTS: I think we are.

HÖVELMANN: Two questions I didn't have a chance to ask this morning: Both relate to Ruth's paper. Ruth, you reported about the 44-year-old Chinese woman you said you spent a year with. You told us that she had been British trained and had converted to Catholicism. In what sense do you think she can be considered someone representative of her own home culture (you contrast her with an American afterwards)?

HEINZE: I just wanted to show that she had been exposed to different cultures. It was prestigious to be British educated, but the Chinese heritage superseded all the education coming from the outside.

HÖVELMANN: So, are there any differences between her mediumship and traditional Chinese mediumship?

HEINZE: Not at all. The heritage was stronger than the education, which was fairly limited.

HÖVELMANN: And the second brief comment: You said that it was "almost impossible for her to cheat," which for me translates to that it was possible for her cheat.

HEINZE: I did not exclude this possibility. I never excluded it.

HÖVELMANN: It's just the formulation that struck me.

HEINZE: Yes, almost impossible. I still haven't figured it out because I think these materialization are not necessary, in spiritual matters; therefore, I did not put too much stress on it.

HUGHES-HARTOGS: I have a bit of general information: perhaps Beverly knows about this or can comment on it. A short time ago, before I left the States I read a long article on... it's a new form of physiological monitoring. We're all familiar with EEGs and so forth, but it's a new, far more extensive, far more elaborate, far more information-giving type of equipment that provides such a wealth of detail that they think it is going to revolutionize the care of people with strokes, of people with epilepsy, and so on. And conceivably, this might also affect some results as far as we are concerned. I just at least wanted to bring it up, and perhaps somebody else in the audience is familiar with this development.

HÖVELMANN: Is it the SQUID that you mean?

HUGHES-HARTOGS: I beg your pardon?

HÖVELMANN: SQUID.

HUGHES-HARTOGS: Yes, that's right.

RUBIK: "Super-conducting quantum interference device." SQUID is an acronym for this. It's not an animal! It measures extremely low-level magnetic fields, such as those associated with nerve activity. This device is absolutely required for measuring magnetic fields of living systems because they are too small to be measured by any other means. It's generally a very expensive procedure because the device must be cooled with liquid helium. The SQUID has been around for some time, so you must be talking about some recent development that allows it to be less expensive, because it has been incredibly expensive.

HUGHES-HARTOGS: It's still expensive.

RUBIK: Oh, okay. I was wondering, because there are so few of them and so few people working in that area.

MICHELS: A question for Beverly that refers to your formal paper: You made a remark that I can't repeat in its exact wording because I didn't write it down that way. You made a remark that in many types of research you consider the experimenter no more than an extension of the machinery, or you think that the experimenter is only considered that way.

RUBIK: Any type of research. I'm not just talking about parapsychology.

MICHELS: Not necessarily? Or specifically not about parapsychology?

RUBIK: Well, I think parapsychologists are a bit wiser than this, but within conventional science there is reason to believe that if I have a machine here to collect the data, I may as well leave the room because I have nothing to do with the phenomena. Although that is conventional science, to some extent it has infiltrated parapsychology, especially some time ago. I think things are a little more enlightened now, but I wonder to what extent parapsychologists sit down and evaluate their own inner states, especially because these usually are unreported. They may do studies to look at experimenter effects, there's a certain amount of that, but is each experimenter actually considering their psychological role in the experiment?

MICHELS: I was afraid that your remark meant that parapsychology would not do any research, or not do enough research, where the role of the experimenter himself or herself plays an essential part. There is such research, in Dutch, with which I have personal experience.

RUBIK: Yes, I'm aware of some of this research. I'm just saying that within each experiment we do, we have to take stock of that. However, it's not happening. In every experiment, the inner realms of the experimenter and all of the people involved in it somehow need to be ascertained. I don't have any answers to this in terms of what psychological measures are appropriate. I'm simply raising the question, and it may ultimately show limitations to science. We may meet this wall when we push the scientific method to its extreme. We may encounter limitations for a scientific way of knowing about these inner realms.

MICHELS: So you did not mean more than that it should not be done, and it happens quite often in particular branches of science.

RUBIK: I mean that it should be done as best as we can, but there may be inherent limitations in science.