
PHILOSOPHY AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY: IMPOSSIBLE
BEDFELLOWS OR THE MARRIAGE
OF THE FUTURE?

LAWRENCE L. LESHAN

The data of parapsychology consistently face us with the basic question: "How does the world work?" We cannot look at the report of a single experiment or spontaneous incident without the specter of the question peering at us from between the lines. We parapsychologists are always standing on the edge of the abyss of the unknown as we go about our daily work.

This condition is true of all science. There is, however, a difference. As the history of science has repeatedly shown, there is a consistent and now (since the work of Kuhn¹ at any rate) a well known pattern. Science deals in terms of an accepted and coherent view of the nature of reality and does its work from this base. Standing solidly on it, scientists gradually become aware of problems, discrepancies and contradictions. Facts appear that do not fit the accepted view. These slowly mount up until a new view, a new picture of reality is presented which resolves these new problems. The older generation of scientists, by and large, rejects the new view and remains comfortable resting on the old world picture. A new generation grows up accepting the new one, gradually takes over academic posts and the authorship of textbooks and science moves on, now resting on its new base. The process is presently repeated. No one is ever very uncomfortable as everyone stands solidly on a world picture, on a basis of interpreting reality that their data and most of the professional material they read and write seem to support.

Parapsychologists are in quite a different position. There is no accepted world picture that gives us a base to stand on as we do our work. Our data consistently fly directly in the face of accepted interpretations of reality or else they are not "paranormal" and therefore not of primary interest to us. We are constantly reminded by this data that what we believe are the laws of reality (Broad's

“Basic Limiting Principles”²) are being violated and that we have no viable alternatives, no alternative world-picture we can stand on. In a profound psychological sense, we need always to defend ourselves against “culture-shock,” against what Kurt Goldstein³ has called the strongest of all anxieties, “Catastrophic Anxiety.” This is the anxiety felt when the perceived foundations of reality on which we have built our egos are crumbling before our eyes and no longer support these egos. Our defenses against this threat are so strong and ingrained that we are hardly aware of them and they only emerge into view when we wonder why we, personally or as a profession, have so rarely followed up the few good leads we have found in the past 80-odd years, why there are so few of us or why so many of us leave the field.

One other symptom of our suppressed anxiety and our defenses against it is probably our theoretical timidity. At first glance there seems to be a large scale paradox in our work. We have the courage to work in the most “far out,” the least accepted, of all scientific fields. We face the open or thinly disguised rejection of our scientific colleagues and the lack of understanding of what we are trying to do by the public at large. This intellectual courage, however, seems to have disappeared when we attempt theoretical explanations of our data. The number of our theories is very small and most of them are attempts to reconcile our findings with well-accepted, Newtonian scientific concepts. In spite of the fact that we are all well aware that the data do not fit these concepts, we keep trying to cram them in. We continue to do this in spite of the fact that C. D. Broad in his *Lectures in Psychological Research*⁴ and John Beloff in his *The Existence of Mind*⁵ have completely and finally disposed of this possibility. Louisa Rhine put it succinctly when she wrote: “The facts of mental ability already discovered in parapsychology no more fit the current idea of a space-time world than such a fact as that ships disappear bottom-first over the horizon fits the model of a flat earth.”⁶ We all know this and go right on trying to fit the facts into “the current idea of a space-time world.” The contradiction between our lack of timidity shown in our choosing to work in this field and our excess of it in devising theories to fit our data can only come from severe psychological stress.

There are various other aspects to this stress than the problem of catastrophic anxiety. Some of these I and others have described elsewhere.⁷ Overall, however, these have led us to generally keep away from philosophic exploration of the meaning of our data and to eschew metaphysics as if it were the plague. Our approach has

been what William James called "radical empiricism." We have just concentrated on experiments and trying to get facts. In this way we have become trivial. Without the synoptic and synthetic functions of philosophy we have become fact collectors. And if there is one thing that philosophy has learned, it is that facts without a context are meaningless and silly. The context of the *Journal of the ASPR* and the *Journal of Parapsychology* is not enough. Our work is isolated from the mainstream of science and the mainstream of our culture. It is irrelevant and trivial because we have rejected our philosophic roots and the synthetic aspects of philosophy. Without these we stand on chaos. (A theory may be invalid, but it gives us a place to move on from.) About all we can do without them is to do new experiments at about the same rate that we forget old ones. We are so isolated and irrelevant at a time of tremendous cultural interest in the paranormal, parapsychology libraries are deserted, financial support for serious work is terribly low, and the public interest is shunted off to Atlantis and astrology while we sit in our ivory towers and write statistics to each other.

However, parapsychology is not the only field that has become irrelevant and trivial in a time of great cultural need. "Seldom before," wrote Morris Rafael Cohen, "has the general craving for philosophic light seemed so vast and the offerings of professed philosophers so scant and unsubstantial."⁸ Before we can understand the strange relationship between parapsychology and philosophy, we must look briefly at the recent development of philosophy.

Since Newton, there has been in the modern world a great quest for simplicity; a belief that development and progress in understanding meant a simplification to straightforward, basic principles. In the present century, philosophy has hoped that "Either language would be reduced to an all inclusive 'logical' system, or essences and principles that would reveal reality in all its marked elegance and simplicity would be revealed."⁹ Berkeley and Hume built tables out of squareness and brownness. Pavlov built intellect out of conditioned reflexes. Loeb built life out of tropisms.¹⁰ And parapsychologists continue to try to build ESP out of card-guesses.

The belief, furthermore, was that human life could be ultimately explained in "logical" terms in the ordinary, everyday meaning of the term "logical." Ultimately, it could be broken down to something like: "Either p or q or pq." Freud saw the unconscious as being logically understandable and comprehensible and believed that if unconscious forces are made conscious, then we would logically see where our real pleasures lay and behave rationally. In a curious parallel

to Freud, Bertrand Russell believed the same. In John Maynard Keynes words, Russell “. . . sustained simultaneously a pair of opinions ludicrously incompatible. He held that in fact human ideas were carried on after a most irrational fashion, but that the remedy was quite simple and easy since all we had to do was to carry them on rationally.”¹¹ The Logical Positivists believed that there was “a unique model for all real science and that when they had described it they would unify all science and eventually all human experience.”¹²

With this basic hope and thrust—of explaining the world and human beings logically and simply, of reducing it to a set of axioms, basic limiting principles—parapsychology was anathema to philosophy. The data of parapsychology show *in each instance* that the usual framework of the world as we perceive it is not consistent. It “slips” and things that could not happen, happen. It is, however, a basic aspect of the models of reality that we have been working towards in the last few centuries that they are completely consistent; they admit of no exceptions, no “miracles.”

The input that parapsychology would bring to philosophy is not the usual kind of scientific input. The usual kind (except for relativity theory and quantum mechanics) can be fitted into the usual views about the nature of reality. If the sun moves about the earth or vice versa, is certainly a major difference, but the implied revolution is limited. In both cases you still have two material bodies relating to each other in time and space. The implications from paranormal data are far greater.

Philosophers either implicitly or explicitly understood the problem. Allow in one good case of paranormal activity and you have destroyed the chance for a basic, simple model and opened the door to almost anything. (As Beloff described it,¹³ you cannot even reduce the number of things you accept and still be safe. One is enough. You cannot be a little bit pregnant.) The best that can be done after admitting a single case, is to hold the rearguard action that the laws we ascribe to reality *usually* work. This we already knew.

The size of the perceived danger is illustrated by an incident described in Ernest Jones' biography of Freud.¹⁴ Shocked and startled that Freud considered telepathy valid, Jones exclaimed: “If we are prepared to consider the possibility of mental processes floating in the air, what is to stop us from believing in angels?” Freud replied: “Quite so. And even *der Liebe Gott*.” Although the data of parapsychology does not necessarily lead us to a belief in angels and a loving God, Freud was not underestimating the size of the problem.

To both philosophers and parapsychologists the danger has been

clear; the facts of the paranormal would create immense havoc. To the philosophers, they ran counter to the faith in simplicity, rationality and consistency. For the parapsychologists the danger was that if they explored the meaning of their data with the sharp and terrible clarity of philosophical tools, they would have to face the fact that the world-design (to use Binswanger's term) on which they had built their egos and by which they lived, was not universal and did not fully work. Each saw the other as an impossible bedfellow.

This has been the situation and it is still to a large degree true. There have been, however, major developments in the past decades which are building up pressure on professionals in both fields to perceive that they cannot continue to live without each other. It may be a forced marriage that is developing, but it will be a real one.

From the viewpoint of philosophy, one pressure that is developing is the gradual failure of Cartesian dualism to work any more. (H. H. Price once described this as "a very brilliant theory that had been very useful in the past, but is now a nuisance."¹⁵) Modern science has been indicating this lack of usefulness for many years. For example, for Descartes the essence of matter was spatial extension; the essence of mind was its cogitations. Today in science, however, matter is seen either as a consistent source of sensations or else as stress points between spatially unbounded fields of energy. The distinction has broken down.

The definition of matter as "real" has also been broken down by developments in particle physics. The basic building blocks are no longer solid. An electron can perhaps be best defined as a region of space that exhibits a certain inertia, repels other electrons and attracts protons. (The best definition of a proton is probably that it is a region of space that exhibits a certain inertia, repels other protons and attracts electrons.) In location it is, in Max Planck's words "smeared all over a probability distribution" and in Heisenberg's words "It has a tendency to exist." As the fundamental building blocks of "real matter," these are insubstantial indeed.

Further there has been a general switch from the search for "reality" to a search for useful ways to construe reality. We have largely given up the hope of knowing what is "out there." In a typical statement, Suzanne Langer defined natural laws as ". . . simply the most general facts we know about the universe."¹⁶ The definition is in terms of knowledge, not eternal verities.

The quest for one, absolute reality has been battered by one event after another in science: the determination of the speed of nerve transmission and of the finite speed of light, the doctrine of the specific

energies of nerves and the work of Riemann and Lobachevsky, relativity theory and the principle of complementarity, Gestalt psychology and the work of Boas and Whorf, the Existentialist movement and the production of the movie that made *Rashomon* a household word, to name only a few. It does not stand as useful any more.

These developments have certainly not gone unnoticed in philosophy and the search for a new way of relating to them has been going on for some time. "In every age," wrote Langer¹⁷, "philosophical thinking exploits some dominant concepts and makes its greatest headway in solving problems conceived in terms of them." As the usefulness of Cartesian dualism has faded, the search has developed for the concepts of the next age.

William James once suggested that the universe might not be a consistent system, but ". . . essentially a loose jointed assemblage of odds and ends," a "pluriverse" rather than a "universe." And, from a superficial point of view, science seems to be moving in that direction. We have the viewpoint of relativity theory that the truth about an event is partially determined by the coordinate system from which you are viewing it, the view of quantum physics that the position of the electron is indeterminate, the fact that the "basic, moving agents" on one level seem to be statistical factors, on another cause and effect, field interactions on another. That "organizing forces" exist on biological levels and probably teleological forces on psychological levels. The four kinds of forces of physics today seem to have little to do with each other except for the fact that the same entities may be involved in more than one of them.

It has become clear from psychology and anthropology that Husserl's "enormous *a priori*" differs considerably with different people and different cultures. The Linguistic Analysts such as Ryle and Wisdom pointed out that the major function of language was not as something to be made perfect so as to absolutely reflect the structure of reality, but rather as a tool whose fundamental use was human communication and the insuring of common experience. V. V. O. Quine, in particular has pointed out that a single proposition is not a specific unit of discourse. It is modified and changed much more by our total "man-made fabric" of experience and expectation than it modifies the fabric.¹⁸

Overall philosophy has been part of a movement of our culture towards a new paradigm to replace the older, no longer useful one. It is being generally recognized that this will not be a simple, but a complex paradigm, that it must encompass differences involved in different levels and different points of view. In the *Tractatus* of an early

Wittgenstein we see the high organization of the search for the clarity and sharpness of an approach to language that will absolutely relate it to reality. In the Introduction to the *Philosophic Investigations* of his later work, Wittgenstein describes the book not as a coherent answer to the problems, but as a set of sketches from which we may be able to get a picture of a landscape. No one angle of vision would be sufficient.

Life is seen as complex in the new development. It is, as John Austin put it, to come up against many problems you can't anticipate or predict. (Ann Landers once wrote that life is what happens to you when you have other plans!) The function of language is to adjust itself to all sorts of demands and it is its ability to do so that makes it so significant.

It is being slowly realized that no one kind of language can deal with all the types of communication we human beings need. We cannot describe meter-readings and deep feelings of sadness with the same grammatical structure. If we start from *experience* and attempt to describe, clarify and communicate it (and this has been seen as crucial in philosophy in this century—to describe what is felt and experienced) we need different types of language with different grammatical structures.

The story is told¹⁹ that in a conference of English and American philosophers, Gabriel Marcel was trying to explain his ideas about grace and transcendence. The audience continually responded with requests that he clarify his language and say exactly what he meant. Finally he said "Perhaps I can't explain, but if I had a piano here I could play it." We know now that the great effort of the Logical Positivists to build *one* language that would reflect "reality" cannot succeed. Life is simply too complex for this. Being in love and the Kinsey approach to sex are such different kinds of experience that they cannot be communicated in the same *types* of language, any more than what is communicated in meter-readings and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. We have come past the point of saying "What we cannot speak about we must consign to silence."²⁰ There are many other ways to speak and Picasso's *Guernica* clearly expresses one type of experience in a way no "logical" language could hope to.

To be modern in European and American philosophy today is to ". . . give up simple explanations of man and the world, to embrace complexity once and for all, and to try, somehow, to manage it."²¹

Through modern developments in science, changes in Western culture, the existentialist philosophers and the Linguistic Analysts, the development of philosophy has arrived at a point where the data of parapsychology are not only acceptable, but necessary.

It is only by incorporating the new knowledge that each age brings forth that philosophy can continue its task. Unless it does this, it becomes trivial or else it becomes a tool for maintaining an outworn status quo. The new knowledge of our age is of the many kinds of reality we are and embody; that things are different from different viewpoints, and that different laws function and different entities exist when we look from different angles and with different purposes. Without the discipline and overview, without the synoptic thrust that only formal philosophy can bring to bear, the knowledge remains a chaos of unrelated fragments and confusing facts that provides no guidelines as to how we can direct and enrich our lives. Without incorporating the new knowledge, philosophy is unrelated to the living human being and desiccates in its academic home.

Further, it must relate the new knowledge to experience. The input from parapsychology and from theoretical physics is of much the same structure, but the paranormal relates directly to our own experience. The cloud chamber photographs and the equations of physics relate only indirectly.

Every survey has shown the high percentage of Western culture individuals who have had experiences that they regard as paranormal. It is only because of the older orientation of philosophy that the world works in a completely consistent way and that therefore they could not have happened, that these almost universal experiences have been ignored.

In a very basic way, the data of parapsychology typify the new understanding, the new conceptualization that is developing for our time. It demonstrates with heavy experiential impact that the usual laws governing reality do not work all the time; that there are exceptions and that—since this is intrinsically forbidden by these laws—there are other sets of laws, other world designs that are also valid.

Once this is accepted, and accepted it must be (the principle of complementarity may have been first enunciated in physics, but it can no longer be restricted to that domain) parapsychological data fill in a gap in philosophy by relating the new conceptualization directly to human experience. And unless this gap is filled, philosophy remains irrelevant and unrelated and cannot fulfill its task.

Both philosophy and parapsychology need each other at the present. Parapsychology needs philosophical orientations and tools so it will not remain a trivial business of collecting unrelated facts and remain outside of our culture. Without an overarching view, without general theory, it is just a hobby at best.

Philosophy needs parapsychology to fill the gap between the new

conceptualization it is moving towards and human experience. Further, the paranormal is far too widespread a human experience for philosophy to ignore and still claim to be the field that searches for the deepest possible understanding of man and the cosmos, that seeks for the answer to Kant's three questions: What can I know? What ought I to do? What dare I hope?

Perhaps one of the most interesting things about the new conceptualization of reality that is emerging is that it automatically brings in its wake a theory of the paranormal. This may seem surprising, but perhaps, from a wider view it should not be. Each basic definition of reality accepts certain questions and provides a path to answers to them. It regards other questions as unreal and makes them unanswerable. The previous reality definition of our culture legislated the paranormal out of existence by definition. The new one indicates a basic and workable theoretical understanding of it.

In a brilliant paper in 1964, Gardner Murphy²² suggested that we had been looking in the wrong way and the wrong place for laws of psychic phenomena. He suggested that "the paranormal presents not a system of laws, but a very different kind of reality; namely a sort of vehicle or modality in which reality may express itself."²³ He said that ESP events appear "when we tear loose from the ordinary framework of our space-time organization of knowledge."²⁴ "The medium through which such [paranormal] is conveyed may be a medium alien to the ordinary concepts of time and space."²⁵ There is, said Murphy, no new knowledge gained in ESP, only access to knowledge inaccessible through ordinary sensory channels. The different modalities, our everyday one, the dream one, the one in which ESP occurs, Murphy compares to "the different notation which in some respects can be translated back and forth and in some respects cannot."²⁶ It is in this paper that the first hint—of which I am aware—of the new theoretical understanding of ESP occurs. (I recently read this paper for the first time after I had just completed a new book *Alternate Realities*. To my surprise I found that the book carried out a suggestion and a program of research suggested by Murphy twelve years before.)

A basic aspect of the new conceptualization of reality is that how-the-world-works is, to some degree, up to us. There are a number of ways in which the world can be construed and when we construe it in one of these ways, that is the way it works. Whether matter is continuous or discontinuous, whether light travels in particles or waves, is determined by the purpose and world-design with which we approach the problem. I am not suggesting that any schizophrenic

fantasy is valid and that if there are 432 inmates of a mental hospital, there are 432 different valid ways of organizing reality. Rather there is a limited number of basically different world-organizations valid for human beings. These are coherent, highly organized metaphysical systems. Certain things occur or can be done in each of them—they are “normal”; certain other things cannot occur or be done—they are “paranormal.” In a somewhat overstated account of this, A. S. Eddington wrote: “In my observatory there is a telescope which condenses the light of a star on a film of sodium in a photoelectric cell. I rely on the classical theory to conduct the light through the lenses and focus it on the cell: I switch on to the quantum theory to make the light fetch out electrons from the sodium film to be collected in an electrometer. If I happen to transpose the two theories, the quantum theory convinces me that the light will never get concentrated in the cell, and the classical theory shows that it is powerless to extract the electrons if it does get in. I have no logical reason for not using the theories in this way, only experience teaches me that I must not. Sir William Brigg said that we use the Classical Theory on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and the Quantum Theory on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays.”²⁷

The essence of this statement—and of the knowledge emerging in a dozen different scientific fields—in that when we use one of various different valid organizations of reality, when we really perceive-react to the world in this way, then that is the way the world works; that is how reality is organized. There is no “way-the-world-works,” there are, at least, a number of different ways that we can choose. “There is, in fact,” wrote Suzanne Langer, “no such thing as *the* form of the ‘real’ world; physics is one pattern which may be found in it, and ‘appearance,’ or the pattern of *things* with their qualities and characters is another.”²⁸

What is legitimate in one metaphysical system is not in another; one system’s “normal” is another’s “paranormal.” From this viewpoint, ESP occurs when we have shifted (consciously or not) from the everyday, sensory organization of reality in which it can *not* occur (and no twisting of logic will remedy this fact) to another system in which it occurs “normally.”

I have elsewhere described some of the valid systems of construing reality which are presently known.²⁹ In one of them (which I have called, for various reasons, the “Clairvoyant Reality” or “Clairvoyant Mode of Being,” ESP is the normal way information is communicated. I first came across this concept when I questioned Mrs. Eileen Garrett for many hundreds of hours on the subject “What was going

on?" "How did the world look?" at the moment when she was attaining "paranormal" information. Slowly there emerged from her answers the picture of a full-fledged, organized metaphysical system with which she was—at that moment—organizing reality. Investigation showed that other psychics such as Rosalind Heywood and Douglas Johnson agreed enthusiastically that this was indeed their experience. Further work showed that this particular organization of reality was the same one used by serious mystics of both East and West and by relativity theory.

It is neither feasible nor desirable to repeat here the analyses of the different organizations of reality valid for human beings that I have done elsewhere. My purpose in this paper has been to point out that there have been good psychological reasons in the past for philosophy and parapsychology to keep away from each other; that developments in each have now reversed the situation to the point where they deeply need each other. Further that these developments have led to a theoretical model which provides a solution to the "impossible paradox" of ESP.

Our deepest anxiety today lies in the fact that the diversity of human beings has become too close to us, the complexity of the world too much for us, and we realize we can no longer deal with it with the concepts and words we have from the past. Attempting to deal with this through the study of semantic issues is more an attack on the symptoms of the problem than on the problem itself. We need to accept the complexity, the different valid approaches to reality, in order to make sense out of our modern experience. With its clear and unequivocal statement that the laws about reality which generally apply do not always apply to our experience (and therefore to the world we live in), parapsychology brings us face to face not only with the complexity, but also with a potential set of guidelines for exploring and defining that experience from different viewpoints. It brings us face to face with the principle of complementarity which may be for our age what Cartesian dualism was for the past one.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Kuhn, T., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962.
- ² Broad, C. D., *Lectures on Psychical Research*, London: Routledge, Kegan Paul, 1962.
- ³ Goldstein, K., *Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology*. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1940.
- ⁴ Ref. # 2.
- ⁵ Beloff, J., *The Existence of Mind*. N.Y., Citadel, 1964.
- ⁶ Rhine, L., Parapsychology Then and Now. *J. Parap.* 31, 1967, p. 242.
- ⁷ LeShan, L., On the Non-Acceptance of Parapsychology. *In'Il J. Parap.* 1966, Vol. 8, No. 3. pp 367-386.

- ⁸ Cohen, M. R., *Reason and Nature*. N.Y. Harcourt Brace, 1931, p. viii
- ⁹ Kohl, H., *The Age of Complexity*. N.Y., Mentor, 1965.
- ¹⁰ Langer, S., *Philosophical Sketches*. N.Y. Mentor, 1962, p. 53.
- ¹¹ Keynes, J. M., *Two Memoirs*, London, Rupert Hart Davis, Ltd. 1949.
- ¹² Ref. #9, p. 36.
- ¹³ Ref. #5, p. 219.
- ¹⁴ Jones, E., *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. London, Hogarth, 1957 Vol. 3, p. 408.
- ¹⁵ Heywood, R., *The Sixth Sense*, London, Pan, 1959, p. 224.
- ¹⁶ Ref. #10, p. 124. Langer quotes (p. 15) Whitehead that Metaphysics is ". . . the most general statement we can make about reality."
- ¹⁷ Ref. #10, p. 53.
- ¹⁸ Quine, V.V.O, *From a Logical Point of View*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953, p. 42.
- ¹⁹ Ref. #9, p. 17.
- ²⁰ Wittgenstein, L. J. J., *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*, 6.7.
- ²¹ Ref. #9, p. 15.
- ²² Murphy, G., "Lawfulness versus Caprice: Is there a Law of Psychic Phenomena?" *J.A.S.P.R.*, Oct. 1954, No. 4, Vol. LVIII pp. 237-249.
- ²³ Ref. #22, p. 240.
- ²⁴ Ref. #22, p. 242.
- ²⁵ Ref. #22, p. 244.
- ²⁶ Ref. #22, p. 245.
- ²⁷ Quoted in Tyrrell, G.N.M., *Grades of Significance*. London, Ryder and Co. 1930, p. 54.
- ²⁸ Ref. #10.
- ²⁹ LeShan, L., *The Medium, The Mystic and The Physicist*. N. Y., Viking, 1973. *Alternate Realities*. N.Y., Evans Publ. Co. 1976.

DISCUSSION

DEAN: The papers today have brought very well to our minds the problem facing philosophy and especially so in the last paper by Dr. LeShan, who has shown very forcefully what the problems are. I would like to take an example from some of our work to show that when we tested presidents of business companies or chairmen of the boards of directors, these people told us that they very definitely do know what's going to happen and make the decisions for their companies in accordance with what they know. And there is a very heavy dollar sign or pound sterling sign on their being right in knowing. Now you can be cynical and say that when a company gets big, it can't go wrong no matter what it decides. But there is the experience of Lockheed, despite the enormous bribes that it gave, nearly going bankrupt and saved only by one vote of the U.S. Senate, and Rolls Royce nearly going bankrupt with it also, except that it was bailed out by the British government. If I may take one example, there is the experience of Conrad Hilton, the man who built up the enormous hotel empire. In his biography, *Be My Guest*, he explains very well that he knew which hotel to start out with—the Stevens Hotel in

Chicago. He knew which one to go for next. He knew which man to put in as a director for each of his hotels, so that they would be financially solvent. He knew all these things and, of course, has become very, very wealthy on account of it.

Now, I would like to put in a plea for philosophy to change as physics had to do. If you ask me how can philosophy do it, then I say go back to the father of western philosophy, Descartes, because he put forward the idea, though it wasn't understood, of a two-headed animal. Well, that's just what we are. Our brains are split into two hemispheres—a left hemisphere and a right hemisphere. The left one is very good at logical, analytical, deductive, mathematical problem-solving, counting, time estimation, and verbal description. When philosophers use words, they're doing it with their left hemispheres. But I would put in a plea for there to be a philosophy of the right hemisphere; a non-logical philosophy along holistic, Gestalt, non-logical lines using the data from parapsychology, and I think that the example which Dr. LeShan gave of Mrs. Eileen Garrett was a very good one. She could be common sense using her left hemisphere, her logical part, but she could also switch over to the other clairvoyant sense (as Dr. LeShan called it) for this new type of philosophy.

MATTUCK: I would like to comment on your statement that what parapsychology seems to lack is bold theories. I disagree with that because there has been at least one bold theory which has been put forth, and this is the theory which I mentioned before—the theory of the physicist, Evan Harris Walker. It's extremely bold. Perhaps it's too bold, but if I may quote you, quoting somebody else, “. . . you make more progress from error than from chaos,” and certainly one thing which is not present in Walker's theory is chaos. That is absent! Now it may be in error, but at least it makes quantitative predictions. It gives support for a view of the universe which should be extremely interesting to philosophers, i.e. a *dualistic* view in which there is matter, described by wave functions, and mind, described by hidden variables, and a mind-matter interaction in which the hidden variables cause collapse of the wave functions. Unfortunately, Walker's presentation of his theory in the book *Quantum Physics and Parapsychology* is fairly incomprehensible. However, there is another more pedagogical presentation of the ideas involved in a new book by Stanley Krippner and Alberto Villoldo, *Realms of Healing*. In the appendix of this book there is a ten-page description of Walker's theory which is, I think, capable of giving the man in the street or the non-physicist, a qualitative idea of what it's all about. The theory makes predictions. It leads

to experiments which can be performed in the laboratory, both in extrasensory perception and in psychokinesis, and I think philosophers especially should spend some time trying to find out what Walker's theory is about. The theory may be in error, but I think just the fact that it gives us an extremely well organized picture of the universe which can be either confirmed or falsified, is an important step forward. I think it's the first time in the history of this field that such a step has been made.

BELOFF: Since Dr. LeShan has done me the honor of citing me in his talk, I would just like to make it clear that I don't entirely go along with all the things he says subsequently. In particular, you see, I've never really abandoned the realist position. There, I'm much more Popperean, I suppose, than he would like me to be. His thinking, it seems to me, shows a dangerous sort of subjectivist/relativist tendency that I find has to be viewed with very considerable care. He puts it all so charmingly that we're almost seduced into admitting all sorts of things that I think, upon reflection, we ought to be very careful about. I agree with him that there are multiple possible descriptions of reality—that an artist will describe things in one way in one mood and in another way in another mood as with Douglas Dean's two halves of the brain—there are all kinds of ways of communicating and describing things. But I still abide by the old fashioned idea that there is a single series of events, a single reality, and that reality isn't just a creation of the mind.