



who ask for help will receive it in the degree they are able to use it, but they will receive guidance, not direct assistance.

Theon Wright  
St. Simons Island, GA

### Experimenter's Potent Influence

Editor: Regarding the recent Tart and Neubert article, "ESP Training" (March/April, 1976), I believe the readers of *Psychic* may be interested in some comments concerning possible alternative interpretations of Dr. Tart's data.

In my review of Tart's monograph (*Journal of Parapsychology*, 40, March, 1976) my comments are presented in greater detail. In his monograph, Tart claims to have trained subjects to use their ESP in a forced-choice, GESP paradigm employing immediate feedback of their results on a trial by trial basis. However, those subjects who scored at an extremely significant rate in Tart's three-stage study were almost exclusively tested by one particular experimenter/agent from Tart's pool of undergraduate experimenters/agents.

Based on these results as well as a batch of statistically insignificant incline effects, Tart, in his monograph invokes the phenomenon of learning as explanatory. The incline effects are one criterion for determining the kind of increasing performance suggestive of learning. As my previous review suggests, based on psychologically accepted criteria indicative of learning (and these apply to parapsychology as well), the conclusion one must come to regarding this series of experiments is that "learning" is simply not present. According to the published results, a high degree of ESP was elicited. But subjects showed no evidence of learning; that is, being able to increase their performance over time.

Rather, it appears as though one interpretation of Tart's results is that the subjects who attained the very high scores did so partly because of the presence of their experimenter. Recent theoretical research suggests that the experimenter, both psychologically and parapsychologically, is

a potent influence in psi research. Because of the obvious dichotomy in experimenter effectiveness in Tart's study — that is, EI's subjects scoring at a very highly significant rate, while other experimenters elicit either mildly significant or chance scoring — the effect of the experimenter, as opposed to anything like learning, seems much more probable.

So I think the reader should bear in mind that Tart's results are very much open to question, even apart from the fact that the experimenters were undergraduate college students, apparently naive not only to psychological research experience, but to parapsychological research experience as well. The reader cannot make this kind of critical interpretation based on the scanty data reported in the Tart and Neubert article, and because that article is consistently couched in such popularized phrases as "research breakthrough" and "ESP training," it becomes almost misleading. It is a fact that Tart's subjects "trained" on devices used to test ESP performance. It is also factual (according to published data) that they showed varying degrees of ESP in their performance. But it is clearly not a proper fact that any of them "learned" to use their ESP.

Over the many years of psi research the one salient feature that has consistently characterized the phenomenon is its unconscious nature. And as most psychologists realize, the unconscious, that metaphorical no-man's land that over-sees all that we do that we either don't realize we're doing or later wish we hadn't done, is highly uncontrollable, to say the least.

Dennis P. O'Brien  
Pittsfield, MA

### Editor's Reply

While O'Brien makes a valid point that experimenters have a drastic effect on ESP test results (both psychologically and psychically), that does not mean that the subjects do not learn. Rather, it suggests that the optimum condition for a subject to learn is with a "psi-positive" experimenter; with "psi-cidal" experimenters, no ESP learning results.

Dr. Tart will reply in the next issue.

### White Roses for Kuhlman

Editor: Kathryn Kuhlman ("In Search of a Miracle: The Riddle of Kathryn Kuhlman," by Antoinette May, April 1976) will always live in the mind and hearts of many of her followers who have been healed of mind and body through her great ministry. No one must sit down and look for miracles. But by being up, and by doing . . . , the Lord will be with thee.

For Kathryn Kuhlman to get her people well, her one ounce of faith was worth a ton of experience. Many people will live by that faith and the hope of that one great woman — who believed. Many brainy women never interested us as much as this "heart" woman; white roses, please, less than red.

Phillip J. Rapich  
Pittsburgh, PA

### Toward Higher Consciousness

Editor: I was especially interested in Milan Ryzl's statement (Profile, April 1976) that: "First, there are indications that better performances in ESP require a certain level of moral development." I agree.

To quote Gopi Krishna of Kashmir, "The error of science has been that it has largely ignored the spiritual side of man and devoted its attention to the physical and organic fields."

I believe that a higher consciousness may be acquired through religion.

Hazel A. Burdick  
Palo Alto, CA

### Hypnosis Correction

In Mark Turck's article, "Developing ESP through Hypnosis," April 1976, several lines from pages 37 and 38 were inadvertently transposed. Corrected pages will be sent to subscribers on request.

The Editor

