

HANDBOOK OF INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY. Edited by K. Ramakrishna Rao, Anand C. Paranjpe, and Ajit K. Dalal. New Delhi, India: Cambridge University Press India Pvt. Ltd., Foundation Books, 2008. Pp. xix + 648. \$66.00 (hardbound). ISBN 978-81-7596-602-4.¹

This volume provides 31 chapters by scholars or experts from multiple disciplines, philosophical or religious orientations, and countries. It provides an invaluable resource for those interested in any or all aspects of the very broad topic of traditional Indian philosophical schools of thought that may be deemed to relate to the conceptual and/or applied interests of psychology. A huge strength of this volume is the presence of highly informative and, often, well-developed chapters that represent a variety of views about the underlying nature of reality—a fundamental concern in this volume (even if odd for a psychology text)—and their proposed ramifications for understanding the human mind and its function and for transforming that mind for the better.

The editors and chapter authors of this volume have endeavored to lay a groundwork for and to inspire the development of a psychology that, unconstrained by the metaphysical materialism they deem to guide Western psychology, would be ready to investigate and thereby to learn about and implement in application, concepts derived from ancient Indian scriptural sources and traditional Indian philosophies. They argue that such a psychology, unlike allegedly empiricist and materialistic Western psychology, can address issues of meaning, purpose, and value in life. They suppose that this new psychology should be able to help individuals realize their full potential and to lead genuinely moral and ethical lives, freed from the delusions, pain, fears, and frustrations of those lacking the self-knowledge advocated by Indian scriptures and spiritual teachers.

The development of research is a *sine qua non* for developing a psychology. It was not easy, based on reading this volume, to envision, in

¹ In the case of some of the Sanskrit terms used in this review, a typed character will lack the proper, traditional diacritical marking. These markings on a character signal a change in the pronunciation, imparting a different sound than the same character without such a marking. Due to a lack of suitable fonts on this reviewer's computer, a few of these diacritical markings had to be omitted (or in the case of the term "Vaiśeṣika," substituted) in this review. Most and possibly all of the lapses in diacritical marking in this review refer to the following terms (but there may be a very few other cases of which I have lost track): "Sāṃkhya," one of the six orthodox schools (or systems) of Indian philosophy, should be written with a dot (·) directly over the "m." The same diacritical marking also should go directly over the "m" in "samskāras," impressions upon the mind that are created by one's experiences and one's actions and that are deemed to influence one's future experiences and inclinations. The title of one of the six orthodox Indian philosophical schools, written herein as "Vaiśeṣika," instead should be written with a dot (·) directly under the "s" before "ika." I regret these errors of transcription and hope that any potential confusion related to them will be obviated by this explanatory note.

any clear way, the likely shape of the possible research programs in this new psychology, either in terms of the specific kinds of problems to be investigated or the methodologies that might be useful—except for general endorsement, under the banner of consciousness studies, of introspection without specific suggestions about how to obviate the problems related to that method or about how introspection actually would be used. The frequent derision, in this volume, of Western psychology as too centered on neuroscience and as being (allegedly) philosophically materialistic, made me wonder, reading some of the commentary, whether brain-function research might become a no-no, or something close to such, in this new science. That would be very unfortunate because viewing neuroscience as an enemy of “consciousness” research would seem something short of creative problem analysis. There is plenty of excitement here about the idea of a brave new science, but there are few indications about how it might proceed in order to add meaningfully to—or perhaps even to revolutionize—the scientific understanding of the mind, including of human personality. Had an author well informed about both contemporary cognitive science and traditional Indian philosophy been charged specifically with “seeding the mind” of the reader about potential research problems and investigational approaches for this new science, the result might have been an important contribution.

CHAPTER AUTHORS AND TOPICS

A full table of contents, with chapter titles, may be found at the following website: <http://www.cambridgeindia.org/ShowBookDetails4.asp?ISBN=9788175966024>. Actual titles of chapters are not provided below, but, instead, brief indications of the thesis or content of each, along with the chapter numbers and the authors' names.

Introductory chapters (2), which include (Ch. 1), a prologue by K. R. Rao that introduces Indian psychology, along with chapter sketches, and (Ch. 2), wherein S. K. K. Kumar provides a historical perspective on Indian thought and tradition related to psychological issues.

Part I—Systems and Schools

(Ch. 3) P. Jain on Jaina psychology; five chapters on Buddhist psychology, specifically, (Ch. 4) D. J. Kalupahana on early foundations; (Ch. 5) P. D. Premasiri on cognition in early Buddhism; (Ch. 6) W. Waldron on unconscious mind; (Ch. 7) J. Duerlinger on theories of “persons” or nonpersons, given the Buddhist-positing illusory character of self; (Ch. 8) W. L. Mikulas offers a western interpretation of Buddhist psychology; and seven chapters on Vedic (i.e., “Orthodox” or Hindu) traditions, specifically; (Ch. 9) S. Menon examines the *Bhagavad-Gītā* relative to consciousness, meditation, work, and divine love; (Ch. 10) K. R. Rao and A. C. Paranjpe

clearly and carefully explain yoga psychology, both theory and application; (Ch. 11) W. G. Braud describes the ramifications of Patañjali's *Yoga-Sūtras* for psi theory and research, noting potentially relevant parapsychological findings; (Ch. 12) E. Taylor and J. G. Sugg explain yoga psychology's reliance on the metaphysics of Sāṃkhya, a dualistic system positing both pure consciousness and inert matter; (Ch. 13) A. C. Paranjpe and K. R. Rao, describe psychology in the Advaita (i.e., monistic) Vedānta teachings; (Ch. 14) V. N. Jha explains the concepts of perception in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system; and (Ch. 15) M. Kapur describes psychological concepts and practices in Āyurvedic medicine, whose roots are in ancient Indian treatises.

Part II—Topics and Themes

(Ch. 16) S. R. Bhatt contrasts Buddhist views of perception with those of non-Buddhist Indian philosophies; (Ch. 17) A. S. Dash delineates Indian (Hindu) views on the origins of motivation, of voluntary and involuntary action, including the *Bhagavad-Gītā* on detachment from the fruits of action; (Ch. 18) A. K. Jha presents the views of the person ("personality") as seen in the six orthodox systems (schools) of Indian philosophy; (Ch. 19) L. Krishnan and V. R. Manoj describe diverse facets of "giving" (or prosocial behavior) from the perspective of an Indian view of values; (Ch. 20) C. P. Bhatta delineates Indian aestheticians' views on prerequisites of being a creative poet; (Ch. 21) D. P. S. Bhawuk presents a model with desire at the root of cognition, emotion, and behavior, based on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*; (Ch. 22) M. Cornelissen argues that an erroneous, inadequate (or dismissive) view of consciousness is a root cause of many ills of humanity and of an (allegedly) impotent psychology; and (Ch. 23) G. A. Mohan, discusses J. Krishnamurti, a spiritual—albeit declaredly nonreligious—teacher originally from India, and explains Krishnamurti's views about obtaining total freedom by escaping the conditioning of the mind.

Part III—Applications and Implications

(Ch. 24) M. Miovic ponders traditional psychotherapy vis-à-vis yogic ideas and practices, with commentary on their inter-relationships, including potential dangers of *sādhana* (i.e., yogic spiritual discipline), complementary roles for these two disciplines, and the need for therapist sensitivity to Indian cultural norms; (Ch. 25) D. P. S. Bhawuk, informed by cultural and cross-cultural research, appeals for Indian organizational psychology to stop courting Western ideas and methods and to investigate models developed from traditional cultural sources such as the *Bhagavad-Gītā* or Indian folk proverbs; (Ch. 26) L. S. S. Manickam describes major obstacles seen as impeding the development of an indigenous Indian

psychology, provides suggestions for remediation, and advocates retaining the original meanings of traditional constructs rather than distorting them as sometimes occurs in research and application; (Ch. 27) J. L. Kristeller and K. Rikhye review meditation research in contemporary psychology (largely non-Indian work), emphasizing “mindfulness” research (broadly defined) and the authors’ model of meditative effects, viewed from the perspective of meditational development within the individual and its clinical application; includes extensive research-related bibliography; (Ch. 28) H. Motoyama endeavors to explain, in extended, detailed discourse, the evolution of the Buddha’s consciousness until *satori* was attained; (Ch. 29) E. Taylor discusses William James’ remarks on “pure consciousness” and Samādhi (and mystical states more generally), considering how they might relate both to the philosophically divergent Advaita-Vedānta (monist) and Sāmkhya (dualistic) schools of thought and to James’ philosophical ideas and development; (Ch. 30) A. C. Paranjpe provides a concise, but well-developed and clearly stated, description of the unusual course of spiritual development and the clear, nonabstract spiritual teachings of Sri Ramana Maharshi, a well-known spiritual teacher whose instructions for achieving self-knowledge differed from the traditional ones in Advaita-Vedānta, despite his identification with that tradition; and (Ch. 31) Charles Tart explains in detail his proposal for state-specific sciences and discusses problems that can arise in developing and implementing it; he concludes with strong cautions about how respondents’ personal predilections and biases can muddle research and threaten the validity of its conclusions. The volume includes a guide to pronunciation and transliteration of the Sanskrit alphabet and a high-quality, extremely useful, glossary of non-English terms with page references (credits for this work appearing in the Preface).

HOW WELL DOES THIS VOLUME INFORM REGARDING TRADITIONAL INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY?

This volume merits very high marks on its breadth and variety of coverage of traditional Indian schools of thought and selected scriptural sources, and the level of scholarship contributed by its authors. Understanding such exposition was not always easy, though, for some of the topics expounded were at once highly complex and abstract, requiring steady, determined persistence to pull oneself through some dense material, the more so in the chapters where there was evident a need for copy editing to remediate problems of expression (possibly related to language), punctuation, grammar, and spelling. The difficulty of reading and understanding created by the number, complexity, and/or abstractness of the concepts presented was exacerbated at times by troubling amounts of needless repetition, both within some chapters and between them. There are several chapters that score highly both on the quality of writing and on freedom from bothersome repetition.

Be advised that much—possibly a substantial majority—of the material in this volume can most properly be considered philosophy rather than psychology, even if it be considered “philosophy of mind.” Discussion of that kind may have little a priori interest for some psychologists, but reading at least the foundational chapters of this kind would seem very important for those planning research on traditional Indian psychological topics or who would wish to provide psychological services for clients identified with any of these belief systems.

The divergence and number of traditional philosophical perspectives reviewed in these chapters make this a well-balanced and generous volume. In “Yoga Psychology and the Sāmkhya Metaphysic” (Ch. 12) Eugene Taylor and Judith G. Sugg endeavor to redress a perceived historical imbalance of information about yogic philosophy by noting that although most of the information in the West on yoga seems to reflect monistic Vedāntic philosophy (i.e., the Advaita form), Patañjali actually conceptualized yoga, in his foundational treatise, in terms of the Sāmkhya system, a dualistic school. In several other chapters the reader will be apprised of the deep and fundamental philosophical differences between Buddhism, with its pragmatism that eschews metaphysical speculation, and the Hindu orthodox systems, which rely on it, even while across those orthodox systems there are some fundamental differences of metaphysics.

Because of the presence of widely differing philosophical viewpoints in this volume, some readers might have wished for, at its end, a summative, integrative chapter, perhaps by K. R. Rao (senior editor), to pull things together with something of an overarching perspective, possibly one exemplifying Eastern dialectical thinking, rather than Western thinking, which tends to ask, “Which view is right?”

HOW WELL DOES THIS VOLUME INFORM AND FOSTER RESEARCH?

In terms of providing useful resources on relevant scientific research, this volume, viewed in cross-chapters perspective, is a bit of a mixed bag. There are several chapters with from good to excellent access to relevant, suitably contemporary, material in refereed journals or scholarly scientific books, but in other chapters, authors’ psychology-related references are largely or entirely substantially dated works, and there is, in some chapters, citation of a number of popular sources. Some authors seem to think of the writings of Freud or subsequent psychodynamic writings as the core of psychology.

There are many appeals for research related to traditional Indian (or “indigenous”) psychology, for research that breaks away from the much-deprecated (alleged) effort by many Indian psychologists to think and work in the mold of Western psychology. There are complaints that some Indian psychologists use methodology and assumptions inappropriate to the Indian ethos. There also are protests against Western psychology in general, and, in particular, against its alleged metaphysical materialism and

prohibition of introspective data. These circumstances are deemed to have retarded the development of an "indigenous" Indian psychology, which, it is said, must investigate "consciousness."

But how does one find problems that deserve investigation by a renovated Indian psychology, specifically, problems that will advance our understanding of human personality and of our world (i.e., basic research)? That kind of research is needed for the conceptually expansive Indian psychology that is being sought. Finding ideas for strictly applied research—research without the goal of understanding—may seem considerably easier because so much of traditional Indian psychology is technique oriented, regardless of the school of thought. But after finding that a technique is useful or not, it might be even more useful to know why that is the case. Finding problems for basic research relative to Indian traditions is not easy because effective basic (i.e., process-investigating) research is built upon empirical observations and, usually, upon empirically-grounded models and theories, not upon the essentially metaphysical suppositions of traditional sources, suppositions that were not intended by their contributors to guide empirical research. It may be easier, though, to identify problems related to the epistemology of traditional Indian psychology, because there is much prior research on anomalous cognition (e.g., ESP) and many leads to follow (see W. G. Braud's chapter).

A potential research topic, not discussed in this volume, concerns investigating who best succeeds with which kind(s) of spiritual discipline or meditation. Various eminent Indian spiritual teachers (in the Vedic tradition) have acknowledged that many paths lead to the same goal (i.e., to spiritual realization) and recognized that "no shoe fits all feet" (my wording). This refers to what contemporary personality psychologists call person x situation interaction. The success of a given form of spiritual discipline could depend, in part, on the type of person trying to use it. Investigation of this problem might (a) substantially benefit application interests and (b) meaningfully advance understanding. Identifying the kind(s) of persons who succeed best with a given approach (and who do poorly) might provide important clues as to why (or in what manner) a certain technique gains its success. This would combine both experimentation and the study of personality. The investigator might first develop a hypothesis about how a particular discipline creates its known effects, and deduce, from that hypothesis, using information from personality studies, which kind(s) of persons, with which attributes, might most readily profit from it.

It seems unfortunate that this volume lacked one or more extended, well-developed chapter(s) focused specifically on and illustrating how basic-research problems with Indian-psychology relevance might be identified and actively pursued through the process of careful, methodologically suitable, culturally-appropriate research. To "seed the mind's soil," such a chapter might describe some highly Indian-tradition-relevant research problems and discuss how they might be addressed by research. For example, a

research problem could be discerning the basis (bases) of a widespread folk belief that spiritual teachers sometimes take on themselves the “bad karma” or suffering of a disciple, thereby reducing his or her suffering. Two logically-not-incompatible hypotheses might then be investigated: (a) that the folk belief is correct and (b) that these folk beliefs serve to obviate the *angst* created by believing that the spiritual teacher is suffering self-generated “bad karma.” Hypothesis-appropriate research methods then would be developed. The much-needed chapter in support of basic research could benefit by discussing in some detail one or a few problem-specific research agendas, going all the way from finding a suitable problem to generating explanatory hypotheses, and, thence, to the development and/or deployment of methods suitable for addressing those problems.

In only a few chapters is there substantial or detailed discussion of empirical research. The empirical research most discussed is meditation work, which is common nowadays, even in the West, where “mindfulness training” is in vogue.

The final part (pp. 207–214) of “Yoga Psychology: Theory and Application” (Ch. 10) by K. Ramakrishna Rao and Anand C. Paranjpe discusses meditation research, including some potential pitfalls in doing or interpreting it. There also is speculation about free will and that meditation might enhance it, as potentially evidenced by psi interactions.

William L. Mikulas in (Ch. 8), “Buddhist Psychology: A Western Interpretation,” thoughtfully considers important conceptual ambiguities in some reasonably contemporary mindfulness-meditation research. His highly recommended discussion of this is very germane to planning meditation research (see, e.g., his section, “Confusion and Confounding,” pp. 148–149). The discussion could have been even more useful had Mikulas suggested specific strategies for remediating these ambiguities.

Jean L. Kristeller and Kobita Rikhye in “Meditative Traditions and Contemporary Psychology” (Ch. 27) contribute a lengthy, at times repetitive, but highly useful chapter that addresses historical and conceptual issues and summarizes major meditation-research findings, organized according to particular effect-type domains. It also provides an extensive bibliography of meditation research, especially mindfulness work. I do not see this chapter as providing highly specific pointers to potentially productive problems in meditation research. Readers contemplating research in the area or wishing to be able to evaluate it might have profited by some in-depth discussion of major methodological issues, along with examples of methodological difficulties in published work and with suggestions for their remediation. As a supplement to Kristeller and Rikhye’s discussion, readers may wish to consult the journal *Emotion*, Volume 10, Number 1, February 2010, for its special 91-page section entitled “Mindfulness Training and Emotion Regulation: Clinical and Neuroscience Perspectives,” published by the American Psychological Association and with Special Section Editors Adam K. Anderson, Amishi Jha, and Zindel V. Segal.

An example of developing focused, meaningful, research related to cultural factors affecting behavior in Indian organizations may be found in Dharm P. S. Bhawuk's "Toward an Indian Organizational Psychology" (Ch. 25). His proposal builds on prior cross-cultural research, and conceptual rationales are provided for predicted outcomes.

L. S. S. Manickam's very thoughtful chapter, "Research on Indian Concepts of Psychology: Major Challenges and Perspectives for Future Action," was not intended to focus on the finding of research problems for the new Indian psychology.

Charles Tart's chapter ("Altered States of Consciousness and the Spiritual Traditions: The Proposal for the Creation of State-Specific Sciences") describes and explains his innovative and controversial proposal for studying states of consciousness. Tart is to be commended for his dedication and care in explaining this concept and for his intellectual honesty in recognizing and his candor in describing in this chapter some difficulties that can confront this proposal's actualization as a research tool.

His chapter's final section, "Challenge to a Future Indian Psychology" (pp. 604–606), constitutes a strongly worded, cautionary, mini-essay very relevant to some of the research interests of this volume. It begins with a warning that investigators could be very misled if they assume that observed agreement of reports, across members of a community of belief, about the reality they experienced during an altered state (developed for the purpose of accessing that reality), is valid evidence of their having been in contact with such a reality during that state. This is because these aspirants' meditative experiences, as well as their subsequent recall and reporting of them, may well have been biased by their previous cultural learning, by expectations induced through training, and by social inhibitions against discordant thinking and reporting. Tart emphasizes that these circumstances might strongly bias, even quite unconsciously, one's judgment, evaluation, and attention during meditation, making things seem different than they actually were.

Tart's cautionary note next becomes more generalized. Although he notes some very practical advantages of working in India in pursuit of a fuller understanding of human nature and reality, he voices a strong, general caution: "On the other hand, millennia old traditions, especially as they become implicit assumptions and biases, can severely limit observation, thinking, motivation and action, so they are a major disadvantage" (p. 605).

What may follow from Tart's admonition is that, despite our best efforts, culture and even local-group considerations likely will in some degree shape what we find through our empirical research. Therefore, getting a bigger picture, a perhaps deeper envisioning of reality (and of how to approach it), may require looking more broadly than in just India, the East, the West, or through the window of any single region, religion, or cultural milieu. By casting widely our investigational net through eclectic research,

we eventually may discern, more completely and more validly, both reality and the route to helpful applications. More need be said, though, about the possible consequences of cultural filtering. They may not all be bad. The unique filtering of reality by individual cultures sometimes may highlight information of unique and special value about the potentialities inherent in reality (and about special application-related possibilities). Because each cultural filter shuts out certain things but admits others, it potentially may cast into clearer perspective, unique and valuable information that gets through it. It may make it more salient, more noticeable. The problem arises if we imagine that the special vision of a given culture is all the truth or the only truth. I suspect that the unique spiritual genius of the famous Indian mystic, saint, and spiritual teacher Sri Ramakrishna, derived from his having set out in his personal life to experience non-Hindu religions (i.e., Islam and Christianity), as well as a series of different perspectives from his native Hinduism. I suspect that similar reasoning was behind the genius of the present volume's very eclectic selection of chapters but suggest that a full flowering of the perspectives-expanding psychology it envisions ultimately may be enriched by and even require a still more culturally inclusive perspective than is afforded in this volume.

Parapsychological investigation may play a major role in how the envisioned new science enriches and deepens our understanding of ourselves and of the world. William G. Braud's superb chapter, "Patañjali Yoga and *Siddhis*: Their Relevance to Parapsychological Theory and Research," is wonderfully informative and thoughtful. It adds substantially to this volume's foundational value for anyone interested in psi phenomena as they relate to traditional yogic thinking. This tour de force: (a) summarizes succinctly the philosophical underpinnings of Patañjali's *Yoga-Sūtras*, (b) explains Patañjali's views of the meditational processes and cognitive factors underlying the supposed psi or other remarkable events (called *siddhis* or "attainments") deemed possible through yogic discipline, (c) provides a remarkably broad and useful thumbnail sketch of contemporary parapsychology (with important references), (d) characterizes selected parapsychological theories (or models) and related research findings with potential relevance to Patañjali's discussion of *siddhis*, (e) discusses alternate interpretations of Patañjali's discourse on *siddhis*, and (f) philosophizes about the broader personal implications of such matters. For parapsychologists this chapter may be among the most important in this volume, and it is specific enough, including references to primary sources on research and theory, that it may motivate and help inspire some psi (and other) research related to yogic discipline.

To my surprise, I noticed in that chapter an error regarding my own work, "Reviews and meta-analysis of research findings indicated that hypnosis was conducive to receptive psi functioning (see Braud, 2002; Honorton, 1977; Schechter, 1984; Stanford and Stein, 1993)" (p. 230). That is incorrect, relative to the Stanford and Stein meta-analytic work. We

indicated that, due to several complicating factors revealed by our meta-analysis, no substantive conclusion justifiably could be made about the possible role of hypnosis in facilitating ESP-task performance (Stanford & Stein, 1994; Braud cited a convention proceedings, but our conclusions there were no different than in the cited journal paper).

At least 13 chapters in this volume mention either psi cognition or action (e.g., PK) or use equivalent words. Such events receive mention in the context of their potential emergence—desired or not—at some stage of spiritual practice that includes meditation. Whether the philosophical context of the chapter was Buddhist or Hindu, the discussion acknowledged that extraordinary, nonsensory cognition (or even paranormal action) was likely to emerge as meditation develops. There was mentioned the risk of such events detracting the aspirant from spiritual objectives or even contributing to egoism, which is deemed adverse to spiritual development. These cautions were attributed to Indian spiritual teacher(s) or to published, traditional spiritual resources. The emergence of such events in the course of meditation seemed everywhere regarded merely as a signpost along the road of meditative development, not as a legitimate goal of the spiritual aspirant.

There is, in this volume, a surprising gap in coverage of extant scientific research relevant to psychological ramifications of Indian spiritual traditions. There is neither actual description of nor detailed discussion concerning the extensive reincarnation-hypothesis research conducted by the late Ian Stevenson, an eminent USA psychiatrist. Stevenson, along with colleagues, often from India, investigated, in India and in other countries, ostensible memories of past lifetimes and other putative influences, upon body and/or behavior, sometimes presumed to derive from prior lifetimes (see Tucker, 2008, for a sketch of the major foci of such work by Stevenson and for a bibliography of it). Rao, Braud, and Miovic are to be commended for having mentioned and cited some of this work in their respective chapters. However, this work merited detailed review in a separate chapter because, if rebirth actually occurs—still a big “if,” in my view, despite the research—its ramifications could be great for understanding human personality, as is suggested in ancient Indian spiritual treatises.

Aside from putative past-life memories, the pages of this volume contain many references to hypothetical other influences, on the individual, of past lifetimes, via *samskāras* (“impressions”) claimed to carry over from the past and subtly, generally quite unconsciously, but sometimes powerfully, influencing thought, feelings, behavioral dispositions, and even gross biological manifestations. *Samskāras* are among the kinds of supposed mental conditioning from which the Indian spiritual practices are said to liberate aspirants. So what better ground could there be upon which to begin building a viable new psychology informed by traditional Indian psychology? That a non-Indian living in the USA should have taken the lead in this domain makes Stevenson’s work no less an outstanding

contribution to the scientific study of claims centrally relevant to Indian indigenous philosophy.

Extended discussion of Stevenson's findings, methods, and responsible, cautious approach to investigation, along with his admirably tentative suggestions about the most reasonable interpretations in the best cases, could have supplied important guidance to future researchers in an area loaded with potential pitfalls. If the reviewer had criticisms and suggestions for improvement of such work, that would have been good, too. Stevenson's work is replete with empirical findings that could suggest hypotheses, relevant to Indian philosophical traditions, that are worthy of continued investigation.

In conclusion, I regard this volume as an invaluable resource and well worth the considerable effort needed to read its diverse and complex chapters that include many new terms from other languages that may represent entirely new constructs. The thought of psychologists potentially learning and benefiting from these ideas so novel to most of them—from the West and possibly even from India—is an exciting one, especially if that reading should inspire some thoughtful research or research-guided applications along these at once ancient and new frontiers.

REFERENCES

- STANFORD, R. G., & STEIN, A. G. (1994). A meta-analysis of ESP studies contrasting hypnosis and a comparison condition. *Journal of Parapsychology*, *58*, 235–269.
- TUCKER, J. B. (2008). Ian Stevenson and cases of the reincarnation type. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, *22*, 36–43.

REX G. STANFORD

900 E. Vermont Ave., Apt. 13202
McAllen, TX 78503-1711
calidris@mindspring.com