



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gestion will rather take refuge in fraud as the best means of giving trouble in this problem.

On the whole, I cannot complain of any desire by Prof. Leuba to do the Report an injustice. I am rather pleased with the general spirit that is shown toward such work, and I am not anxious to make proselytes. Every man must make up his own mind on the problem and scientific psychologists cannot adopt the hypothesis which I have defended until much more has been accomplished in this perplexing field, and until they have the opportunity to come into direct personal contact with experimentation in it. But I will say that there will be little opportunity granted them as long as they publicly ridicule it. There are no doubt fakirs and silly performances have given the conception by which the average intelligent man and scientist has to judge of the subject, and the contempt with which this has to be met only make respectable people conceal genuine phenomena from the knowledge of scientific men. The only way to find facts which really require investigation is to exhibit the kind of tact and respect which the student of abnormal psychology has always to show in the treatment of pathological phenomena. When this is done, our psychologists will find it convenient to avoid public ridicule of the subject and they may actually discover some interesting facts right at home.

JAMES H. HYSLOP.

NEW YORK.

REJOINDER TO PROF. HYSLOP.

I regret very much the erroneous statement of which Prof. Hyslop complains in Section 3 of his answer. I do not know how to account for it and I cannot now do better than offer an apology.

The recognition of the mistake just referred to does not, however, modify my opinion that the first part of the volume gives a wrong impression, *i. e.*, an impression much more favorable to the spiritistic hypothesis than the one derived from the complete records filling the second part of the book. I had simply stated my own observation and that of other persons. I have since then verified its correctness. But, as I had said no blame attaches to Prof. Hyslop on that score.

The other remarks of Prof. Hyslop are either without any force or bear upon points which affect in no way the position I have taken in the discussion. I beg the reader's indulgence for a word of comment upon the issues raised in the sections of his answers indicated by the numerals below.

1 and 2. If I have treated some of the incidents as if Prof. Hyslop assumed them to be evidences merely because they were true, the fault is probably as much with him as with me. It is not always easy to find out what evidential weight he ascribes to true incidents. He seems to me at times to vacillate from what might be termed an official attitude, quite skeptical, to a private one, more receptive.

3 and 6. The requirements with which Prof. Hyslop would burden a reviewer are not to be endured. He need not suppose that, because no reason is adduced the writer has none to offer. If I called attention to the false incidents without discussing their compatibility with my hypothesis, and if I was content with merely stating that the supposition of an abnormal mental condition prevailing on the "other side" was a damning supposition, it is because I was writing a critical review and not an exhaustive treatise. For the same reason, I could not summarize his discussion on this last point. I might, however, have referred the reader to the pages of the Report on which the discussion is to be found. I have the same sufficient excuse to give for the omission of "Mistakes and Confusions" in mentioning the main advantages of the spiritistic theory. The arguments I have mentioned (p. 102) are, in my opinion, and I believe, in his own, the *main* advantages, as I was careful to say. Had I added "Mistakes and Confusions" without explaining how they could be used to the advantage of the spiritistic hypothesis, my readers could not possibly have appreciated their value for Prof. Hyslop's thesis.

4, 5 and 8. I had carefully read Appendix IV. I did not, however, find it either possible to discuss it or necessary to refer to it. I can reconcile my opinion with the facts brought out in that Appendix without being driven to the conclusion that the Columbia University students were insane; for, if there are many points of similarity between the experiments reported in Appendix IV and the alleged communications through Mrs. Piper, there are also many points of difference.

The failure on my part to discuss the value of confused incidents and of errors should not be called an evasion; it is the outcome of economy of space in a paper already too long.

9. My remark upon the strong biasing influence of the feelings in the peculiar circumstances under which these experiments were carried on is no "*ad populum* argument." It is a sound psychological remark. Instead of recognizing its truth, Prof. Hyslop prefers to turn around and impute the same to the skeptic. That does not help his case.

My sentence, "Let us rather listen to the conclusions of those who have only read and not witnessed," is not to be construed as an *a priori* condemnation of the scientific men who investigate and experiment for themselves. My meaning would have been better expressed as follows: "Let us rather listen to the conclusions of those who have been observers at the sittings, but not sitters themselves." This might have been gathered from the tone of the whole paper and particularly from my remark when, speaking of suggestion (p. 105), I made it clear that to my mind those best fitted to appraise the evidence were neither the sitters nor the outsiders, but those present at the sittings as investigating observers.

10. I am still of opinion that the only meaning of the word *tokens* allowed by the context is the one it has in the phrase "token of friendship." Let the readers go to the text and decide for themselves (pp. 397, 411). I did not make Prof. Hyslop say that it was a "wonderful incident." It is my own opinion that I was expressing when I said that his interpretation of the word *token* made, out of a common utterance, a wonderful incident.

I made Prof. Hyslop ascribe more weight to the second passage I quoted than he actually did. He does, however, mention some of those incidents in the recapitulation (p. 88) and there he *seems* to give them a good deal of importance.

JAMES H. LEUBA.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.