

these reports that while the reports from individual asylums have reference to the general statistics for the previous year ending December 31st and to the financial statistics for the period ending March 31st of the current year, the Inspector's Report, although dealing with the general statistics for the same period as those from the several asylums, are a year behindhand in their tables of finance. A probable explanation may be that the more recent accounts have not yet been audited at the time when the Inspector's Report is being written, and that they do not wish to touch on unaudited accounts. But such a plea in defence of a practice which we venture to think is to be deprecated, can hardly be regarded as adequate, unless this method is a statutory regulation. For, although the later accounts may not have been audited at the time the writing of the reports is undertaken, the audit will have almost certainly been made before they are completed, and in the hands of the publisher; and any necessary amendments or alterations in the figures could readily be made before publication. This would bring these tables as nearly up-to-date as possible. Those which appear in the Report under review have reference to an annual period which terminated over two years ago on March 31st, 1915. Some remedy ought to be devised for an anomaly of this kind.

Except for the fact that a large number of the asylums, practically one-half, are overcrowded, some greatly so, there is nothing of special interest or that requires comment as regards these institutions.

*Christianity and Sex Problems.* By HUGH NORTHCOTE, M.A. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Pp. 478. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis and Co. London: Stanley Phillips, 1916. Price 12s. 6d. net.

Attention was called to this book in the *Journal*, on its first publication ten years ago, as a treatise in moral theology, discussing the problems of sex from a remarkably enlightened and liberal standpoint of Anglican Christianity. In the present thoroughly revised edition the author has greatly enlarged the book, nearly doubling it in size, and adding six new chapters with numerous appendices. The usefulness of the work has thus been greatly increased for all those—from whom the medical psychologist can scarcely be excluded—called upon to consider sexual problems from the point of view of morality and social hygiene. As the author points out in the new Preface, bad casuistry has often been condemned, but a sound casuistry remains more than ever necessary, and the science of sexual moral theology "holds a rightful place in the scheme of knowledge, and has an important function to fulfil in the moral education of mankind." Even those who are indifferent to moral theology may still find that the author's fairness of mind, his practical acquaintance with difficulties, and his extensive knowledge of the most recent scientific literature of sex, render his book an interesting introduction to sexual psychology.

HAVELÓCK ELLIS.

*Raymond: Or Life and Death.* By SIR OLIVER LODGE, F.R.S.

This book consists of three parts: *First*, what is called the "Normal Portion," consisting of reminiscences of Raymond Lodge, who was

killed near Ypres on September 14th, 1915, æt. 26; of letters from him at the Front, and of letters from officers who had served with him. *Secondly*, what is called the "Supernormal Portion," containing the evidence which, in Sir Oliver Lodge's opinion, conclusively proves that Raymond has communicated with various people since his death. *Thirdly*, an exposition of Sir Oliver Lodge's beliefs about life and death, including, of course, his views on the relationship of mind to matter.

After reading *Raymond* I have no doubt of Sir Oliver Lodge's *bona fides*, for he presents the evidence at considerable length, when he would have made out a stronger case if he had suppressed most of it. However, Parts I and II appear to be really introduced as pegs on which to hang his own views about the universe, for he says (p. 280): "Some people may prefer the details in Part II; but others who have not the patience to read Part II may tolerate the more general considerations adduced in Part III—the 'Life and Death' portion—which can be read without any reference to Raymond or to Parts I and II." But the evidence in Part II should be carefully read, as otherwise some of the statements in Part III might give a very false impression. For instance, he says (Part III, p. 374): "But now, if I or any member of my family goes anonymously to a genuine medium, giving not the slightest normal clue, my son is quickly to the fore, and continues his clear and convincing series of evidences," whereas it appears to me that no serious attempt to avoid giving clues was made in any case.

Of the sittings with mediums recorded in *Raymond*, there are only nine in which a semblance of anonymity was attempted, and in none of these was any real effort made to take all possible precautions against fallacy. The mediums were discoveries of a Mrs. Kennedy, and were recommended by her to Sir Oliver Lodge, who apparently made no independent inquiries about them. All the supposedly anonymous sittings of Lady Lodge were held at Mrs. Kennedy's house, or else were arranged by her; and, as she had received many messages through the mediums, as well as through her own automatic writing, from her son Paul, who was killed in a motor accident in June, 1914, she was a convinced spiritualist, and we have no guarantee that she had not been talking about her friend Sir Oliver Lodge and his loss. At any rate, her presence at the *stances* was a clue; and then the fact of Raymond's death had been announced in *The Times*, so that mediums could easily have got some information about him. As for Sir Oliver Lodge's sittings, he admits (Part II, p. 96) that his "own general appearance is known, or might be guessed," and in every instance the medium recognised him. Then as regards the three sittings which his sons, Alec and Lionel, had with mediums under supposedly anonymous conditions, it is clear that the medium knew who they were. In short, the difference between these facts and what is stated in the sentence I have quoted may be taken as a key to the whole book, which chiefly illustrates Sir Oliver Lodge's lack of qualification for experimental psychology, of which, I take it, psychical research is but a branch. For if he had been a trained investigator, he would have taken, among others, the following precautions: (1) In every case the sitter would have been disguised. For instance, Sir Oliver Lodge himself might

have shaved off his beard, or got himself "made up" by Clarkson. (2) The sitting would have been arranged through someone like a solicitor, who had no interest in spiritualism, and would have arranged the preliminaries as a pure matter of business for a client without giving any clue. (3) In no case would a friend of mediums like Mrs. Kennedy have been present for fear she might give a clue. (4) In every case, if possible, the medium would have been securely blindfolded, so that he could not see the effect of his questions on an emotional sitter like Lady Lodge. (5) The sitter would have talked as little as possible, have never asked leading questions, and have tried not to give the medium hints by word or look.

There are several passages in *Raymond* in which Sir Oliver Lodge inveighs against scientific critics for trying, as he asserts, to limit the range of inquiry; but there is not a word in the whole book about the need of adequate training before undertaking psychical research. Apparently he is quite genuinely unaware that scientific critics, so far from trying to limit the range of inquiry, are actuated solely by their desire that the advance of knowledge shall not be hampered by the publication of researches vitiated by the fallacious conditions under which they have been carried out. Indeed, *Raymond* illustrates very well the difference between Sir Oliver Lodge and investigators trained for biological and psychological research. Whereas he builds his hypotheses on evidence obtained under the most fallacious conditions, in accordance with his dictum that "it seems more useful to get results for such observation as is possible under the circumstances than not to get them at all"—as he said of Eusapia Paladino's "physical phenomena" (*Fourn. S. P. R.*, vol. vi, 1894, p. 328), they maintain that, just as we are all victims of illusion if, without training, we investigate a conjurer's tricks under *his* conditions, so it is mere waste of time to investigate spiritistic phenomena under mediumistic conditions, which are incompatible with real precautions against error.

Sir Oliver Lodge believes that he has reached his present convictions as the result of the cumulative effect of a great deal of scientific evidence, no item of which is conclusive by itself; but a perusal of *Raymond* leaves very little doubt in my mind that by sitting with mediums under absolutely untrustworthy conditions, he has gradually and unconsciously lowered his critical standard, and, like a man who compounds a felony, has had to pay a penalty by becoming the dupe of his bias. Under the emotional influence of conversation with the "dead" judgment is easily warped, and the sitter becomes hypnotised by phenomena which leave the critical reader of the record quite cold, or may even excite his ridicule. As William James said of the difference between taking part in a "Piper" sitting and reading the record of it (*Proc. S. P. R.*, vol. xxiii, p. 32): "The whole talk gets warmed with your own warmth, and takes on the reality of your own part in it: its confusions and defects you charge to the imperfect conditions, while you credit the successes to the genuineness of the communicating spirit. These consequently loom more in our memory and give the key to our dramatic interpretation of the phenomenon. But a sitting that thus sounds important at the time may greatly shrink in value on a cold re-reading, and if read by a non-participant it may seem thin and

almost insignificant." So far, then, from a large number of incidents, each of which is evidentially weak, producing scientific conviction, the fact appears rather to be, as William James also pointed out, that "they will almost always produce a cumulative effect on the mind of the sitter whose affairs they implicate, and dispose him to the spiritistic view. It grows first possible, then plausible, then natural, and finally probable in a high degree" (*ibid.*, p. 18).

Sir Oliver Lodge says (p. 144) there are "innumerable" incidents in which the medium shows supernormal knowledge; but I have only found one incident in the whole of *Raymond* where a normal explanation cannot be given with every appearance of probability. I refer to the occasion in Alec Lodge's sitting with Mrs. Leonard on December 21st, 1915, when he asked the medium, "What used he to sing?" and received the following answer (p. 212): "Hello—Hullalo—sounds like Hullulu—Hullulo—something about Hottentot; but he is going back a long way he thinks. (*Sotto voce*) An orange lady? He says something about an orange lady. (*Sotto voce*) Not what sold oranges? No, of course not. He says a song extolling the virtues and beauties of an orange lady. And a funny song which starts M—A—, but Feda can't see any more—like somebody's name. Also something about Irish eyes. (*Sotto voce*) Are they really songs? Very much so." Now we are told in a note that "My Orange Girl" was the last song Raymond bought, that "Irish Eyes" was a comparatively recent song which he had sung several times, and that he had a still more recent song about "Maggie Magee," which Sir Oliver Lodge of course implies was the one referred to by "a funny song which starts M—A—, like somebody's name." The first part of the answer also is supposed to refer to a song called "My Southern Maid," on which Raymond had apparently written in pencil in March, 1904, the words—

"Any little flower from a tulip to a rose,  
If you'll be Mrs. John James Brown  
Of Hon-o-lu-la-lu-la-town."

This last fact might easily be explained by coincidence, but I think that such an explanation, while possible, is not so probable in the case of "My Orange Girl" and "Irish Eyes." On the other hand, it is an isolated incident, incapable of being repeated; and, if we knew all the conditions of the experiment, we might get a clue to a normal explanation just as in the case of Maskelyne's mysteries, which deceive us so easily. In this sitting Alec Lodge acted not only as sitter but also as recorder, and it is impossible under these circumstances to have any record of hints which he may have given subconsciously by his manner or expression, if not by word of mouth; and Feda's—(Mrs. Leonard's "trance-control" affected this name)—manner in answering the question suggests fishing for hints. Then, again, to ask a spirit about the songs it used to sing is what may be called a "stock" question, as a study of the Piper records shows; and it is not improbable that a medium who knows her business gets up the songs of the day. Again, "My Orange Girl" may have been a recent song which Mrs. Leonard happened to know was being widely sung; while "something about Irish eyes" is just the sort of thing I should say if I tried to guess at the title of one of a number of songs. Lastly, of course, I should like to know for

certain that Mrs. Leonard could never have got any information about Raymond's songs from any of his family, or from Mrs. Kennedy, etc. Although, then, I have to admit that I do not know what is the explanation, I do not feel impelled to seek a supernormal explanation for a single incident like this, considering the conditions under which it occurred. Also it is to be noted that again and again other questions were answered incorrectly or evaded, although the answers must have been known quite well to Raymond when he was alive.

The content and style of the mediums' utterances do not suggest a supernormal origin, as they are nowhere inconsistent with the culture of the medium employed. The spirit talk is so full of stock phrases, and so often shocks the expectations and requirements of common sense, that it is difficult to take seriously the long-winded descriptions of Raymond's adventures in "Summerland" with his cat and his dog "Curly," or his visits to other spheres, including, apparently, an interview with the Deity. "Feda," however, is sometimes rather amusing, as, for instance, in Sir Oliver Lodge's sitting with Mrs. Leonard on December 3rd, 1915, when towards the end he looked at his watch, and she said, "I could talk for hours; don't go yet." Even Sir Oliver Lodge realises the worthlessness of some of the evidence when he writes (p. 357): "It is true that in the case of some mediums, especially when overdone or tired, there are evanescent and absurd obtrusions every now and then which cannot be seriously regarded." But this admission gives his whole case away. What may appear ludicrous to him does not thereby cease to be interesting as a scientific phenomenon; and there is no test for distinguishing between the sub-conscious—or conscious—patter of the medium and those utterances which he regards as transmitted by a spiritual entity.

In more than one place Sir Oliver Lodge begs the reader to be willing to learn and be guided by facts and not by dogmas; but Part III is full of contentious assertions and matter calling for criticism, such as his remarks about the nature and honesty of mediums; his argument that prevision is consistent with free-will (p. 315); his views on the relation of mind to matter (pp. 326-330); his assertions that telepathy is a fact (p. 313), and that memory exists apart from the bodily mechanism (p. 328); his belief in psychometry (p. 305), and that possession by spirits is the explanation of dissociated personality (pp. 357-8); and his verbiage about the ether of space (pp. 318-9), and "etherial counterparts" (p. 336), etc., etc. His views about table-tilting, however, I must quote as a final example of the effect which psychical research has had on him. On p. 238 we read: "In general we may say, with fair security, that no receptivity to physical phenomena exists save through sense-organ, nerve, and brain; nor any initiation of physical phenomena save through brain, nerve, and muscle"; and on p. 363—"Certainly the table can only move at the expense of the energy of the medium or of people present"; but on p. 365, where he hints that speaking and writing without the aid of any physiological mechanism, as well as "materialisation," are facts, he writes—"In these strange and, from one point of view, more advanced occurrences, though lower in another sense, inert matter appears to be operated on without the direct intervention of physiological mechanism. And yet such mechanism must be



in the neighbourhood. I am inclined to think that these weird phenomena, when established, will be found to shade off into those other methods which I have been speaking of, and that no complete theory of either can be given until more is known about both. *This is one of the facts which causes me to be undogmatic about the certainty that all movements, even under contact, are initiated in the muscles.*" (The italics are mine.) Apparently he believes that a spirit, by utilising *potential* human energy, may directly make a table move in the absence of muscular contraction. What a shock Faraday's spirit would receive, could he realise that his experiments on table-tilting were thus ignored!

I. L. TUCKETT.

## Epitome of Current Literature.

### 1. Physiological Psychology.

*The Classification of Dreams* [*Per la Classificazione dei Sogni*]. (*Psiche*, October-December, 1915.) Assagioli, Dr. Roberto.

The writer offers the following classification of dreams only as a preliminary sketch, and not as a complete scheme. The nature, structure, and characters of dreams are so diverse and complex that it is impossible to classify them conveniently from one point of view. It is necessary, therefore, to make as many classifications as there are characteristics by which one can, and ought, to distinguish dreams.

#### *I. Classification of Dreams according to their Origin.*

(a) Dreams in which the action of external sensorial stimuli (visual, auditory, tactile, etc.) is recognised. To this category belong also the dreams in which is recognised the influence exercised by atmospheric conditions, particularly by their sudden changes.

(b) Dreams in which the action of internal, organic sensorial stimuli is recognised—that is to say, the various buzzings and noises in the ears, and all the sensations proceeding from the activities of the various organs. Such sensations generally remain subconscious during waking hours, buried in the general organic sense of well- or ill-being (coen-æsthesia), but during sleep they have a power of exercising an influence on dream-activity.

(c) Dreams in which the action of supernormal stimuli is recognised. Being ignorant of the true nature of these stimuli, we can for the present only deduce their existence from their effects.

(d) Dreams of an evidently psychical origin. Many dreams are clearly the production of the spontaneous psychical activity of the dreamer, without the co-operation of other stimuli. To this ample category belong dreams reproducing real events, and the dreams determined by emotional tendencies and conditions.

(e) Dreams with no evident origin. This is a provisional category, which we hope with the progress of science will soon become unnecessary.