THE STUDY OF THE PARANORMAL AS AN EDUCATIVE EXPERIENCE

JOHN BELOFF

The question I want to raise in this paper is a very basic one, namely: What justification can we offer for the teaching of parapsychology at the university?

I presume that no similar defense is called for with respect to parapsychological research. If there *are* paranormal phenomena—and I take it that we are all agreed that there is an overwhelming case for supposing that there are—then, clearly, someone ought to be studying them and where better than at the university? In short, the pursuit of knowledge, the quest for truth is one of those unconditional values of our culture that requires no extraneous justification.

The same cannot be said, however, when it comes to our educational policies. We cannot teach everything and it is a matter for debate as to which options deserve a place on the undergraduate curriculum. Basically, two reasons can be advanced for the teaching of any particular topic: the one social, the other purely intellectual. The social reason is that there are certain sorts of knowledge and certain skills that a student needs to equip himself for his future profession. Hence the prominence we give at the university to such faculties as those of law, medicine or engineering. Since parapsychology can scarcely be described as a profession—the number of those who make it their career, in your country, is still negligible—we can hardly justify the teaching of it on vocational grounds.

The intellectual reason is the one that is presupposed in the idea of a liberal education. Philosophy, logic, pure mathematics, no less than history, literature and the study of dead languages and defunct civilizations have few social applications and they have vocational value only to those who will in turn be teaching them to others. Yet only the most hardened philistine would dare to suggest that we banish them from our seats of learning!

Could a case be made for parapsychology on the grounds that it contributes to a liberal education? We must admit that it seems sadly lacking in many of the qualities that we expect of those disciplines that are cultivated for their own sake. It lacks that majestic edifice of theory that has been the pride and delight of the physical sciences; it lacks an agreed body of facts such as gives the historical, geographical or social sciences a firm consensual basis; and it lacks, finally, both the aesthetic appeal and the cultural significance that attaches to the arts and the humanities.

Nevertheless, there are, I am going to suggest, three possible lines that our defense may take. First, we may argue that the demand for it already exists. That the young are eager to learn more about the paranormal and that, if we fail to satisfy this demand in a responsible academic manner, there are charlatans and vulgarizers enough to whom they can turn who will be only too willing to satisfy it in an irresponsible, commercial manner! Secondly, we may argue that, whether or not parapsychology has any intrinsic educational merit, it has by now shown itself to have sufficent relevance to other disciplines whose importance is not in question: to psychology, psychiatry, or anthropology, to philosophy and theology and finally to physics itself. Then, thirdly, we may argue—indeed I shall argue—that, over and above any relevance which it may have to these other disciplines, the objective study of the paranormal (which is how I would define parapsychology) may be credited with certain unique virtues as an educative experience in its own right. In what follows, I shall consider each of these arguments in turn before trying to draw some general conclusions.

Let us start, then, with the argument that, since the demand exists, it is incumbent on us to try and meet it. This is a recent development and it is still only marginally relevant to the situation that obtains in my country. Its urgency arises from growth of the so-called "counter culture" in the United States during the 1960s and, more particularly, of the "occult revival" which was one aspect of it.

I am not here concerned with the causes of the particular episode of our recent social history. It may be, as some have suggested, that too many people these days are educated beyond their intellectual means. When they find that they are incapable of grasping genuine scientific ideas or are bored by genuine scholarship they turn instead to the pseudo-sciences which, at the cost of a modicum of intellectual effort, enable them to enjoy the seductive feeling of being the possessors of a hidden knowledge and a superior wisdom. It is also the case that we are witnessing today a widespread disenchantment with official science,

which is often blamed for the crisis through which our civilization is now passing. Anything, therefore, that serves to cast doubt upon the validity or at least the sufficiency of the accepted scientific world view is bound to be welcome to those who are struggling to promote an alternative world view. In these circumstances we have to think carefully before lending ourselves to what is essentially an anti-rational, anti-intellectual revolt.

Our traditional antagonist was the hard-headed skeptic who clung tenaciously to a dogmatic materialism. It was against his opposition that we strove to produce some small dent in the carapace of scientific orthodoxy. We were less concerned about those who believed too much too readily; we thought of them as the lunatic fringe whom we had to learn to tolerate. In the present intellectual climate, however, when the universities are no longer peaceful havens of reason and learning, we have a positive duty to restrain the credulity of the young and to counter the mass of misinformation to which they are exposed, and to which they are so pathetically vulnerable. For, after all, is not one of the chief aims of all education that of helping the learner to distinguish between well-founded and ill-founded claims to knowledge? It is, I may say, unfortunate that, at such a time, too many among us who should know better are themselves being seduced by the ideals of the counter-culture and are willing to lend countenance to the nonsense that is purveyed under its aegis, but it is all the more vital that the rest of us should not weaken in our resolve to uphold the highest critical standards.

We come now to our second line of defense, namely the relevance of parapsychology to established fields of inquiry. Here the two most promising openings are those afforded by (a) psychology and (b) physics. How you propose to integrate parapsychology with either of these two fields will depend, in the first instance, on what you conceive a paranormal phenomenon to be. If, like the late Sir Cyril Burt, or like J. B. Rhine, you believe that psi is essentially non-physical, even though it may have physical manifestations, you will be more likely to want to assimilate parapsychology to psychology than to physics. If, on the contrary, like a number of parapsychologists of a new generation, you believe that everything that happens must ultimately have a physical explanation, you will look for an understanding of psi phenomena, not to the mind but to the brain conceived as a purely physical system and to the possibility that it may possess certain novel and unsuspected physical properties which we had not previously allowed for.

Physics, in any case, can never be left out of the equation if only because PK is, in effect if not in origin, a physical phenomenon. Today,

in the post-Geller phase of parapsychology, when PK effects of a directly observable kind have once more come to the fore, we again find that physicists, in America, in Britain and in the Soviet Union, are being drawn to parapsychology in the hope that it may enhance our understanding of fundamental physical processes. There is some difference of opinion, however, among these physicists as to whether psi phenomena can be explained in terms of known physical principles or whether physics itself will have to undergo another transformation before it can encompass them. Only a little while ago it looked as if nothing could be more discredited than the idea that parapsychology could be reconciled with physics as it now stands. Yet, no less an authority than Gerald Feinberg, in his foreword to Edgar Mitchell's compendium *Psychic Explorations*,[1] ventures the opinion that psychic phenomena may not, after all, be found to contradict "known physical laws" and may prove explicable "within the existing body of physical principle."

Again, it looked until quite recently as if nothing could well be more futile than to attempt an electromagnetic theory of ESP. Yet, today, we find several theorists independently coming forward with the suggestion that telepathy at least might turn out to be a form of telecommunication based on extremely low frequency electromagnetic waves, the idea being that this type of transmission is exceedingly penetrating and so cannot be arrested by faraday cages, long distances or other obstacles that interfere with other types of radiation. John Taylor,[2] a theoretical physicist of King's College, London, Michael Persinger,[3] of the Psychophysiology Laboratory of the Laurentian University, Canada and I. M. Kogan[4] of the Society of Radio, Electronics and Biocommunication of Moscow, have each, in their various ways, been toying with this idea. Taylor has gone further and suggests that this kind of radiation can explain the metal-bending performances he has observed with Geller and a number of mini-gellers.

Personally, I do not take very seriously this line of speculation. It seems to me that if psi phenomena are ever reconciled with physics it will only be when physics has been transformed and extended out of recognition. But, of course, I am not a physicist and I may well be mistaken. Meanwhile the critical test of the physicalistic approach to psi, I suggest, will be whether the phenomenon can be simulated artificially. Thus, if low frequency electromagnetic radiation of the sort which the brain can emit can carry information of the sort that has been demonstrated in telepathic experiments, then it should be possible to design apparatus that can pick up this information in lieu of a living

subject. Similarly, if such radiation is responsible for releasing stresses in metals so as to create bending, as Taylor suggests, it should be possible to design a gellerizing machine that would render Geller redundant. After all, we can, to a large extent, simulate artifically in this way the functions of our sense organs. We can even design artificial intelligences. We surely have a right to demand from those who believe that psi is physical, an artificial psi subject!

But, whatever the future may hold, there can be no doubt that the most concerted attempt so far to bring parapsychology into the academic fold has been via psychology. This is hardly surprising since, whatever else may be said about psychic phenomena, they seem only to occur in the presence of, or at least in connection with, a living subject, normally a human being. Hence, so long as we are content to ignore the question of the mechanisms by which information is acquired or transmitted, the only questions we can ask about psi are psychological ones, questions relating to the psychological conditions under which they occur and the characteristics of the individual who manifests them.

Historically speaking, the most famous attempt to domesticate parapsychology, with a view to affiliating it to academic psychology, was that associated with William McDougall and his disciple J. B. Rhine at the Duke University Parapsychology Laboratory. They were inspired in their endeavor by three ideas in particular: first, the idea that ESP was a universal property of mind, not just the freakish gift of a few exceptional individuals; secondly, that a statistical methodology would enable us to reveal even the small degree of ESP ability that ordinary individuals may possess; thirdly, that by making the test-procedure simple and rigorous it could be readily copied as a result of which independent confirmations would be forthcoming that would put an end to any lingering doubts about the question of authenticity. The same reasoning, of course, was applied to PK which entered the picture somewhat later. We may note here that, by introducing the term "parapsychology," McDougall hoped to delineate this quantitative and experimental approach from the broader field of psychical research which would continue taking care of spontaneous cases and uncontrolled phenomena but could not so readily be brought within the academic purview.

These were splendid ideas and by no means unreasonable at the time they were conceived. Yet, I do not think I am being provocative if I say that none of them has been fulfilled. Positive results still largely depend on having the right subject, and a good card-guesser is no less of a rarity than a good medium in the bad old days of psychical research.

Independent corroboration is still the exception rather than the rule, and it is now beginning to look as if we need not only the right subject but even the right experimenter. Rhine, I gather, discourages young aspirants from embarking on a career in parapsychology if they cannot first demonstrate that they are the right sort of experimenter, that is one who can get positive results! In the event, so far from skepticism dissolving under the weight of accumulating statistical evidence from the laboratories, few other universities have felt encouraged to follow the example of Duke, which, on Rhine's retirement, itself severed its connection with parapsychology.

Yet, despite these setbacks, the aim of bringing psychology and parapsychology closer together is still very much alive. It is notably exemplified in the work of Gertrude Schmeidler and Ramakrishna Rao, who have done much to link parapsychology with personality theory, using unselected subjects. It is the point of departure for the work of Rex Stanford. His PMIR (Psi Mediated Instrumental Response) model of psi is based on the premise that, without knowing it, we utilize paranormally acquired information in the satisfaction of our immediate needs.[5] Stanford has pioneered what I like to call the "surreptitious" approach to psi. That is to say, the subject is kept in ignorance of the fact that psi is involved in the ostensible task that he is required to undertake. In recent years at least three researchers have independently adopted the surreptitious approach with positive results: Stanford himself, using a pseudo-memory task,[6] the Kreitlers of Tel-Aviv University using a pseudo-subliminal perception task[7] and Martin Johnson using a pseudo-examination task.[8]

Others have sought a meeting point between psychology and parapsychology not in these everyday acts of cognition but rather in certain special states of consciousness. Perhaps the most notable exponent of this approach at the present time is Charles Honorton, currently president of the Parapsychological Association, but the approach has been so widespread that it may seem invidious even to single out any particular worker. An enormous number of different techniques and different states of mind have been explored from this angle and, although success has been sporadic, this approach continues to attract adherents.

Yet another avenue towards a rapprochement with academic psychology has been to explore the physiological substratum that may be assumed to be common alike to psychological and parapsychological phenomena insofar as both are mediated by the psychophysical organism. Here, again, many names could be cited, but I do not need to look any further than our own laboratory at Edinburgh. Thus, Richard

Broughton has been investigating the possibility that our ESP function may be mediated by the right hemisphere in the sort of way that language and, more generally, logical and sequential thinking seems to be mediated by the left hemisphere. Brian Millar is pursuing an even bolder hypothesis. He is attempting to replicate the so-called "Lloyd Effect,"[9] namely, that if you stimulate the agent, in a telepathic set-up (Millar uses a stroboscopic lamp for this purpose), an evoked potential should be discernible in the subject's EEG record, if this is analyzed by a computer which averages the brain-responses on each trial. Both Broughton and Millar will be reporting on their work to the forthcoming Parapsychological Association Convention so I will not say more about it now and I mention it only to illustrate the new psychophysiological approach to psi. Perhaps, however, I should add that, in the best Edinburgh tradition, Millar got only chance results.

As a psychologist myself, as well as a parapsychologist, I naturally welcome these attempts to bring parapsychology into the psychological arena. Psychology is, in any case, far from being a unified science and I have myself elsewhere attempted to present parapsychology as one of the many distinct psychological sciences.[10] Yet, for all that, I am bound in all honesty to admit that so far the influence which parapsychology has had on any of the other psychological sciences has been minimal. The one area where parapsychology has undoubtedly made a difference is that of philosophical psychology. It no longer seems possible to discuss the nature of mind, or the mind-body problem, as if the parapsychological evidence did not exist, although, amazingly enough, there are plenty of philosophers who are so purblind that they go on writing as if they were still living in the eighteenth century, when commonsense could always expect to have the last word!

But, if, as we have seen, the relevance of parapsychology to physics is still so controversial and its relevance to psychology is at best marginal, where does this leave us with respect to the question of justification that we set out to answer? I think that one thing we have got to recognize is that our field is much more erratic, anarchic and basically subversive than we like to admit when we are engaged in one of our public-relations exercises. It is only by arbitrarily restricting the scope of parapsychology, as McDougall and Rhine attempted to do in their justly celebrated program, that we can give it even the semblance of being like any other conventional science. If there are any of you who are ever tempted to play down the sheer unruliness of our data, I would recommend the following salutary excercise to be performed once a day before breakfast until further notice: try repeating over to yourself the names of some of the more colorful psychic personalities

who have left their imprint on our turbulent history: Daniel Home, Eusapia Palladino, Franek Kluski, Eileen Garrett, José Arigo, Ted Serios, Uri Geller. . . you may add or subtract as you please. I am not asking you to accept any or all of these at their face value, merely to acknowledge that they represent so many prodigious question-marks. To contemplate the careers of these, or others like them, is to be confronted with the sheer impenetrable mysteriousness of the world which makes a mockery of our scientific pretensions.

This brings me to my final point, namely, what *I* conceive to be the most distinctive contribution which parapsychology can make to a liberal education, and the chief lessons that we can hope to learn from it. It teaches us, I suggest, not only that the world is a stranger place than we would otherwise suppose, but also how difficult it is to arrive at any definite conclusions about it. It raises for us, in its most acute form, the eternal question: "What can I believe?" This question is one that we encounter all through life whenever we are forced to consider some creed or religion that makes far-reaching claims on our credence. Unlike these other creeds or religions, however, parapsychology spurns any resort to propaganda or appeal to faith. On the contrary, it deliberately fosters skepticism by being hypercritical of every claim which it is called upon to adjudicate and so keeps us in a perpetual state of uncertainty. At one instant it will open up for us exciting vistas of new worlds to be conquered; at the next, it will cause them to vanish again in a haze of doubts. It forces us to reckon with the almost bottomless duplicity of our fellow creatures, and yet it forbids us to take refuge in any easy cynicism no matter how fantastic the case under consideration. In a word, it plays tug-of-war with us so that we can enjoy neither the peace of mind of the committed believer nor the complacency of the skeptic.

From one point of view we have much in common with the lawyer, or even the historian, who is likewise concerned to reach a conclusion about some episode that can only be reconstructed on the basis of human testimony or, at most, documentary evidence. We, however, are in a much more perplexing situation than they are, in that we lack the canons of plausibility based on commonsense experience to which they can appeal. One can see this when the law is called upon to pronounce on some paranormal claim that comes before the courts. The result is usually farcical. As we know, it is not easy to prove that an accused person is insane, but to convince a judge that an accused person has paranormal powers is almost beyond the wit of man! A celebrated trial took place in London, at the Old Bailey, during the last world war, of the notorious materializing medium Helen

Duncan, who was indicted for fraud under the "Witchcraft Act."[11] Her defense counsel offered to stage a séance for the benefit of judge and jury in order to demonstrate their client's authenticity. The judge, however, declined the offer on the grounds that it would be demeaning to the dignity of the court! In spite of a score or more of witnesses who testified to the marvels which she had wrought, it took the jury only twenty minutes to return a verdict of guilty. Perhaps the jurors were all earnest disciples of the philosopher David Hume who, you will remember, argued that it was always more rational when in doubt to suppose that those who testify to a miracle are either lying or are deluded than that the miracle really happened as alleged. And, in the case of Mrs. Duncan's miracles, this may well have been the wisest maxim to adopt.[12] Unfortunately, the parapsychologist cannot settle for this simple Humean rule or for any other *a priori* principle of rationality. Or, perhaps, this is not a misfortune after all, perhaps it is this very absence of any rule or precedent that makes the study of the paranormal such a unique educative experience. There is no other discipline that I know which engages at the same time a person's critical faculties and his imagination and then stretches them both to a comparable extent.

REFERENCES

[1] Mitchell, E., et al.: *Psychic Exploration.* Edited by J. White. New York: G. P. Putnam's. 1974.

[2] Taylor, J.: *Superminds.* London: Macmillan. 1975.

[3] Persinger, M.: *The Paranormal: Part II.* New York: MSS Information Corp., 1974.

[4] Kogan, I. M.: "The Informational Aspect of Telepathy" (Paper presented to the UCLA Symposium "A New Look at ESP," 1969). Unpublished.

[5] Stanford, R. G.: "An Experimentally Testable Model for Spontaneous Psi Events, Part I, Extrasensory Events," *J. Amer. S. P. R. 68*, 1974, 34–58. Part II Psychokinetic Events. *Idem* 321–357.

[6] Stanford, R. G.: "Extrasensory Effects upon 'Memory,' " *J. Amer. S. P. R. 64*, 1970, 161–186.

[7] Kreitler, H. & Kreitler, S.: "Does Extrasensory Perception Affect Psychological Experiments?" *J. Parapsych. 36*, 1972, 1–45.

[8] Johnson, M.: "A New Technique for Testing ESP in a Real-Life High-Motivational Context." *J. Parapsych. 37*, 1973, 210–218.

[9] Lloyd, D. H.: "Objective Events in the Brain Correlating with Psychic Phenomena," *New Horizons, 1*, 1973, 69–75.

[10] Beloff, J.: *Psychological Sciences.* London: Crosby Lockwood Staples. 1973.

[11] Becchover Roberts, C. E. (Ed.): *The Trial of Mrs. Duncan.* London: Jarrolds. 1945.

[12] West, D. J.: "The Trial of Mrs. Duncan," *Proceedings of the S. P. R. 48*, 1946, 32–64.

DISCUSSION

FRANKLIN: In the reference that you made to the physical sciences, have you seen any developments of theoretical approaches which are

appealing to the mind as well as to students in the area, which are not within the realm of accepted things? In other words, it looks as if there is a step towards new approaches and have you seen anything that is satisfying there?

BELOFF: I assume that you are referring here to what's coming under the heading of "Paraphysics," and that sort of thing. . . these sort of speculative theories. . .

FRANKLIN: I'm certainly not sure. There are many advances in psychology that I have very high regard for, but I'm a physicist and look principally at that area. My question is, "Why hasn't there been much new?"

BELOFF: Why is this question directed at me? I'm not a physicist. If physics has something to say about parapsychology, you, sir, should be the one to enlighten us.

FRANKLIN: Well, you reviewed the work of John Taylor and of others and made reference to them. That's why I asked.

BELOFF: Yes, indeed. I mean, such theories as these that I have studied and insofar as I can comprehend them, have failed to impress me at all as a solution to the problems of psi. But this may be my own shortcoming.

JOHNSON: I would just like to follow up the question. As far as I know, one of the difficulties is that I wouldn't call them theories—just surmises or assumptions and these usually don't have very much of test implications. Secondly, we still have the tremendous problem to overcome regarding repeatability within parapsychology. Is that some of the reasons why you don't feel impressed by the theories or the hypothesis from the physical side, so to say, or why don't you feel impressed by them?

BELOFF: I think you put your finger here on a very important point. I mean, if they could make predictions that we could test empirically and these predictions or hypotheses are confirmed, we should have to pay much more attention than when they are simply at a speculative level and one is really dealing in analogies and possibilities of a rather fluid kind.

DOMMEYER: It has occurred to me that there seems to be a tendency to associate parapsychology rather constantly with psychology. Maybe this ought to be done, but I wonder whether there are not some unfortunate features connected with that association. Doesn't one sometimes drag all the prejudices of psychologists into parapsychol-

ogy? I think, for instance of the experience of Stanford University with the Thomas Welton Stanford Psychical Research Fellowship. The psychology department, in general, was not very favorable to the use of the fellowship in the way in which this organization would like to have it used, so I wonder whether it might not be better ultimately if parapsychology were simply to disavow connections with any of the established fields. I wonder whether it would not be better to have parapsychology set itself up on an independent basis and rather than taking the psychological approach, perhaps taking a multi-disciplinary approach because obviously some physicists and people from other disciplines are interested in this area. So I wonder why we should associate it so often with psychology, and whether that doesn't constitute a handicap.

BELOFF: Yes, I have considerable sympathy with your question because, although, as a psychologist, naturally, I have a certain interest in bringing the two together, I have come more and more in the course of time to recognize the sort of unique nature of parapsychology. I quite agree with you. I don't think it can be simply brought into any other single discipline. On the other hand, we have to recognize as a practical fact that we are hardly yet strong enough to stand alone and I can't quite see how we would make our entry into the university, which I think is very important because this is where important research will be done. I can't quite see how, you know, simply calling ourselves "interdisciplinary," we are going to make a stand, but maybe these practical difficulties can be overcome.

RAO: You pointed out two possible areas of relevance with regard to parapsychology finding a place in the university curriculum—the social relevance and the intellectual relevance of the field. You apparently felt that you can hardly claim a justification for social relevance. Don't you agree that many cultures in the world have built-in belief systems that border on the acceptance of the paranormal, and that any inquiry or investigation into these assumptions with a view to find factual evidence bearing on them is an important social function to perform? I personally believe that a scientific inquiry which will throw light on our assumptions and belief systems is a legitimate function that has an important social relevance. This is one comment.

The second one is with regard to the greater emphasis on or justification for having parapsychology in a university teaching situation for intellectual reasons. Now, I have a feeling that for anyone who is undergoing training for a research career in psychology,

judicious training in parapsychology could be very useful. Parapsychology is a discipline which deals with problems replete with conceptual ambiguities and uncertain variables that can easily trap a less sophisticated investigator into committing errors of design and inference. The history of the progress of parapsychology, I think, is a story of the development of methods and techniques to tame and control what one time appeared to be uncontrollable behavioral variables. As such, a study of parapsychology should prove to be an enviable asset for any student of human nature.

BELOFF: Yes, Dr. Rao, I really am in agreement with both the points you've raised, but I feel the first one about social relevance. . . I mean, obviously parapsychology does have social relevance because it enters into daily life and into people's culture, but I think there would be more of what I could consider a justification for research into the field rather than the actual teaching aspect, but that's a small point. In the other case—I bring that under my heading of being connected with psychology. Certainly if parapsychology is, as I think, a psychological science, then no psychology student is complete without some knowledge of it. Although I don't give courses at the undergraduate level in parapsychology, I always in my general courses try and make them aware of the fact that there is parapsychology as well as the other things that they have to learn.

KRIPPNER: I would like to pick up on the comments that Dr. Dommeyer and Dr. Rao just made about the place of parapsychology in the curriculum. It seems to me that this is another piece of evidence that the universities, by and large, are behind the times. We are now getting to the point where we realize parapsychology, at its best and at its truest, is interdisciplinary and covers psychology, physics, anthropology, philosophy, biology, etc. Some universities are finally starting to open up a little bit by admitting parapsychology into a few psychology departments. What these universities are doing is very gratifying but might be passé, in terms of the standing the field will have in the near future.

BELOFF: I don't have very much to add to that because I am basically in agreement with it—that it is an interdisciplinary study and that some of the people making some of the most important contributions today certainly aren't psychologists by background. They often come from physical sciences or elsewhere. We shall hear something more from Bob Morris, because I understand that his position is something of an interdisciplinary situation, and he will have more, perhaps, to tell us about how it's working out. My misgivings were how we would

convince universities of our relevance, you see—if they acknowledged us, there would be no problem. We would then have a department of parapsychology which could draw upon all these other ongoing disciplines.

RYZL: I want to address myself also to this interdisciplinary feature of parapsychology, and I think in California we have good examples. Several universities or colleges have accepted parapsychology on this interdisciplinary level. An example is the Tutorial Department at the University of California in Santa Barbara and I would suggest that Bob Morris tell us more about it. For another example, the San José State University has had successful courses in the cybernetics department; this is another case of an interdisciplinary approach; and now there is a program being prepared in John F. Kennedy University which plans to offer parapsychology in a department related to religious studies, but not only on a philosophically-oriented level, but experimentally-oriented. So this is an example of the fact that parapsychology is transcending the limits of one single field.

BELOFF: Yes, thank you, Dr. Ryzl. I'm glad to hear you tell me of this because I think it's a healthy development that this should be coming about.

HASTINGS: I have two observations. One is that there is sometimes an advantage in doing an interdisciplinary program instead of an internal departmental program, simply because you have more access to the different contributions form various academic areas. Secondly, in some cases we are handicapped as a profession by having to fit into the traditional and current university and college departmental programs. In order to gain status and legitimacy, we sometimes find it necessary to justify ourselves as philosophers or cyberneticians or psychologists or physicists, when research is coming from all these areas. This does not mean that parapsychology is subordinate to any of these, but that it is more than any one traditional field. We may want to look at ways the research concepts can be opened out so as not to exclude the many areas that are contributing. Psychologists may have to understand ways of research that are quite different from their familiar ones. Physicists may have to learn psychological ideas that are quite foreign to their discipline. So I think we should consider how we can incorporate diverse approaches as we move into a coherent education program.

MORRIS: I guess I should mention some of what's going on at the University of California at Santa Barbara now. The only reason that UCSB was an acceptable campus really for parapsychology was

because of the existence of an interdisciplinary undergraduate major called the Tutorial Program; because of this, I teach all three of my courses in the Tutorial Program. They do not threaten anybody. They do allow a fairly natural kind of interaction. The contacts that I've had at the University so far have been drawn primarily from electrical engineering, physics, geology, and religious studies. My boss is a professor of Italian, and I am also overseen by a professor of English and a professor of religious studies.

TART: Let me make an exteme statement, though. I'm all in favor of interdisciplinary studies, but as I think about the parapsychological literature, the only variables that significantly and reasonably consistently correlate with psi performance are psychological ones. While I would like to know of other variables that correlated with psi, I think that in practical terms, psychology is still by far the most relevant discipline for working with psi.

BELOFF: I would endorse that opinion, certainly.

BISAHA: I agree with Bob on that matter. I attended a few education conferences, and the tendency is now for the programs to be interdisciplinary-related. The fact is we're no longer departmentalizing in the departments, but making programs that are communications which encompass a whole section of college courses. Previously we called it *liberal arts*, but recently it's called *general education*. We are under the illusion that if a student goes to college, we expect him to get a job, but that's no longer the case. They're going there for an education, and the specific purpose, of course, is to develop a new educational principle. Maybe the fact is that education is meeting our prerequisites for parapsychology in this line right along with what we've been speaking about this morning.