

was, after all, something of a pioneer in stimulating interest in out-of-body experiences even if she eventually threw in her lot with the skeptics. But these are all minor points. The book will, I am confident, become essential reading for all who are involved in the survival issue.

*John Beloff*

*6 Blackett Place, Edinburgh EH9 1RL, Scotland UK*

**Scientific Development and Misconceptions through the Ages, A Reference Guide** by Robert E. Krebs. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999. vii + 286 pp. \$49.95 (paperback). ISBN 0-313-30226-X.

The announced aim of this book is to present a short history of science and a review of misconceptions through the ages as they have arisen in all the fields of science. Because the author is a retired administrator at a health sciences center, it is not surprising that biological and applied areas receive special emphasis. The author insists that deliberate falsifications are beyond the scope of the study, which attempts to be comprehensive in other respects. Classification plays a major part in the author's attempt to distinguish between the sciences and other fields of belief. Most mathematicians will be surprised to find their discipline classified as an applied science. Students of theology will find its inclusion in the class of superstitions, a less than promising starting point for a comprehensive study of intellectual endeavors. Krebs tries to give due credit to philosophy by calling it a "borderline science." Philosophers will be able to forgive administrative misconceptions, which may be fruitful as topics for discussion in the classroom. Problems of classification appear once more when astrology is treated in the same chapter as cosmology.

There is a large amount of instructive material in sections on medicine and health, theoretical biology, chemistry and physics, and conservation. The identification of historical disputes and outcomes is in many cases helpful at a certain level of instruction. In my opinion, some of the strongest lines of discussion in this book concern the identification of motivations for less than critical beliefs and belief systems. The errors upon which the author concentrates are of various kinds, ranging from technical mistakes in calculation to flaws in broad conceptual systems. A stronger account of misconceptions through the ages might devote more analytic attention to different levels of concept identification and use in the scientific endeavor.

*Robert F. Creegan*  
*Professor Emeritus, Philosophy*  
*The University at Albany, SUNY*