

Engineering professor Robert Jahn laid his career on the line to test the power of

PSYCHIC POWERS WHAT ARE THE ODDS?

the mind over machines. He thinks he's onto something.

John McCrone reports

IN THE lobby of the Flamingo Hilton, Las Vegas, slot machines—one armed bandits—stretch in serried ranks to the far horizon. Hanging over the machines nearest the entrance stands a sign stating: "97.4—the hottest slot percentage in town". With characteristic American bluntness, the Flamingo's management tell customers that the machines have been adjusted to cream off "only" 2.6 cents of every dollar they spend.

This promise of steady, if unspectacular, loss is supposed to draw in the punters from the gritty heat of the Las Vegas strip. And attract them it does. So impatient are they to shed their money at the guaranteed rate that they feed adjacent machines with both hands, shovelling in coins and barely waiting for the clacking reels to come to rest.

If ever proof were needed against the existence of telepathy, psychokinesis, precognition or any other form of psychic power, the gambling halls of Las Vegas seem to provide the perfect place to find it. The odds on every game of chance—from the slot machines and crap games to the blackjack and roulette tables—have been fine-tuned to fractions of a per cent. Judging by the faces masked in concentration, it can hardly be said that the gamblers are not exerting every psychic effort to win. And yet still the cash flows into the pockets of the casino owners in an even, predictable stream.

Despite such everyday evidence, people continue to believe in the power of the mind. Public opinion polls commonly find that as many as a quarter of the population are convinced that they personally have experienced premonitions or moments of telepathic understanding. Belief in the psychic seems impossible to

shake. But what if someone could design the perfect laboratory test? A test that could settle the matter once and for all, either revealing believers to be dupes or forcing sceptics finally to start taking mental powers seriously? The dream of such an experiment has led parapsychology—the science of psychic research—to experiments which mirror the very games of chance which have made the gambling industry so profitable.

Roll of a dice

Under tightly-controlled conditions, subjects try to influence the outcome of a random event such as the roll of a dice, the radioactive decay of an atom, the diffraction pattern of a beam of light, the fall of a cascade of polystyrene balls, or the "direction" taken by electrical noise. What is more, some parapsychologists claim to be seeing an anomalous effect. They are reporting a deviation from chance which is vanishingly small—just a tenth of a per cent—but when measured over millions of trials, this faint effect multiplies into a hugely significant distortion of the apparent odds.

The results of these trials have provided inspiration for some apparently wacky research into the possibility of "thought-controlled" household appliances. Dean Radin, a researcher at the University of Nevada, in Las Vegas says: "It may be a small difference, but if we can find a way of amplifying it, we could build thought-controlled switches. Perhaps in fifty years we will be using psychokinesis to open our garage doors or change channels on our TVs." If the research grapevine is to be believed, a laboratory in one of the world's biggest electronics companies already has a team

thinking about these futuristic gadgets.

But before we get carried away by visions of an effortless, thought-driven world, what is the scientific status of micro-psychokinesis—supposed ability of the mind to influence small events.


Psychic experiments with random systems date back to at least the 1930s. But most of the early research relied on dice or mechanical devices which, because of slight imperfections of manufacture, could never be truly random, and which were also rather susceptible to fraud. Reviews of this work showed that the tighter the controls, the less likely an experimenter was to report an effect.

In the 1970s, Helmut Schmidt of the Mind Science Foundation in San Antonio made a major advance with the introduction of experiments that used a Geiger counter to measure radioactive decay. The testers were asked to speed up or slow down the rate of decay as displayed on the Geiger counter without touching the instrument or the radioactive source. Then in the 1980s, Robert Jahn, an engineering professor at Princeton University, New Jersey, began studies using the random white noise generated by an electrical diode.

Demolition job

Jahn's work is currently the most respected of PK studies because of its scale and technical sophistication—although as was made plain when Jahn featured in a recent BBC2 TV series, *Heretic*, his move into parapsychology has horrified Princeton's authorities. When Jahn, a rocket propulsion specialist, went public with his research in 1986, he was demoted from dean of the engineering faculty to an associate professorship and left in no

Photography: John Millar



'If ever proof were needed against the existence of telepathy, psychokinesis, precognition or any other form of psychic power, the gambling halls of Las Vegas seem to provide the perfect place to find it'

doubt that he would have been booted right off campus if it were possible.

Even in the safety of his Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR) laboratory funded by the McDonnell Foundation and the Fetzer Institute, in the basement of the engineering department, Jahn has had to face a barrage of criticism from former colleagues and other sceptics. Some dismissed his results as being caused by faulty laboratory equipment, others have even suggested that they could be the result of fraud. There is also a constant demand for Jahn to clearly define the mechanism that converts thought to action.

Despite this rough treatment by fellow academics, Jahn—like most parapsychologists—is surprisingly open and helpful when questioned about his research. His first remark is that common-sense examples such as gambling are not a particularly good argument against paranormal powers. Jahn points out that in group situations, such as race courses and roulette games, many people would be willing different outcomes and these are likely to cancel each other out. Then, of course, there are the management's wishes to consider.

Another confounding factor, he believes, is the possibility of "psi-missing" where some people might consistently get the opposite of what they try to will. Finally, the size of the effect being claimed—just a tenth of a per cent—is so small that it could easily be built into the odds on gambling devices like slot machines.

Tossing a coin

Jahn has also gone out of his way to counter criticisms of his scientific technique by running all his experiments under the controlled conditions of the laboratory. His basic experiment, which he has been running for 14 years, is simple. He built a random event generator—roughly, the electronic equivalent of tossing a coin. A thousand times a second, the white noise produced by a diode is sampled and its phase will produce either a positive or a negative value. On average, there should be an equal split. Jahn gets people to sit in front of the generator and will it to produce either more "heads" or "tails". The subjects—or operators, as Jahn calls them—can see how well they are doing from a cumulative line rising or falling on a computer screen.

The most common criticism of this kind of experiment is that either the machine is probably not truly random in performance or that the recording of the results leaves too much scope for mistakes and even plain fraud. Jahn has gone to great lengths to counter these possibilities.

The design of the random event generator does not seem to be in question. Measured over many days and millions of readings, its output has been perfectly well-behaved—even to the point where it throws up the occasional "excursion" into apparently significant deviations from chance. If left to run long enough, a properly random system should sometimes stray quite a way from the mean, and Jahn's generator produced the expected number of such excursions during its calibration trials.

The generator also has safeguards against tampering. Subjects are normally left alone during trials and sceptics have

Jahn has fitted the generator with various warning bells and temperature gauges. But more importantly, the sampling method does not rely on the raw output of the noise diode. Instead, the definition of what counts as a head or tail is alternated with each trial, so a positive signal will be counted as a head on one trial, but a tail the next. This added twist would cancel out any inherent bias that the equipment might develop during the course of an experiment. Switching the polarity criteria a thousand times a second would also seem to rule out any deliberate, or even inadvertent, tampering by subjects.

Controlling conditions

And as yet another precaution, the performance of subjects is measured against three conditions: subjects must move the line up for half the time; down for half the time; and, as a control, they must sit by the box, leaving it to perform on its own. Jahn says it is difficult to think what kind of equipment failure or environmental interference could change its direction as the subject has to switch between each of the three conditions.

The control over recording data seem equally stringent. One complaint against many earlier parapsychology experiments was that subjects could begin and end trials as they wanted. By recording trials that seemed to be going in the desired direction, and aborting sessions once they began to produce a downward turn using the excuse of having a headache or suddenly feeling uninspired, subjects could manipulate an experiment to create a result. But Jahn guarded against such perils by specifying the number of trials to be completed in advance and insisting that all results be recorded in the final database. In addition, the initiation of each session and the logging of results was controlled by computer software. Not only were results automatically dumped onto tape, but the computer printed out a separate paper record and subjects wrote up their scores in the laboratory's logbook.

With an apparently watertight design, Jahn reported his first major batch of results in 1986 after completing a quarter of a million experimental trials (a trial consisting of 200 "coin-flips" in each of the three conditions). This was already several hundred times more data than collected by any other micro-PK

Jahn has also gone out of his way to counter criticisms of his scientific technique by running all his experiments under the controlled conditions of the laboratory.



suggested that its output could be affected by something as crude as it being given a kick, to more subtle effects like waving a magnet near it or even just leaning towards the machine and creating some sort of weak capacitance effect from the static on a subject's clothing.

To guard against such possibilities,

researcher. But Jahn and the small team he assembled kept on going, and by last year Jahn had reached 14 million trials using over 100 different subjects.

In brief, the results he has found are tiny but highly significant. The size of the effect is about 0.1 per cent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone. However, while microscopic, the effect is so constant that there is only a 1 in 5000 chance that Jahn's results are a statistical fluke rather than some kind of anomaly.

So it seems like game, set and match to the parapsychologists. An experiment which was designed to meet all the standard criticisms of psychic research has come up with a steady, robust result. Certainly Jahn's work appears to have put sceptics, such as James Alcock of York University, Ontario, and Ray Hyman of the University of Oregon—both members of the self-appointed policing body, the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP)—on the defensive. Yet a closer look at the detail of Jahn's findings still raises some worrying questions.

Since reporting his early results in 1986, Jahn has extended the scope of his experiments. What he has found is that the anomalous effect appears astonishingly insensitive to changing circumstances. The size of the effect, for example, remains much the same when instead of testing the influence of subjects on a physical process—the random thermal movement of electrons across a transistor junction, for example—Jahn asks them to disturb the output of a pseudo-random source. The pseudo-random number generator is just a repetitive mathematical calculation, so it would seem that the mind is as good at influencing arithmetic as real events.

The size of the effect also appeared constant when Jahn tested subjects with a random mechanical cascade. This device is a pinball machine, looking rather like a giant version of the popular Japanese arcade game, *pachenko*, in which 9000 polystyrene balls are dropped through a grid of nylon pegs, bouncing and skittering to collect in bins at the bottom. In an unbiased system, the balls should end up with a classic Gaussian bell-shaped distribution. But

Jahn claims that when subjects sat in front of this three-metre-high "macro-PK" device, they were able to produce slight deviations to the side.

More implausibly still, the effects on all three systems seemed impervious to distance and time. Over the past few years, Jahn has reported the results of large-scale trials in which 30 people attempted

happening is not a mental interference with a physical event but something much more subtle—a distortion of the laws of statistics themselves. Jahn thinks that subjects somehow distort the "probability envelope" of an outcome.

How they are supposed to do so is far from clear. Jahn has written about how such a view ties in with a quantum mechanical view of consciousness in *Margins of Reality*, coauthored with Brenda Dunne, who manages the laboratory. Jahn argues that, like quantum systems, consciousness appears to have both a "particle" and a "wave" aspect. Consciousness is at its most concrete and particle-like when involved in ordinary rational thought, but becomes fluid and wave-like when thinking is creative and holistic. Jahn cites the wave aspect of quantum systems which allows the systems occasionally to penetrate physical barriers—a phenomenon familiar to microelectronics engineers who have seen this effect with quantum tunnelling in which particles can be made to "leap" across insulated junctions. So, by analogy, the mind might be able to reach beyond the brain and have a faint resonant influence on the surrounding world.


Mumbo jumbo

Sceptics, however, treat such talk as mumbo jumbo. They point out that, for a start, statistics are something that emerge from the behaviour of random processes, not something that creates them. Instead, sceptics see the surprising insensitivity of the claimed PK effect as being rather fishy.

Suspicious have hardened as sceptics have looked more closely at the fine detail of Jahn's results. Attention has focused on the fact that one of the experimental subjects—believed to be a member of the PEAR laboratory staff—is almost single-handedly responsible for the significant results of the studies.

This was noted as long ago as 1985 by a fellow parapsychologist, John Palmer of Durham University, North Carolina, who wrote a report on Jahn's work for the US Army. One subject—known as operator 10—was by far the best performer, and this trend has continued. On the most recently available figures, operator 10 has been involved in only 15 per cent of the 14 million trials but contributed a full half of the total "successes". If this person's figures are taken out of the data pool, scoring in the "low intention"

'Attention has focused on the fact that one of the experimental subjects—is almost single-handedly responsible for the significant results of the studies'



to influence the devices from as far away as Kenya, New Zealand, England and Russia. Each subject would sit down for an hour at an agreed time and try to alter output according to a prearranged pattern. The distance a subject was from the experiment seemed to have no effect on the end result.

In another batch of trials using the same people, Jahn asked them to make their efforts up to several days before or after the running of the machine. If anything, says Jahn, the effect was slightly stronger under such extreme conditions.

Jahn is not perturbed by such a pattern of results. He says that on the face of it, if psychic powers exist, they should be strongest when subjects are closest to the equipment. Also it seems likely that feedback on success rates and the kind of device being used should have an effect. But Jahn believes that micro-PK is misnamed because what is actually

The luck of the draw

WHILE successful parapsychology experiments grab attention, failures to find a result rarely get any press. But one recent experiment—modelled closely on Robert Jahn's micro-PK studies—is worth mentioning.

Stan Jeffers, a physicist at York University, Ontario, says his curiosity was piqued

when he stumbled upon an old report of Jahn's research. He says Jahn's methodology sounded impressively solid, which inspired him to mount his own parapsychological research. Soon he discovered that CSICOP member, James Alcock, worked at the same university, and this helped when producing a strong experimental design.

Jeffers's idea was to test

people's ability to bend a beam of light and so distort the interference pattern created as it passed through a diffraction slit. Jeffers says the experiment was a straight optical equivalent of Jahn's polystyrene ball cascade, except that because he used photons, subjects were dealing with "zillions" of events per second and so he expected any effect to show up quickly.

After testing over 80 people—including self-proclaimed psychics—Jeffers found only chance results.

Jahn himself admits that he expected Jeffers's experiment to work and was puzzled when it did not. Jahn has since lent Jeffers one of his new miniature random noise generators and Jeffers is planning further investigations.

condition falls to chance while "high intention" scoring drops close to the .05 probability boundary considered weakly significant in scientific results.

Sceptics like Alcock and Hyman say naturally it is a serious concern that staff at PEAR have been acting as guinea pigs in their own experiments. But it becomes positively alarming if one of the staff—with intimate knowledge of the data recording and processing procedures—is making such a huge contribution to the "successful" results.

Adding fuel to the controversy, sceptics have pointed to the strange behaviour of the baseline condition results. Theoretically, the baseline condition should show the same gently wandering pattern as the calibration trials which separately validated the generator's performance, with occasional excursions into areas of apparent significance. Instead, the baseline result has stuck unnaturally close to a zero deviation from chance.

In noting these results, Jahn himself has remarked that what makes the situation even odder is that when the baseline statistics and the high and low scores are all added together, the result is a well-behaved Gaussian distribution. It is almost as if the extra hits found in the high and low scores had been taken from what would otherwise have been outliers of the baseline condition.

Alcock says this is exactly the sort of pattern that might be expected if some sort of data sorting had been going on. Given an effect size of just one in a thousand, it would not take much to distort Jahn's results.

Little of this speculation has been discussed openly by CSICOP members—to do so would be virtually to accuse Jahn's laboratory of fraud, and sceptics admit they have no proof of that. Alcock also stresses that Jahn is widely respected and such alterations need not be deliberate, they could happen as the result of honest mix-ups.

Jahn, however, says he is well aware there has been a whispering campaign and he welcomes the chance to put the record straight. With candour, Jahn

says no experimental design can ever rule out fraud. But he believes that the recording procedures at PEAR are unusually tight and any fiddling with results would have to be systematic because it would have to include the laboratory's computer database, the print-outs and subjects' entries in the logbook. Jahn adds that sceptics have had a long-standing invitation to check his work first-hand and the few that have dropped by seem to have left relatively impressed.

Into the unknown

Jahn admits that operator 10—whom he insists must remain anonymous—has been responsible for a large proportion of the significant findings. But he makes two points. First, at least four or five other of the 100 subjects show a more powerful effect than operator 10. What is different is that they have been involved in far fewer trials. Jahn says if these better performers had been able to do as many runs as operator 10—and if the strength of their effects persisted—then operator 10's results would have dropped away into the background.

His second point is that when the contributions of all the operators are plotted, they form a smooth continuum. Just as there are a few high performers like operator 10 at one end of the spectrum, so there are an equal number

of poor performers—even psi-missers—at the other end who drag the overall numbers down. With over 100 subjects, statistically speaking there would have to be a few high-end scorers like operator 10, so no sinister conclusions should be drawn from that fact alone.

As to the "too perfect" baseline, Jahn says this fits in neatly with his argument that what subjects are doing is bending statistics rather than having a direct influence on physical events. It seems that, in the short term, subjects can pull the scoring in one direction. But this has to be balanced by a shortfall in later extreme scores.

However, in the end, says Jahn, sceptics will always be able to dismiss positive results from a parapsychology experiment. Suspicions of fraud, faulty machinery or plain mistaken recording of data can never be completely countered. Jahn says the only way forward is to have the same experiment replicated by other laboratories. This is why he has recently built a cheap, solid-state version of his random event generator and over the past year he has been farming them out to other interested investigators.

Yet even replications may not be the answer, given the strength of entrenched views. Hardened sceptics are just as likely to find reasons to suspect a successful replication. And, of course, the same doubts work the other way. If a scientist produces negative results (see Box), then the parapsychologists may be the ones to start talking about incompetence and faulty procedures.

Recent experience suggests there may never be a simple, conclusive test of the existence of psychic powers. However, Jahn's work does seem to narrow the boundaries somewhat, for if such abilities exists, then their effects appear microscopically small. They also seem quite bizarrely resistant to the constraints of time, place and logic. Knowing what science is not looking for, at least is knowing something. □

John McCrone is a science writer specialising in psychology and technology.

'Sceptics invited to check his work first-hand seem to have left relatively impressed'



Observer noise

The study of parapsychology is disturbing because it challenges some of the fundamental principles of the scientific method. In the case of the thought experiments described in your article "Psychic powers: what are the odds?" (26 November), the independence of the experimenter from the experiment is at issue.

The separation of the observer from the observed is of course nowhere absolute. At the quantum level the limit is defined by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, and by the philosophical speculations of the Copenhagen school.

A different type of interaction operates in the "softer" social and medical sciences. An anthropologist, for example, cannot study a cultural group without influencing, and being influenced by, that culture. One day we may have a social-scientific uncertainty principle to define this effect.

In considering the attempts to prove psychokinesis such as Robert Jahn is doing, one can speculate that the observable



effect may never exceed experimental noise. Conceptually, if such phenomena are real they could be influenced not only by the individual actually involved in the experiment but by all interested parties who are thinking about it at the time: the designer of the experiment and all the friends who wish him or her success. On the other hand, sceptics who conduct the identical experiment could equally displace the outcome in

the opposite direction.

Parapsychology may therefore always be impossible to prove. This argument is not new. The efficacy of miracles has been debated for centuries, and proof of their validity has long relied on the presence or absence of "faith".

Another point: if psychokinesis does exist it must be weak or the (honest) influence of strong-willed scientists on the outcome of their work would by now be evident, rather than lost in a background of experimental noise.

Graham Hagens
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

John McCrone's otherwise well-written article contains one factual error that should perhaps be corrected, namely that when "Jahn . . . went public with his research in 1986, he was demoted from dean of the engineering faculty to an associate professorship and left in no doubt that he would have been booted right off campus if it were possible".

In point of fact, we had been publishing and speaking publicly about our research for several years prior to 1986, during which period I served both as Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and as Professor of Aerospace Sciences, as is the Princeton custom. While it is true that a number of my faculty and administrative colleagues had expressed reservations about the work, no explicit threats to my retaining either position were ever directly voiced to me.

My decision not to seek reappointment as Dean in 1986, after fifteen years in that chair, was based on a number of personal and professional considerations, including my desire to devote more effort to my two research programmes. At that time, I simply returned to a full-time role as (full) professor in my home department of mechanical and aerospace engineering, which position I retain today.

No "demotion" was explicitly or implicitly involved; to the contrary, this return has proven

professionally and personally advantageous to me.

Robert Jahn
Princeton University
New Jersey

Battery blues

The limitations imposed on the electric car by the present battery technology (as described in "All charged up and nowhere to go", 3 December), could be overcome if a more systemic approach were to be made to the design of the car and its energy supply system. Instead of making the batteries an integral part of the car and recharging them on board, it would seem more sensible to make them easily replaceable on filling station forecourts. Payment would be for the net electric charge received.

Suitable battery handling equipment could make battery replacement as speedy as refilling a fuel tank. Recharging could be confined to off-peak times and could be carried out more safely and cheaply at filling stations than at home. Battery exchange could be made at unmanned sites, all round the clock; something not really practical with liquid or gaseous fuels.

To obtain the full economic benefits of scale in the early years of electric car technology, the design of batteries should be modular and suitable for all makes and sizes of vehicles, and compatible with handling equipment in all forecourts.

No significant "green" effect will result if, as suggested in the article, only rich customers will be able to afford to buy electric vehicles. Governments and local authorities trying to popularise the use of electric vehicles could do so by bearing the capital cost of the batteries, by leasing them to vehicle owners, and by supporting the development of battery exchange sites throughout the country. Priming the market pump in order to reach the critical sales levels needed for really low cost vehicle production should be needed for only a few years.

Fenton Robb
Eyemouth, Berwickshire

Double whammy

As a retired BT engineer with over 40 years experience of street works, to me the most disturbing aspect of the damage to trees by TV cabling is that in many cases the excavations are unnecessary (Forum, 3 December).



BT has had for decades in most suburban areas an extensive underground duct system with plenty of space for additional cable—but, as Barry Fox points out in the same issue (Technology), BT is not allowed to compete.

Since, as Cyril Bracegirdle says, the cable companies are mainly American owned, this puts the British public on the receiving end of the double whammy of unnecessary environmental damage and seeing the profits from it float over the Atlantic.

G. E. Haines
Woodbridge, Suffolk

British opt-out

In brief reply to Bruce Reed's comments (Letters, 10 December) on my letter of 12 November, even when a British contribution to the European Union budget in respect of research and development is included, the government's spending on R&D is now less, in real terms, than in 1984/5 by about £1 billion per annum—and still falling (*Forward Look 1994*, HMSO).


Bruce Reed is right to draw attention to the British Treasury's insistence, unique in the EU, that a proportion of the EU funds returned to Britain for support of R&D should be counted against—and so reduce—Departmental

Well done, parties

Fred Pearce's assessment of the first Conference of the Parties (CoP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (This Week, 17 December) was altogether too gloomy. The political process, far from being paralysed, may be outpacing the necessary scientific cooperation.

In the 30 months since the Earth Summit 103 nations have ratified the convention. No other treaty on biological resources has progressed so fast.

Over 30 nations have been preparing biodiversity country studies and, surprisingly, a handful of nations (including Britain) have already published action plans.



Over two dozen more are in preparation, and this is before the draft UN Environment Programme (UNEP) guidelines have been distributed.

The CoP's subsidiary body on scientific, technical and technological advice (SBSTTA) is the think-tank for the CBD. It needs to work fast, but the key question is whether it will really be scientific and technical. The Mexico meeting of experts last February was too political. SBSTTA must be allowed to identify the scientific backdrop to reporting and priority-setting.

This clearing house for scientific and technical cooperation will pump life-blood into the convention. The Nassau decision to put off for a year rather than spend millions on computers for the secretariat was prudent. Key questions include how to structure the clearing house, and how to introduce the

north's information and technical resources.

The CBD is a comprehensive instrument covering all species and ecosystems. The work plan may have deferred on forests to the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), but gave welcome emphasis to marine and coastal work.

The CoP meets again in just 12 months. We must use that time to support and steer the process cooperatively, not blow it off course or down narrow channels.

Mark Collins
World Conservation
Monitoring Centre
Cambridge

* * *
As the leader of the British delegation to the meeting, I would like to set the record straight on several issues. First, the decisions which the parties are criticised for putting off are ones which they never intended to take at Nassau, namely the location of the secretariat and the need for and modalities of a biosafety protocol.

Secondly, Pearce failed to mention any of the important decisions that were taken, such as those on the spending guidelines to the Global Environment Facility, the agreement of the medium-term work programme for the convention and the designation of UNEP as host of the secretariat.

Thirdly, while it is true that decisions on how to tackle forests will be taken in the light of next year's CSD meeting, it is certainly not true that the CSD process is being coordinated by Canada and Malaysia. There is only one of several initiatives feeding into the CSD and working towards building a consensus on forestry, including one of our own in partnership with India.

Finally, while few countries, apart from Britain, have produced formal national plans, many countries are in the process of doing so.

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is a long-term process which does not start with the convention. Nor can the convention be expected to halt the decline of species in its

tracks. But the fact that 104 countries have ratified a convention which has come into force remarkably quickly by the standard of major international treaties is one which should give us hope in the fight to reverse the trend of species loss.

Peter Unwin
Department of the Environment
London

Future leaks

John McCrone discusses the experiments on possible human influence on random systems performed by Robert Jahn at Princeton University ("Psychic powers: what are the odds?", 26 November, and Letters, 7 January). While it is instructive to examine one laboratory's claim in isolation, evidence for the existence of a valid anomaly cannot rest on a single group's effort.

In the case of a putative interaction between the cognitive intent of an individual and a hardware random-number generator, there is a substantial database of laboratories that have collectively conducted over 600 replications of the basic experiment. D. I. Radin and R. D. Nelson conducted a careful meta-analysis of this database and concluded that there is *prima facie* evidence for an anomaly that cannot be accounted for by selective reporting, methodological flaws or selected subjects (*Foundations of Physics*, Vol 19 No 12, 1989).

In McCrone's article, he remarks on the possibility of data selection. We, too, have noticed that the sum of data for high, low and no aims yields a mean chance expectation distribution. An additional clue to what may be happening is that Jahn's Z score statistic does not increase with the number of bits sampled in each trial. If the effects were due to a shift in the probability of each bit away from 0.5, the Z score on each trial should increase as the square root of the number of bits sampled.

Assuming that Radin and Nelson's meta-analysis is correct, we provide a different explanation for Jahn's and

other results. We propose that subjects are statistical opportunists and initiate a trial to capture a locally deviant sub-sequence from an otherwise unperturbed physical system. This model explains why the high, low and control samples add to mean chance expectation, since they comprise sub-samples of an unbiased distribution. Furthermore, with a given ability to select sub-sequences meeting the trial aim, the Z scores of the samples will be independent of the number of bits sampled: just what the data show.

How are subjects able to "select" when to initiate a trial? We suspect that there may be a statistical "leakage" of information about the upcoming sequence from the future. This information allows the subjects slightly, but systematically, to bias their decisions (for example, when to initiate trials) to more favourable outcomes.

C. Honerton and D. C. Ferrari analysed all the so-called precognition experiments from 1935 to 1987. Their analysis included 309 separate studies reported by 62 investigators. Approximately two million individual trials were contributed by more than 50 000 subjects. After a careful flaw analysis and a correction for selective reporting, they found a statistically robust but tiny effect (*Journal of Parapsychology*, Vol 53, 1989). We find this database as compelling as any we have seen in the social sciences.

With strong independent evidence for the kind of information leakage needed to explain Jahn and others' data in terms of anomalous selection, we view all these experiments into anomalies as pointing to a single underlying mechanism of information transfer.

McCrone is concerned about the fact that most of the "successful" data appear to be contributed by a single subject, operator 10. If one is trying to understand the mechanism of a phenomenon, as opposed to studying its distribution in the population, then one should study talented individuals. If one wanted to study violin

playing and sampled Jascha Heifetz. The writers of this letter, summing the results one would conclude that violin playing was impossible.

James Spottiswoode and Edwin May
The Cognitive Sciences Laboratory
Palo Alto, California

Watered down

No doubt Caroline Pond is correct (Review, 26 November) when she writes "many reputable scientists remain unconvinced" by the aquatic ape theory (AAT); but can someone cite for me a summary of her "large body of evidence that refutes it"?

The AAT arises from (is consistent with) a large suite of facts about human anatomy, physiology, and molecular biology. Each attack upon AAT that I know proceeds along a narrow front, offering an alternative explanation for just one fact of the suite and, often, ignoring any fact embarrassing to AAT's older rival, the savanna theory (ST).

This is true of each major contribution, including that by Pond herself, in the only organised exchange for and against AAT: *The Aquatic Ape: Fact or Fiction?* (Roede et al, eds., Souvenir Press, 1991). Pond deals with the "subcutaneous" fat deposits that extend across much of the human body. She shows how these deposits correspond with smaller deposits of fat in other primates.

She offers nothing, however, to explain the "baby fat" that holds the skin of a newborn human infant taut, like a marine mammal's and in contrast with the slack skin of an ape neonate. A human baby floats easily, contentedly, right side up. Its fat layer has developed during its last few weeks in the womb. It's as if the chimpanzee's 8-month pregnancy has been extended by a month to allow time for baby fat to accumulate.

The extra month places a heavy burden upon the human mother. In comparison with the chimp female, she must be equipped to furnish her fetus with something like 50 per cent greater flow of calorific

energy. It does not explain how this extra burden on the mother, or how our species's subcutaneous fat, could be advantageous on Africa's savanna.

Opponents of AAT have not assembled a consistent body of anatomical and physiological facts in support of the ST, which arose from, and appears still to rest upon, just one geographical circumstance: the large number of hominid fossils from East Africa's Rift Valley. The discovery of *A. ramidus*, lying in an ancient tropical forest, is a big embarrassment for ST and a small one for AAT: although *A. ramidus*, unlike other hominid fossils older than two million years, seems not to have been found near an ancient lake or river, even so, its discovery brings hominid fossils closer to where our story began, at the intersection of the Rift Valley and the Red Sea.

Arthur Squires
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, US

All for me

As a parent and grandparent I can assure James Ward (Letters, 24-31 December) that the "anthropic principle" has nothing to do with physics and everything to do with psychology—the desire of every child to think of itself as at the centre of the Universe.

Its theme is the Me! Me! Me! principle. God (or "something") made the Big Bang the way it was simply in order that I, wonder of wonders, could eventually come into existence. On philosophical, let alone scientific, grounds this supreme arrogance is not the behaviour of grown-up people.

Thirty-six per cent of the British population have learnt to live without religion and that proportion is increasing. This change to a non-mystic and more scientific outlook does not support Ward's contention that we need quasi-religious, anthropic beliefs to prevent "a caste system of scientists and lay people, with no possibility of communication between them". Prepare to duck as more and more of the public caste their Pampers to the wind.

Peter Rowland
Dulwich, London

John Galbraith's new screw with triangular hole may well be too late (Technology, 3 December and Letters, 24/31 December). In Canada there is already in hardware shops a screw with a square hole



which must share many of the advantages, and screwdrivers with a tapering square end to fit it are available.

I can confirm that the tapering fit does provide a very secure grip, and of course there is no danger of slipping out of the slot, as one does with conventionally slotted heads, or raising a sharp splinter of metal to injure the next handler.

There does seem to be a communication gap across the Atlantic: another excellent North American idea virtually unobtainable in Britain is the spirally fluted ordinary nail (I know the hardened version can be bought here) which gives, at a guess, ten times the grip of an English wire nail. I always restock when I visit Canada.

D. Bard
London

Monopolised

I refer to Andrei Linde's idea that our Universe exists inside a single magnetic monopole produced in the first split-second of creation (*New Scientist*, Science, 12 November and Letters, 17 December).

The answer is a resounding "no". Linde may be one of the founding fathers of the inflation model of cosmology, but he is, like most theorists, out there in left field, ignoring the experimental evidence for magnetic monopoles. Moreover, these inflation models are based on SU(5), which incorrectly predicts the monopole catalysis of proton decay.

PURCHASE AN ADVANCED COMMERCIAL CFD CODE FOR JUST £150 + VAT

PHOENICS is the most widely-used Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) software tool in the world, simulating fluid flow, heat transfer, combustion and chemical reaction in a wide range of environmental and industrial processes.

PHOENICS runs on most hardware platforms, from PCs to supercomputers.

The re-issue of PHOENICS Version 1.5 as 'Shareware' celebrates the release of PHOENICS Version 2.1 in the third quarter of 1994. It follows closely a similar re-issue, in November 1993, of PHOENICS Version 1.4, a package that has proved extremely popular.

PHOENICS 1.5 boasts many advantages over its predecessor 1.4 in every module of the code. With Menu Input Procedures, a User's own Library and a new Solver this Shareware product is certainly worth investigating.

**Enquire about
PHOENICS 1.5
TODAY**

40 High Street
Wimbledon Village
London
SW19 5AU
Tel: 081 947 7651
Fax: 081 879 3497

