

GUEST EDITORIAL

On Wolverines and Epistemological Totalitarianism

ETZEL CARDEÑA

Lund University, Sweden
Etzel.Cardena@psychology.lu.se

Submitted: 5/1/2011; Accepted: 7/4/2011

*Whoever undertakes to set himself up as a judge of Truth and Knowledge
is shipwrecked by the laughter of the gods.*

— Albert Einstein

Only fools and charlatans know and understand everything.

— June 9, 1888, letter from Anton Chekhov to Ivan Leontiev (Scheglov)

While strolling with my beloved in the local zoo, we came across a shortish, furry, brown fellow who engaged our sight and seemed to want to play with us, albeit at a distance. He was friendlier even than the acknowledged local clowns (the bears) and surprise followed surprise as we read that this guy belongs to the ferocious wolverine species. Could this same jolly creature be one who would promptly dispatch us, much larger animals, if he were not fed for a while? Thinking about these seemingly contradictory views of one and the same being and of how reality is always more complicated than our models of it, I had the insight that what mostly afflicts “skepticism” is the inability to tolerate complexity and even seemingly contradictory views about a phenomenon. I write “skepticism” in quotation marks to differentiate the epistemological absolutism that pervades both the strident anti- and pro-psi proponents from what I consider a healthy abeyance from fully committing to a closed position in science or other aspects of life. I contend that although the person in a “New Age fair” trading in everything from magical rocks to mysterious odors may seem to be the counterpoint of, say, the arch-skeptic academic who a priori declares psi impossible, they are both afflicted with the same inability to assimilate contradictory information and tolerate ambiguity, it is only their axioms that differ. And even those may not be that different when we compare superficial materialism and superficial spiritualism (Cardena, 2010). Consider Humphrey’s comments (1995:54) that “materialism is to all intents and

purposes the fact of life” no matter how contentious that concept of “matter” is in physics and philosophy (e.g., Wigner, 1969), and that of a Brazilian medium who reported that after death there is food, the same as here, just better-tasting (cf. Playfair, 2010). For both, nothing else seems to exist but everyday objects, the only difference being that for the second they continue after death.

The main thesis of this Guest Editorial is that although the rhetoric of the aggressive psi critic, the all-believing psi-proponent, or the New-Ager would seem to be, pun intended, universes apart, they are both instances of an epistemological totalitarianism that assumes an all-knowing apprehension of the nature of reality and reveals intolerance for complexity and ambiguity and an indictment of anyone not sharing that view. Let me discuss the differences between the respectable skeptic and the “skeptic.” The former is a person who is inclined to question accepted opinions, including those offered by “authorities,” scientific or otherwise, and those stemming from one’s own preconceptions. This attitude undergirds the scientific attitude toward epistemology, which divorced itself from pronouncements coming from way back (as in Aristotle’s statements about the number of teeth found in a horse) or way up high (as in texts inspired by the religious or academic higher echelons). Here are two examples of this very healthy stance. 1) The Editors for the issue of the *Journal for Personality and Social Psychology* in which the recent series of studies on precognition by Daryl Bem were published wrote that they found the results “extremely puzzling [but] our obligation as journal editors is not to endorse particular hypotheses, but to advance and stimulate science through a rigorous review process” (Judd & Gawronski, 2011:406). 2) Also, Carl Sagan’s principled refusal to sign a letter against astrology not because he felt

that astrology has any validity whatever, but because I felt and still feel that the tone of the statement is authoritarian. . . . That we can think of no mechanism for astrology is relevant but unconvincing. No mechanism was known, for example, for continental drift.

He also discussed whether the signatories had any expertise on the matter and concluded that “we can question whether they have the right to state that ‘there is no scientific foundation for (astrological) tenets’ without having done the necessary homework” (in Gauquelin, 1983:5).

In contrast, the “**skeptic**” is **s**implistic and **k**nowledge-averse, **e**nsures that other perspectives cannot be considered, is **p**ejorative toward his/her antagonists, aims to **t**errify others, holds **i**nconsistent standards, and uses **c**ircular and other forms of faulty reasoning. In what follows, although I will refer to specific authors to make my points, my criticism is against a way of thinking found in both pro and anti-psi stances rather than against particular individuals or conclusions about psi. Thus, I expect that this piece will make

a number of readers uncomfortable but hopefully encourage reflection on the danger of endorsing any simple solution to our topic.

Simplistic

“Skeptics,” notwithstanding their surface differences, are convinced that they have found a single explanation for everything, be it materialist metaphysics, evolutionary theory, the action of psi in every event, or the world of the spirits and angels, and refuse to consider complexity and uncertainty. Isaac Asimov (1987) was insightful in his analysis of “pseudoscience” as providing “a security blanket, a thumb to suck” instead of the uncertainty and insecurity of science, but failed to extend it to those who use science for these same purposes. In a scolding rebuke to the latter, Marilyn Robinson (2010) discussed how the issue is not that broad theories such as evolution are wrong, but that they do not explain everything and are often used to underpin metaphysical commitments rather than scientific explanations, a position that the eminent evolutionary biologist Richard C. Lewontin calls “evolutionism” (2005). He also (1994) pointed out how biology, dependent on so many complex phenomena plus a sprinkling of randomness, might be considered more an interpretative discipline than an “exact” science, a perspective missing in so many psychologists and philosophers such as Dawkins, Dennett, and Pinker cloaking themselves with the mantle of an all-explaining evolutionary theory.

An equally all-encompassing (and as unfalsifiable as some functionalist evolutionary accounts) stance, although parting from a different metaphysical point, involves such ideas as the New Age *The Secret* (Byrne, 2006), which proposes that positive thinking will transform reality. While there is a sprinkling of truth to the idea that attitudes and beliefs can have some effect on self and others’ experience and physiology (Cardeña & Cousins, 2010), to pass it off as an all-powerful force makes a mockery of the victims of massacres and other forms of violence throughout history who, we should assume, were not thinking positively enough about themselves and their children.

“Skeptic” treatises are rife with other forms of oversimplification. For instance, Humphrey (1995) describes a monolithic science and states that “Most people most of the time actually behave as if they were thoroughgoing materialists” (p. 55), apparently not realizing that individuals may hold as valid *simultaneously* the reality of a world of objects and of seemingly non-material forces, as the cross-cultural phenomena of shamanism, mysticism, and others exemplify (Cardeña, Lynn, & Krippner, 2000). Grossman (2010:x) also describes a monolithic science that “has in fact already established that consciousness can exist independent of the brain and that materialism is therefore empirically false.” Predictably his and Humphrey’s “sciences” arrive at opposite conclusions. A similar certainty about science is found in a theory

of survival which states that “The reality of living spirits will no longer fall outside of science, *it will be required by science* (my emphasis)” (Schwartz & Russek, 1990). Actually, even the “mainstream” psychology I work with is not at all how these authors portray it. For every theory I know (including some in the “harder” sciences such as biology and physics) there are knowledgeable people who vehemently disagree about the evidential value of different pieces of research, how to interpret them, and so on. Of course, the latter is not a foreign idea at all to the philosophy and sociology of science (cf. Lakatos & Musgrave, 1970).

Knowledge-Averse

“Skeptics” do not need to read anything that runs counter to their beliefs because they already **know**. Thus, not even minimal rules of academic scholarship count. Humphrey (1995) provides an example of this attitude in a book written ironically while he held an endowment created to research psi phenomena. In it he showed that he is well-read in literature and philosophy, yet when it comes to the major theme in his book, psi phenomena, he only included slightly more than 10 references to research, most of them having to do with beliefs and attitudes, rather than about testing the validity of psi phenomena. An undergraduate thesis with about 10 references to its central topic would be unlikely to get a passing grade in my university. The same practice is followed by some psi proponents (e.g., Playfair, 2010) who fail to cover the relevant literature and give due credit to reasonable, alternative explanations, not to mention the many popular books that do not include even a single reference. In contrast, in a recent book evaluating the worth (or not) of most skeptical criticism of psi, McLuhan (2010) analyzed hundreds of publications for and against psi, discussing the merits of both sides and found that overall critics failed to actually engage with specific data reported by psi researchers, relying instead on generalizations and made-up cases. He reports that developmental biologist Lewis Wolpert carried this to the extreme of refusing to see a relevant film being shown as part of his debate with Rupert Sheldrake (p. 291).

In addition to the failure to conduct the typical first stage of a research project, namely doing a good literature review, Friedman and Krippner (2010) provide a number of examples in which critics blatantly misrepresented Krippner’s research (e.g., Zusne and Jones) and even failed to correct their mistakes after they had been pointed out to them (e.g., Hansel).

Ensures That an Alternative Perspective Will Not Be Listened to

Contrary to the free discourse of ideas propounded by John Stuart Mill and others, the “skeptic” wants to eliminate the existence of alternate positions. For

instance, in his op-ed the cognitive scientist Douglas Hofstadter (2011) blasted the editors of the prestigious *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* for allowing an article on research in precognition, which had undergone appropriate peer-review, to be published, and recommended just to “ignore” it and deny it publication. A similar type of censorship was attempted by physicists Antony Valentini and Mike Towler who initially disinvited Nobel prizewinner Brian Josephson and physicist David Peat to a conference discussing the work of David Bohm because of their interest in, respectively, psi and synchronicity (Reisz, 2010). Ironically, Bohm himself endorsed the reality of psi and got an award from the American Society for Psychical Research.

Although I am not aware of an equally egregious example among psi researchers, a recent anthology on the possibility of survival (Storm & Thalbourne, 2006) did not include a single chapter that would provide an informed alternative to the position of the survival of consciousness. Along similar lines, some of us get periodically chastised in a closed list on survival research for expressing doubts about its reality, never mind that such knowledgeable authors as Gauld (1982) have a very difficult time reaching closure or clarity on what the relevant research means, even while accepting that there is a good case to be made for anomalous cognition in this area. And popular New Age books often fail completely to discuss alternative or supplementary explanations to their tenets.

Pejorative

Although the attacks by “skeptics” against parapsychologists have not reached the extreme of comparing them to Hitler, as Frederick Crews did with Freud (in Begley, 1994), questions about personal integrity, intelligence, and even personal insults have been the order of the day. Richard Dawkins (1998), showing no evidence that he had actually read parapsychology research called psi “bunk” and those who “[t]ry to sell it to us fakes and charlatans, and some of them have grown rich and fat.” Although in this and in other areas there have been and continue to be people who engage in fraud for personal gain, last time I checked with parapsychology researchers I could not find anyone who would be considered wealthy and their waists did not evidence a greater voluminosity than typically found in academic circles.

Hofstadter (2011), with unrestrained nastiness, called anyone endorsing or doing research on psi “crazy” and “crackpot.” Thus, he must consider “crackpots,” among many others at least 10 previous Nobel prizewinners in physics, medicine, and other disciplines (Marie and Pierre Curie, Lord Rayleigh, Joseph John Thomson, Santiago Ramón y Cajal, Maurice Maeterlinck, Charles Richet, W. B. Yeats, Henri Bergson, Nicholas Murray Butler, Brian Josephson, Alexis Carrel, and Thomas Mann), towering figures in physics including David

Bohm, Wolfgang Pauli, Sir William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Alfred Russell Wallace, co-creator of natural selection theory. “Crazies” in other fields include, in psychology, Sigmund Freud, C. G. Jung, and H. J. Eysenck, along with at least two past American Psychological Association Presidents (William James and Gardner Murphy), foundational philosophers such as C. S. Peirce and Henry Sidgwick, the mathematician Alan Turing, the anthropologist Margaret Mead, eminent writers including Upton Sinclair and poet laureate Ted Hughes, and inventors Thomas Alva Edison and Hans Berger (who developed the EEG to attempt to research telepathy). Recently, research on parapsychology has been conducted in various universities including such bastions of “craziness” as Cambridge University, the University of London, Edinburgh University, Princeton University, Cornell University, the University of California, and Lund University. And, of course, Hofstadter claims to have a better grasp of physics than Einstein, who wrote that “we have no right to rule out a priori the possibility of telepathy. For that the foundations of our science are too uncertain and incomplete” (1946, in Ehrenwald, 1978:138).

Other uncouth criticisms include the characterization by David Marks (2000) of remote viewing researchers as incompetent, deceptive, and fraudulent, and by Ganoe and Kirwan (1984) who described research on psi as pseudoscience and “horse manure” (p. 376). Eric-Jan Wagenmakers also manifested this scatological inclination by commenting about Bem’s research that “It shouldn’t be difficult to do one proper experiment and not nine crappy experiments” (in Kols, 2011).

On the other side, we have the milder contempt of Grossman (2010) stating that whoever holds a materialist perspective is not “a responsible investigator” and is dogmatic and “irrational.” He also stated that those who succeed academically do so not on the grounds of “talent, but mostly on competition, self-promotion, and so forth.” He also implies that anyone disagreeing with his conclusion has not accepted the primacy of love. I have encountered in other venues the similar idea that whoever holds a materialist perspective cannot be ethical, find meaning in life, or be a “nice person.” As an antidote to that assumption, here are the beautiful words of Bruce Frederick Cummings (nom de plume Barbellion), who had no trouble expressing the sacredness of life without requiring an afterlife, in his *The Journal of a Disappointed Man* (Barbellion, 1920:72).

To me the honour is sufficient of belonging to the universe—such a great universe, and so grand a scheme of things. Not even Death can rob me of that honour. When I am dead, you can boil me, burn me, drown me, scatter me—but you cannot destroy me: My little atoms would merely deride such heavy vengeance. Death can do no more than kill you.

Terrifies Others

One of the central principles of contemporary politics is that it pays to fear-monger so your audience will become terrified and flock in panic to you to be rescued from such threats. Just such a rhetorical strategy is used by Hofstadter (2011) who writes, without giving a scintilla of evidence supporting his contention, that publishing Bem's studies on precognition goes "against the laws of physics as we know them [and] . . . our entire scientific worldview would be toppled . . . and we would have to rethink everything about the nature of the universe." Really? This must be news to some physicists including David Bohm, Brian Josephson, and Dean Emeritus of the Princeton University School of Engineering and Applied Science Robert Jahn, who have written about the reality of psi phenomena without fleeing to a cave to wait for the imminent collapse of science as we know it. It is also worthy of remark that pronouncements about psi phenomena breaking the laws of physics à la Hofstadter typically fail to mention just what laws are being broken and in what way. For instead, consider that backward causation is both a recognized theory in physics (Sheehan, 2006) and compatible at least in principle with the precognition data reported by Bem and others.

Humphrey (1995) also expresses the fear that the existence of psi would undermine individuality and with it everything bright, beautiful, and creative in nature and culture. This would come as a surprise to artists and other creative people who typically show greater psi abilities than the population at large (e.g., Schlitz & Honorton, 1992).

I could not think of similar fear-mongering by pro-psi authors, but with respect to the New Age literature we are of course living just one year before 2012, the year that according to the interpretation by some of the Mayan calendar the whole world will end, although perhaps not for those who become spiritual enough to escape that fate. By the way, being Mexican I have friends with Mayan roots, all of whom seem to be, amazingly enough, unconcerned about this imminent debacle.

Inconsistent

The scientific process has a number of features that guard it against blatant authoritarianism and prejudice, among them the assumption that evidence trumps authority and that our hypotheses should be put to the test not only by us but by others who do not share our perspective. These safeguards are to be applied consistently by all players, but the "skeptic" frequently disregards the rules. As Robinson (2010:2,33) writes about authors such as Dennett and Dawkins who provide their versions of evolutionary theory to dismiss the

importance of consciousness and culture, that parascience claims the authority of science without practicing

the self-discipline or self-criticism for which science is distinguished . . . [and presumes that it] has given us knowledge sufficient to allow us to answer certain essential questions about the nature of reality, if only by dismissing them.

Consider a recent review of a book on neurobiological aspects of people claiming psi abilities. In it, Hughes (2010) chastises the authors for “casting aspersions” on “useful science” yet has no problem in stating that psi phenomena “do not exist in a way that can be seen, heard, felt, witnessed, or recorded *by a disinterested observer* [my emphasis],” failing to support his own aspersion. He also writes that the authors need to “acquire higher standards of epistemology,” yet has no compunction in citing a meta-analysis of psi research (Milton & Wiseman, 1999) while failing to mention both the criticisms against various aspects of that study (Bem, Palmer, & Broughton, 2001) and a more comprehensive and recent meta-analysis (Storm, Tressoldi, & Di Risio, 2010).

Another example of inconsistency is that while “skeptics” often claim that memory mistakes can explain anecdotes of putative psi events, they carefully avoid mentioning that arguably the most influential research on the reconstructive nature of memory, that of Frederic Bartlett, showed that people tend to “normalize” their recollections, rather than making them more outlandish and psi-friendly. This memory process would indicate that the recollection of putative psi phenomena would underestimate their actual incidence. As McLuhan (2010) describes, even when such a process is found in the psi literature it is taken by “skeptics” to count against the evidence of psi. The description by Bartlett of what tends to happen with remembrances of unusual events is very familiar to me, as I have observed how events that we experienced as very unusual seem to lose potency and intensity with the passage of time.

Zingrone (2004) has also documented many instances in which critics of parapsychology have failed to follow the standards they demand, whether rightly or wrongly, from psi researchers. She presents examples in which a number of critics, including James Alcock, present alternative explanations to psi that either are irrelevant or which they themselves do not test (the published research records of a number of critics of psi methodology, including those of Alcock, Hansel, and Hyman, is rather thin, as evidenced by PsycInfo), and they are uncritical of the sources of their “data,” including “anecdotes” whose use they criticize in the pro-psi literature. They also show a lack of self-evaluation and criticism of their own arguments, while being thoroughly critical of those offered by parapsychologists. A more recent example documenting unscientific standards by “skeptics” is a paper on Martin Gardner’s attack on the research on

the famous medium Mrs. Piper, which describes his blatant misrepresentation of the actual research (Taylor, 2010).

One point on which Hughes and I agree, however, is that some authors writing on parapsychology, spirituality, or similar topics are inconsistent in decrying mainstream science, the scientific method, and materialism while at the same time using, admiring, and quoting scientific research data that may be interpreted as supporting their ideology. Grossman's claim (2010) that science has proved his conclusion while simultaneously blasting academia is an example of this tendency.

Circular and Other Forms of Specious Reasoning

Implicit in many of the examples discussed above is circular reasoning, which allows the "skeptics" to retain their certainty. Thus, Grossman (2010) states that whoever holds a materialist perspective is not "a responsible investigator." How does he know? Well, because whoever is a responsible investigator does not hold a materialist perspective. Similarly, for Hofstadter (2011) anyone supporting psi is a crackpot. How does he know? Because only crackpots would support psi. . . . And there are other types of circular reasoning and vicious circles. When aiming to appear reasonable, a critic may write that "it might be worthwhile to allocate some resources toward seeing whether these findings [on anomalous cognition] can be independently replicated" (Hyman, 1995) and some years later state "craziness . . . an embarrassment for the entire field" when a collection of studies replicating each other and previous studies is published (Hyman, in Carey, 2011).

A different kind of circular reasoning is the misuse that Wagenmakers, Wetzels, Borsboom, and van der Maas (2011) make of Bayesian statistics in which the probability of psi is given as 10^{-20} . In context, this means that at the same time that evidence is demanded for the validity of psi, that evidence is invalidated a priori (for a rebuttal to Wagenmakers et al., see Bem, Utts, & Johnson, 2011). Even Humphrey (1995:75) does not buy the goods offered by Wagenmakers and coauthors:

It is important, however, that we play this fairly and do not load the dice against the paranormal . . . we must be careful not to prejudge the issue of 'fishiness' [or experimental or statistical competence, I may add] by presuming that the very fact that a paranormal phenomenon would contravene normal laws is proof that it cannot have occurred.

With regard to proponents of psi, although I do believe that there are such things as decline and experimenter effects (Irwin & Watt, 2007), I am sympathetic to the argument of some critics that research in psi is sometimes interpreted as supportive for it no matter what the actual results are. They

complain, for instance, that fishing expeditions for anomalies in data are typically launched, rather than considering that some studies may just not show evidence of psi phenomena (Alcock, 2003). However, failures to replicate in parapsychology, especially considering the very low statistical power of most projects, is not egregiously damning considering that accepted phenomena in mainstream psychology and other disciplines also show a far-from-perfect replication record (see Bem, 2011, for a discussion and references on this issue).

The “skeptic” also uses other exceptions to scientific practice, such as the unfalsifiable critique that if the only alternative to a psi experiment is fraud then it should be presumed (cf. Truzzi, 1978). Holding this belief consistently would of course pretty much eliminate all of science since only the experimenter him/herself (presuming that there was no self-deception) could be certain of the nature of the experiment. As a final example, we have the ever-changing goalpost for what counts as “enough” evidence for psi phenomena. Where once it was assumed that there was no scientific evidence for psi phenomena, once evidence started accumulating under demanding research conditions the goalposts moved such that “the [evidential] standards of any other area of science” (Wiseman, in Penman, 2008) do not apply to psi. This opinion has the “advantage” of being so unclear that a “skeptic” could always retort that no matter what data were proffered they would not be enough to satisfy this fictitious requirement. I have yet to find in the writings of Roger and Francis Bacon, Galileo, and other developers of the scientific method the principle that evidential standards vary according to the topic investigated.

From *The Secret* type of New Age theories, one also encounters a variety of contradictory and unclear statements, including a different form of unfalsifiable reasoning: If people want something hard enough, they will get it. If they do not, well, it is because they consciously or unconsciously did not want it enough.

I will now leave the “skeptics” to their certainty and give some words to the humbler open perspective of William James. He wrote that (1956/1897:ix): “There is no possible point of view from which the world can appear an absolutely single fact.” The courage to assume that one’s perspective is not likely to explain all observations also underlies Henry Sidgwick’s idea of the *tertium quid*, or the residue of unexplained phenomena in different areas of enquiry (Gauld, 1968; see also James’s “unclassified residuum”, 1956). Yes, many reputed psi phenomena can be explained by failures in reasoning, perception, memory, or fraud, yet there have always been observations and experiment results that could not be so explained and for which at this point we have the right to hold psi as a valid explanation. Furthermore, the cognitive and emotional ability to tolerate ambiguity, remain open to other possibilities, and attend to the “unclassified residuum” can stimulate new forms of expression, ideas, and discoveries in both the arts and science (cf. Koestler, 1964).

To come back to the wolverine at the beginning of this article, he is not only a ferocious, deadly creature or a playful guy, but both and much more. To reduce him to either a “red of fang and claw” or a cute Disney creature fails to approach him in all his complexity. As both some spiritual and phenomenological (Braud, 2011), and scientific (cf. Keller, 1983) traditions maintain, the cognitive and emotional openness to encounter phenomena as they are may reveal more of reality than the imposition of a priori models. To understand wolverines, and the world in general, we should reject self-indulgent epistemological totalitarianism and let ourselves be seduced by the melancholy whisper of uncertainty.

Acknowledgments

This Guest Editorial is a slightly edited and expanded version of a Guest Editorial commissioned by the *Journal of Parapsychology*. It would not have come to light without the loving presence and astute editorial assistance of Sophie Reijman. I am also grateful to William Braud and Stephen Braude for their valuable suggestions.

References

- Alcock, J. E. (2003). Give the null hypothesis a chance: Reasons to remain doubtful about the existence of psi. In J. E. Alcock, J. Burns, & A. Freeman (Eds.), *Psi Wars: Getting to Grips with the Paranormal*, Exeter, UK: Imprinta Press. pp. 29–50.
- Asimov, I. (1987). *Past, Present, and Future*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Barbellion, W. N. P. (1920). *The Journal of a Disappointed Man*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Begley, A. (1994). Terminating analysis. *Lingua Franca*, 4(July–August), 24–30.
- Bem, D. J. (2011). Feeling the future: Experimental evidence for anomalous retroactive influences on cognition and affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 407–425.
- Bem, D. J., Palmer, J., & Broughton, R. S. (2001). Updating the ganzfeld database: A victim of its own success? *Journal of Parapsychology*, 65, 207–218.
- Bem, D. J., Utts, J., & Johnson, W. O. (2011). Must psychologists change the way they analyze their data? A response to Wagenmakers, Wetzels, Borsboom, & van der Mass (2011). <http://dl.dropbox.com/u/8290411/ResponsetoWagenmakers.pdf>
- Braud, W. (2011). Toward more subtle awareness: Meanings, implications, and possible new directions for psi research. *Mindfield. The Bulletin of the Parapsychological Association*, 3(1), 1–8.
- Byrne, R. (2006). *The Secret*. Hillsboro, OR: Atria Books/Beyond Words.
- Cardeña, E., (2010). Against the grain? “Matter” and “spirit.” *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 2, 122–123.
- Cardeña, E. & Cousins, W. E. (2010). From artifice to actuality: Ritual, shamanism, hypnosis, and healing. In J. Weinhold & G. Samuel (Eds.), *The Varieties of Ritual Experience*, in the section by A. Michaels (Ed.), *Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual, Volume II: Body, Performance, Agency, and Experience* (pp. 315–329), Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz.
- Cardeña, E., Lynn, S. J., & Krippner, S. (Eds.) (2000). *Varieties of Anomalous Experience: Examining the Scientific Evidence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Carey, B. (2011). Journal’s Paper on ESP Expected To Prompt Outrage. *The New York Times*, January 5, 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/06/science/06esp.html>
- Dawkins, R. (1998). *What’s Wrong with the Paranormal? The Sunday Mirror* [London], Sunday, February 8, 1998.

- Ehrenwald, J. (1978). Einstein skeptical of psi? Postscript to a correspondence. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 42, 137–142.
- Friedman, H. L., & Krippner, S. (2010). Is it time for détente? In S. Krippner & H. L. Friedman (Eds.), *Debating Psychic Experience: Human Potential or Human Illusion?* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Ganoe, W. H., & Kirwan, J. D. (1984). NOVA's descent into the paranormal. *Skeptical Inquirer*, 8, 373–376.
- Gauld, A. (1968). *The Founders of Psychological Research*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gauld, A. (1982). *Mediumship and Survival*. London: Heinemann.
- Gauquelin, M. (1983). *Birthtimes: A Scientific Investigation of the Secrets of Astrology*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Grossman, N. (2010). Foreword. In C. Carter, *Science and the Near Death Experience*, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.
- Hofstadter, D. (2011). A Cutoff for Craziness. *The New York Times* The Opinion Pages, January 7, 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2011/01/06/the-esp-study-when-science-goes-psychoic/a-cutoff-for-craziness>
- Hughes, B. M. (2010). Extraordinary People, Ordinary Evidence: New Paradigms for Parapsychology, Same Old Problems. Review of *Mysterious Minds: The Neurobiology of Psychics, Mediums, and Other Extraordinary People* by Stanley Krippner & Harry L. Friedman. *PsycCRITIQUES—Contemporary Psychology: APA Review of Books*, 55(30), Article 3.
- Humphrey, N. (1995). *Soul Searching. Human Nature and Supernatural Belief*. London: Random House.
- Hyman, R. (1995). *Evaluation of Program on Anomalous Mental Phenomena*. <http://www.ics.uci.edu/~juttsh/hyman.html>
- Irwin, H. J., & Watt, C.A. (2007). *An Introduction to Parapsychology* (5th ed). Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.
- James, W. (1956). *The Will To Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy*. New York: Dover. [Originally published 1897]
- Judd, C. M., & Gawronski, B. (2011). Editorial Comment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 406.
- Keller, E. F. (1983). *A Feeling for the Organism*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Koestler, A. (1964). *The Act of Creation*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin.
- Kols, D. (2011). 53.1% of You Already Know What This Story's About. Or Do You? Need a Hint? It's About Professor Daryl Bem and His Cheerful Case for ESP. *New York Magazine*, February 27, 2011. <http://nymag.com/news/features/bem-esp-2011-3>
- Lakatos, I., & Musgrave, A. (Eds.) (1970). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewontin, R. C. (1994). A rejoinder to William Wimsatt. In J. Chandler, A. I. Davidson, and H. D. Harootunian (Eds.), *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practice, and Persuasion across the Disciplines*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 504–509.
- Lewontin, R. C. (2005). The Wars over Evolution. Review of *The Evolution–Creation Struggle* by Michael Ruse and of *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution* by Peter J. Richerson and Robert Boyd. *The New York Review of Books*, 52(16), 51–54.
- Marks, D. (2000). *The Psychology of the Psychic: A Penetrating Scientific Analysis of Claims of Psychic Abilities*. Buffalo: NY: Prometheus.
- McLuhan, R. (2010). *Randi's Prize. What Skeptics Say about the Paranormal, Why They Are Wrong & Why It Matters*. Leicester, UK: Matador.
- Milton, J., & Wiseman, R. (1999). Does psi exist? Lack of replication of an anomalous process of information transfer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 387–391.

- Penman, D. (2008). Could There Be Proof to the Theory That We're ALL Psychic? *Mail Online*, January 2008. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-510762/Could-proof-theory-ALL-psychic.html#ixzz0RBt2KwPH>
- Playfair, G. L. (2010). *Chico Xavier: Medium of the Century*. London: Roundtable Publishing (International Spiritist Council).
- Reisz, M. (2010). He Didn't See That Coming, or Did He? *The Times Higher Education*, April 20, 2010. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=411401&c=1>
- Robinson, M. (2010). *Absence of Mind: The Dispelling of Inwardness from the Myth of the Self*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schlitz, M. J., & Honorton, C. (1992). Ganzfeld psi performance within an artistically gifted population. *Journal of the American Society for Psychological Research*, 86, 83–98.
- Schwartz, G. E. R., & Russek, L. G. S. (1990). *The Living Energy Universe, a Fundamental Discovery That Transforms Science & Medicine*. Charlottesville, VA: Hampton Roads.
- Sheehan, D. P. (Ed.) (2006). *Frontiers of Time: Retrocausation—Experiment and Theory*. Record of symposium, American Association for the Advancement of Science (Pacific Division); San Diego, California; 20–22 June 2006. American Institute of Physics.
- Storm, L., & Thalbourne, M. A. (Eds.) (2006). *The Survival of Human Consciousness: Essays on the Possibility of Life after Death*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Storm, L., Tressoldi, P. E., & Di Risio, L. (2010). Meta-analysis of free-response studies, 1992–2008: Assessing the noise reduction model in parapsychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 471–485.
- Taylor, G. (2010). How Martin Gardner bamboozled the skeptics: A lesson in trusting a magician. *Darklore*, 5, April 29, 2010. <http://darklore.dailygrail.com/samples/DL5-GT.pdf>
- Truzzi, M. (1978). On the extraordinary: An attempt at clarification. *Zetetic Scholar*, 1(1), 11–22.
- Wagenmakers, E. J., Wetzels, R., Borsboom, D., & van der Maas, H. L. J. (2011). Why psychologists must change the way they analyze their data: The case of psi. Comments on Bem (2011). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 426–432.
- Wigner, E. P. (1969). Are we machines? *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 113, 95–101.
- Zingrone, N. (2004). Failing to go the distance. On critics and parapsychology. http://www.skepticalinvestigations.org/Examskeptics/Zingrone_critics.html