

EDITORIAL

This issue of the JSE deals with a potent group of controversial topics. We begin with a research paper addressing the so-called source of psi problem—that is, the problem of identifying causal lines in parapsychological research. For example, in a classic PK lab experiment, there’s no way to determine conclusively why the experimental result occurred and who is responsible for that result. In the absence of something like a PK-meter, for all we know the experimenter (or an onlooker), rather than the official subject, might be the principal causal agent. The paper by Rock and Storm considers the vexing version of this problem as it arises in survival research, where the challenge is to determine whether anomalous information in a mediumistic setting comes from a deceased communicator or whether it’s entirely due to various kinds of psi among the living. Rock and Storm present a novel method which they believe may tilt the scales in favor of positing living-agent telepathy rather than communication involving a discarnate.

Next up is a report on a promising macro-PK subject in Buenos Aires. Of course, the topic of macro-PK is guaranteed to raise red flags for many. But as in many of the best cases, the subject in this study works in good light and under conditions in which fraud would be easily detected if it occurred. The subject’s phenomena are quite modest compared to the more exotic phenomena of physical mediumship. But this subject is not a medium, and he produces his effects independently of the confounding trappings of a typical mediumistic séance.

Next, an essay by Etzel Cardeña discusses “examples of blatant attempts to suppress and censor parapsychology research and those who are doing it.” This, of course, is a problem many JSE readers have encountered personally. Cardeña considers why the resistance to psi research is, not simply intense, but also disproportionate to what one would ordinarily expect in response to an empirical inquiry. And in an appendix to his essay, he presents an Editorial he wrote that was censored by the then-editors of the *Journal Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*.

But perhaps the main event for many will be the dialogue in this issue on the subject of climate change. My editorial predecessor Henry Bauer critiques a recent publication on the subject from the Royal Society and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, arguing that what’s presented as the mainstream science supporting the case for human-caused climate change is instead a form of “dismissive dogmatism” that “distort[s] and misrepresent[s] evidence with the aim of entrenching a mainstream con-

sensus.” This is followed by challenges to Bauer from Peter Bancel and Andrew Foss, with the final word going to Henry.

I’m especially pleased that the JSE is able to publish this debate. The topic of climate change elicits very strong opposing views, often enough from people who (at best) are only casually familiar with the science and data supporting both sides of the debate. I’m sure our readers are an unusually informed lot on many topics, but one can’t be optimally informed on every matter of importance. So my hope is that readers will find this exchange at least to be enlightening and informative, even if their prior opinions remain unchanged.

—**STEPHEN E. BRAUDE**