

Editorial

An Editorial Reflection on Women in Parapsychology from the Perspectives of St. Louis, Montreal, and Dublin, and the Pages of this Journal

NANCY L. ZINGRONE¹

In the fall of 2021, I heard from Cedar S. Leverett about a project that she and Gerhard Mayer, the editor of this journal, were embarking upon. Cedar and I had corresponded about the place of women in the parapsychological community and why there were more men researching, speaking, and serving in the higher positions of the field than women. I knew her from the Parapsychology Research and Education courses (otherwise known as the ParaMOOC) that my late husband, Carlos S. Alvarado (1955–2021) and I had been teaching for some years, with the support of Lisette Coly of the Parapsychology Foundation, and such colleagues as Natasha Chisdes and Bryan Williams.

Cedar attended some of our sessions over the years, and Gerhard had kindly given talks and interacted with the students as well. It was only a few months after Carlos had passed away when Cedar reached out. When she did so, I was still reeling from the loss and looking for a way to reawaken my interest in the field as well as preparing to re-educate myself so that I could carry forward some of Carlos's undone projects.

The Parapsychology Foundation (PF) had been at the core of my interest in the field, first as a place where I spent my extra money on proceedings and monographs while in college. It was the place that inspired me to take a master's degree, and the people who ran the PF both inspired and terrified me. The latter arose from the fact that Eileen Coly (1916–2013) and

¹ **Nancy L. Zingrone** is a research psychologist, director of The Alvarado Zingrone (virtual) Institute of Research and Education, and a remote part-time professor of psychology at the John F. Kennedy School of Psychology and Social Sciences, at National University (California). She is the author/co-author of 30 peer-reviewed articles, a two-time Past-President of the Parapsychological Association, and a Research Fellow of the Parapsychology Foundation. E-mail: nancy@theazire.org

Lisette Coly seemed to think my career was worth watching. They felt that way about Carlos too, of course. But me? Well, I tried to be worthy of their attention.

Carlos and I spent one of our first PF conferences together in New Orleans soon after we met. He had been asked to deliver a talk on out-of-body (OBE) research (Alvarado, 1985) and I asked to be an observer. Six years later, the year after we were married, we were headed to Dublin for the *Women and Parapsychology* conference so that I could give a talk (Zingrone, 1994a) and he was invited to be an observer.

Needless to say, I was eager to work with Gerhard and Cedar on this project.

In thinking about how to introduce the content of this special issue, I wanted to include three events: one that I did not attend, but was, in hindsight, emblematic of the continuing effort to make visible the work of women in parapsychology; one organized by Carlos that explored both the work of women in the field but also the impact of gendered discourse on theory, research, and working lives; and, of course, the third being the 1991 conference in Dublin itself.

St. Louis, 1978

The 1978 Parapsychological Association roundtable on the history of women in parapsychology was presented at Washington University in Saint Louis, Missouri to counteract the boycott by many female members, including myself, of that year's association meeting. Missouri was and still is one of the thirteen US-based states who have refused to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution that passed the US Congress in 1972. The three presenters felt that it was a better strategy to represent some of the most important women in the fields of psychical research and parapsychology, rather than allowing the formal presentations to take place without a substantive protest against Missouri's lack of support for equal rights for women. At the time, I disagreed.

Since researching a presentation (Zingrone, 2022) on the women of Society for Psychical Research recently, I think this strategy was well within the style of each of the women mentioned in the 1978 roundtable, that is, to provide evidence as to the importance of women and their contributions to our field. It succinctly answered that question, "What would Eleanor Sidgwick do?"

Sidgwick's answer was clear, whether to skepticism about SPR research into seemingly psychic phenomena, or in response to the 19th century notion that "academic education exhausted women and made them unfit for motherhood" (Sommer, 2013: 74). She was known to meet these challenges by systematically doing a study, gathering data and analyzing it at a high level of mathematical competency, and quietly but firmly presenting the results. No fuss, no muss, just science.

In the St. Louis symposium in 1978, three presentations were given. Janet L. Mitchell provided the first biographical sketch in the roundtable, that of the afore-mentioned Eleanor Sidgwick (1845–1936). While the complete text of Mitchell's contribution was not preserved, her abstract in *Research in Parapsychology 1978* (Roll, 1979) introduced Sidgwick's work for the Society for Psychical Research that spanned 48 years, from 1884 to 1932. Mitchell mentioned Sidgwick's contributions to two of the most important projects of the early SPR, *Phantasms of the Living* (1886), and the "Census of Hallucinations" (1894). Sidgwick had two terms as President (1908–1909) of the SPR, and as a "joint president of honor" with Oliver Lodge (1932), as well as holding important positions at Newnham College at Cambridge University. Her approach to the investigation of physical and mental mediums, the survival hypothesis, and her commentary on the cross-correspondences as evidence were also mentioned.

Athena Drewes presented a biographical sketch of Louisa E. Rhine (1891–1983), who would become the widow of J. B. Rhine two years later. At the time of the roundtable, Louisa Rhine had recently left the position of research director of the Institute of Parapsychology at the Foundation for Research on the Nature of Man (now the Rhine Research Center), was a co-editor of the *Journal of Parapsychology*, and author of then-four substantive books on the subject (1961, 1967, 1970, 1975), the latter written for the adolescent reader. Her work in early PK investigations when she and her husband were at the Duke Parapsychology Laboratory, her important spontaneous case collection amassed over several decades, as well as her published papers based on her analysis of the case collection were also mentioned.

Finally, in the third presentation, Sally Drucker talked about Eileen J. Garrett (1893–1970) who founded the Parapsychology Foundation in New York in 1951. Some of Mrs. Garrett's childhood memories of her personal psychic experiences were discussed, and her training in London at the College of Psychic Science was also mentioned. Drucker described Garrett's skeptical attitude towards her experiences and her mediumship. This ability to question herself led Garrett to an intellectually deep interest in scientific parapsychology, and was probably the impetus for her habit of providing herself as a laboratory participant to the prominent investigators of the day. Garrett's publications (e.g., 1939, 1941, 1949, 1950, 1957, 1968), the 1953 Utrecht conference and the thematic PF conferences that followed Utrecht were also mentioned.

Montreal, 1988

In 1988, the Parapsychological Association met in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Carlos was aware of the work that his colleague, David J. Hess, was doing, and invited him to join us in the symposium Carlos was organizing for the Montreal convention. Hess obtained his master's degree in parapsychology at John F. Kennedy University in the late 1970s/early 1980s as had Carlos.

Hess's approach extended the scope of the symposium from the history and publication rates of women in psychical research and parapsychology to a more conceptual level (e. g., Alvarado, 1989; Zingrone, 1988). At the time Hess had just completed a PhD from Cornell University in anthropology for which he had done field work on spiritism and science in Brazil. Carlos and I were graduate students in the history department of Duke University hoping to obtain doctoral degrees in the history of science with an emphasis on psychology, psychiatry, and psychical research. Carlos's interest in women in psychical research and scientific parapsychology was a traditional concern of his, and I had been recently inspired by publications that illustrated the differing careers of women and men in psychology. The panel was titled "Gender Issues in Parapsychology" and was chaired by Rosemarie Pilkington.

Carlos's contribution, "The History of Women in Parapsychology: A Critique of Past Work and Suggestions for Further Research" was the first presentation in the symposium. Later published in the *Journal of Parapsychology* (Alvarado, 1989), his paper brought in the history of women in general, and the importance of "fundamental contributions to the historical record made by those persons or groups who have hitherto remained voiceless" (p. 234). Carlos not only illuminated the work of such Anglo-American researchers as Eleanor Sidgwick and Alice Johnson (e. g., Sidgwick & Johnson, 1892), and Dorothy R. Martin and Frances P. Stribic (e. g., 1938a, 1938b), but also women from Europe (e. g., Wassilko-Serecki, 1926), those who espoused a skeptical view (Tanner, 1910), and those who provided critical support services for men who were researchers (e. g., Tubby, 1956). Carlos also criticized encyclopedias (Fodor, 1933), histories of the field (Castellan, 1955), and academic treatments of the history of psychical research and parapsychology (Cerullo, 1982) for leaving the women out. His main point was that the state of affairs did not indicate a conspiracy to hide the accomplishments of women in science but rather "proceeded on the common assumption that outlining the work of prominent men in a field is sufficient to explore the history of a discipline" (p. 235). For the rest of his presentation, Carlos endeavored to make plain the consistent and important work of women in the field over its history and argued that those who write the history of psychical research and parapsychology should embrace the notion that our endeavors are "an aggregate of the experiences and efforts of the entire research community as it is constituted at any given time" (p. 236). The recommendations he included to expand and deepen the history of our field are still needed now (p. 240).

My paper for the symposium was inspired by a variety of conversations with Debra Weiner, Dorothy Pope (1905–2003) and other women in the field in the 1980s, as well as a course in quantitative history at Duke University. Carlos and I had started to follow and occasionally attend the conferences of Cheiron, an international society focused on the history of psychology as well. A great deal of work was being done at the time on the differential between women and men as professionals in psychology (e. g., Boice et al., 1985; Guyer & Fidell, 1973; Over, 1981, 1982). With Carlos as my research assistant in data processing (one of the benefits of a

marital collaboration), I gathered data on publication rates, and authorship patterns for men and women publishing in two periods, forty years apart: 1937 to 1946, and 1977 to 1986. The earlier range covered the first decade of publication of the *Journal of Parapsychology*, and the later range covered what was then the most recent decade of the *JP*. As a comparison, data was also taken from the *Journal of the American Society for Psychological Research*. The overall habits (number of articles published in the target decade for both journals, average page length, and so on) were also included in the analysis. I provided a background on the topic from the wider literature of the history of science, women in science, and women in psychology, with a justification of using the term “gender” as it was used then in social sciences and humanities to denote the social role of “female” as opposed to using the term “sex differences” as was common in the era in psychology. Among the findings were that “18 to 24% of all publishing parapsychologists” (p. 340) were women. It was also apparent to me that “The overall disparities in percentages between males and females in both periods and for both journals” were “due to gender differences in scientific recruitment, training, orientation to work, job descriptions within laboratories, and opportunity to publish, as well as differing laboratory policies towards publishing” (ibid.). Not only were these findings in accord with research on the topic in other disciplines, but current research in various disciplines are still showing differentials in these areas, albeit with a higher percentage of the active scientists and academics presenting as female and more evidence for positive movement in gender parity in publishing, while finding gender differences in the choice of methodologies (e. g., Odic & Wojcik, 2020; Ross et al., 2022; Williams et al., 2017).

David Hess’s presentation, “Gender, Hierarchy, and the Psychic: An Interpretation of the Culture of Parapsychology,” was proof positive of a powerful interdisciplinary glance that interpreted terms and text in parapsychological research as a deeply held metaphor for the divergence of the feminine from the masculine. Hess argued that the language used in L. E. Rhine’s (1967) book, *ESP in Life and Lab* could be mapped on Freud’s understanding (e. g., Keller, 1985; Kofman, 1985) of the nature of woman as “disordered,” “secret,” and “elusive” when the subject is psychic phenomena in “life” (Hess, 1989: 105). In the “lab,” on the other hand, the Freudian map of the nature of man prevailed with the phenomena being discussed as “orderly,” and “law-abiding” (p. 104). Hess’s analysis was not only nuanced, but grounded in a variety of disciplines, with explanatory power and recommendations for future research that is in line with today’s understanding of gender stereotypes and how they mask the complexity of phenomena, individuals, and science.

In my recollection, the discussion focused more on the safer areas of the history of parapsychology with some push-back at the use of “gender” instead of “sex differences.” But Hess’s presentation and the full paper printed in the proceedings of that conference was ground-breaking for those of us who understood its importance at the time.

The Montreal symposium that Carlos organized took place three years before the conference that this issue honors. I don't remember if Rhea White, who organized the PF conference with Lisette Coly, also attended the 1988 PA conference, but certainly Hess cited her then-recent work (e.g., White, 1985) and in a later version of his paper intended for an anthology that Carlos and I were planning at the time, he cited one of her newer essays on gender (e.g., White, 1991) as well.

Dublin, 1991

The issue of women in parapsychology had long been a topic of conversation at the Parapsychology Foundation. How could it be others given that the PF was founded by two formidable women, Eileen Garrett and the Congresswoman from Ohio Frances Bolton (1885–1977). Rhea White (1931–2007) had been a grantee of the PF for many years. Her first job in the field was as a research fellow at the Duke University Parapsychology Laboratory from 1954 to 1958. From 1959 to her death in 2007, she had a relationship with the American Society for Psychical Research, beginning as a Research and Editorial Associate, then the editor of the ASPR's journal and in her later years serving as a consulting editor. In 1965 she obtained a master's in library science and began a job at the East Meadow Public Library in East Meadow, New York where she worked for thirty years. Her day job allowed her to write theoretical papers (e.g., White, 1960; 1984), a seminal methodological critique (e.g., White, 1964), and, of course, her work on feminism and parapsychology (e.g., White, 1994). She co-edited a variety of anthologies (e.g., White & Dale, 1973) and founded the *Parapsychology Abstracts International*, both projects a boon to scholars working before the age of internet libraries. Rhea's work led to promoting the term *Exceptional Human Experience* (EHE) and expanding the concepts in her bibliographic, encyclopedic, and theoretical work in her EHE background papers and journal. A long-time mentor to a number of us, Rhea was a perfect partner to Lisette Coly when the conference on women and parapsychology became a reality. She also served as the moderator for the conference sessions.

The idea for the conference originated with Lisette, though. In the early 1990s, as Lisette Coly was struggling with establishing a balance between being a mother of small children and an integral part of the Parapsychology Foundation's administration, she and her mother, Eileen Coly were having conversations about Mrs. Garrett's life and the difficulty that women in the field had with opportunity, credibility, and access to all the possible roles in parapsychology that could move the field forward. A conversation also took place with Gertrude Schmeidler (1912–2009) about how she balanced her married life, her children, and her long career as a research psychologist and professor at City University in New York. Lisette Coly, like other women of Lisette's and my age, were well aware of what it took to become successful as a colleague and researcher in the field. We learned from the stories told to us by women of the generations before us how difficult it was to sustain a career, especially if we were interested in

having a family. As Lisette Coly said recently (personal communication, December 5th, 2022), “No matter how hard we worked, we never seemed to get out of the back of the bus.”

In the conversations Lisette was having, the plan was formulated to focus on the state of women in parapsychology in an upcoming conference in the series that the Parapsychology Foundation had sustained since Mrs. Garrett and the Honorable Frances Bolton had organized the first international conference in the modern era. That first conference took place in 1953 in Utrecht in the Netherlands.

Following the overall structure of previous conferences, speakers were invited, and observers were either invited or had to seek permission to attend.

There was a change in way in which that structure was implemented in the *Women and Parapsychology* conference, though. Up until and after that conference, speakers presented academic papers on each of the two days of the conference. Each presentation was followed by an extended discussion session, there were two general discussion sessions on each of the two days, and both the papers and discussions were published in the proceedings.

Lisette Coly (personal communication, December 5th, 2022) said that, because she felt the discussions were the best part of the conferences, and because the women and parapsychology topic was breaking new ground and would undoubtedly lead to conversations about individual experiences as researchers and scholars, she thought that it was a good idea to use the second day for a brain-storming session. The point of the informal papers presented on the second day of the *Women and Parapsychology* conference was, therefore, focused on “getting to the bottom of our shared common problems” with the intention to attempt to find a solution to those problems.

The resulting conference was an extraordinary experience for many of us. Lisette and Eileen Coly opened the conference, and outlined the purpose of our meeting. Dublin, Ireland had been chosen in honor of Eileen Garrett’s birthplace in near-by County Meath.

Rhea White (1994b) started the conference off with an examination of the feminist approach to science. Jessica Utts (1994b) followed with a review of the social, institutional and cultural impact of gender on science theory and practice. Beverly Rubik (1994a) looked at the lack of the feminine archetype in parapsychological research. Susan Blackmore (1994) reviewed gender differences in belief in the paranormal. Joanne McMahon (1994) presented a biography of Eileen Garrett. Marilyn Schlitz (1994b) provided a cultural critique of women and power and the paranormal. Anjum Khilji (1994a) outlined the contributions to parapsychology of Muslim women. Ruth-Inge Heinze (1919–2007) (1994a) looked at the “life patterns” of women active in the field, and I (Zingrone, 1994a) reviewed the writings of an American cleric Frederic Marvin (1847–c1907) and the Italian Criminologist Cesare Lombroso (1836–1909) on the understanding of women mediums.

As in the traditional PF conferences that took place before and after the 1991 conference, the observers are picked and approved with their substantive participation in the discussion session in mind. In Dublin, the observers were Carlos, Marco Bischof, Gerd Hövelmann, Rebecca Hughes-Hartogs, Denise Iredell, Wanda Luke, Hans Michels, and Sean O'Donnell.

Among the discussion topics were: the tendency of parapsychologists to be apologetic about their position outside of mainstream science, David Hess's point made at the Montreal conference about "reversing the hierarchy" by the language we use to discuss our phenomena and our methods; the difficulties of restructuring methodology or redefining science as opposed to renegotiating professional roles for women in science; spirituality and parapsychology and the juxtaposition of gender culture within a country's culture; the impact of denoting psi phenomena as anomalous and how that clashes with the idea that these phenomena are universal. Finally, in the face of the predictability of the male paradigm, the question was asked whether it is better to integrate a reflexive process into science as opposed to trying to overturn the male paradigm. Other interesting points of view were raised and discussed as well.

In the second day of the *Women and Parapsychology* conference, each of the speakers discussed a variety of topics with an eye towards identifying the obstacles and barriers women encounter in science as a whole and in parapsychology. Anjum Khilji (1994b) discussed the different ways that Muslim countries approach the mystical life and what we would see as paranormal phenomena. Ruth-Inge Heinze (1994b) contrasted the lives of female shamanic practitioners in Korea to American women parapsychologists. I (Zingrone, 1994b) focused on my own experience which included male colleagues and mentors who nurtured my career, but also the experience of being invisible as a scientific colleague. I reported on an informal interview-based survey of women I knew in parapsychology to see how common my own experience was. From those conversations, I recommended some things that women can do to overcome whatever obstacles they encounter. Beverly Rubik (1994b) focused on Olga Worrall as well as how important it is to examine "the foundations of conventional science" (p. 228). Marilyn Schlitz (1994a) highlighted Sandra Harding's (1989) focus on "a robust gender-sensitive reflexivity practice" (p. 232). Susan Blackmore (1994) looked at the differences between women involved in the skeptic movement and women in parapsychology. Jessica Utts (1994a) reflected on how much being a woman did or did not influence her career. Rhea White (1994a) reviewed feminist theory as she understood it and concluded that "To ensure a full-fledged science of humankind, it will be necessary to develop and expand science itself" (p. 250). The discussion that resulted from the second presentations was nuanced, complicated and worth reading. In fact, if you haven't read this proceedings, I highly recommend it after you read this issue of the journal.

For Lisette Coly and Rhea White inviting men to be observers was a daunting task. While those who did attend participated in the formal discussions and in the social moments at meals,

gathering in the lobby, in near-by pubs or in restaurants to keep the conversations going, the low number of men who accepted invitations or requested them, however, was glaringly visible.

Some of us found ourselves trying to understand why the men who mentored us, who showed no sign of misogyny in their work with their female colleagues or students, but who, when questioned, dismissed the relevance of the conference outright. My impression was that many prominent men in the field at the time did not understand what the purpose of the conference was. Some men I admired asked me why I would think that the conference could possibly be relevant to them. Other male mentors and colleagues asked me nervously if any of the women at the conference had discussed their behavior towards women, as if we were gathering in Dublin to share a pint while maligning our male colleagues. There were very few men who assumed that the conference, like any other conference in the field, was engaged in the business of a substantive way to identify, articulate and solve theoretical, methodological, and professional problems, and even fewer who saw the need to examine gender stereotypes, or question the male paradigm of science.

In This Issue

And now, thirty-one years later, Gerhard Mayer has opened the pages of the *Journal of Anomalistics / Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* not only to honor the existence and legacy of the Parapsychology Foundation's conference but also to provide an interdisciplinary, intersectional space for all the ways of approaching the topic of women and parapsychology. Our committee – Gerhard, Cedar and I – set to work making a list of individuals to contact to be invited authors. We put together a Call for Papers that was disseminated around the field. The survey was also advertised on chat lists and through e-mails. We vetted the initial submissions, organized the refereeing, and shared the jobs of providing guidance for revisions, and accepting the final set of papers. Gerhard organized a PA symposium on the topic that took place on November 19th with four of our authors.

The creativity, scholarship, and dedication to their papers of the authors has been astonishing. The resulting set of papers more than honor the 1991 Parapsychology Foundation conference; they extend, broaden, and deepen the themes that were treated in Dublin. The final order of the Table of Contents was brought to life by Gerhard. Four of the authors were invited to contribute to the issue: Fátima Regina Machado, Ina Schmied-Knittel, Jessica Utts, and Caroline Watt. The other six authors responded to the Call for Papers. The eleventh paper was written by Gerhard with editorial amendments made by Cedar and me.

The first section of the Table of Contents included four historical treatments. Caroline Watt's paper, "On Being a (White, Middle-Class) Women in Parapsychology," is a personal and substantive look at her experience in academia from being the first person in her family to go

to university to becoming the second Koestler Chair of Parapsychology at the University of Edinburgh. The second paper was written by Ina Schmied-Knittel and is called “Occultism as a Resource. The Parapsychologist Fanny Moser (1872–1953).” The topic was the life and work of Moser, who took on parapsychology when she found herself caring for her dying husband and could no longer do field work in zoology. Moser’s second profession brought her to our field, and that life and work impacted not only on parapsychology in Germany but through her bequest to the IGPP, on the international community as well. The third paper, “Mrs. Lotte Böhringer (1917–2014) – ‘Anima of the Freiburg Institute’: A Personal Appreciation” by Eberhard Bauer, paints a portrait of an important member of the IGPP whose tireless dedication to the institute made all the difference for the administrative and scientific staff. The final historical treatment is a short critique of the tendency of historians of mediumship to study only the women mediums and not the men, making assumptions that may be a leap beyond the data. Renaud Evrard’s “Parapsychology and Women’s Emancipation: A Historical Cliché?” is not only an important corrective to recent history, but a challenge to the future history of mediumship.

The next two papers in the issue present the experiences of women in very different cultural environments. The first of these, “Being a Psi Researcher in Brazil: My Career and Perceptions as a Woman,” written by Fatima Regina Machado, covers not only her career, but gender issues in the field, and the secular and religious context of Brazil. Sonali Bhatt Marwaha wrote “A View from India on Women Achievers, Knowledge Systems, Psychology and Psi.” Her paper discussed not only her career, but the feminine and masculine in Indian philosophy, an in-depth look at theoretical issues in parapsychology, and how the understanding of our subject matter changes when embedded in the Indian knowledge system.

The next two papers return to methodology. The first of these is Donna Thomas’s paper, “Rethinking Methodologies in Parapsychological Research with Children.” Her work depicts the importance of understanding children’s perspectives and of according primacy to their experiences and ways of knowing in research of this type. Thomas draws complex lessons from previous discussions of various aspects of parapsychological methodologies, including striving to foreground voices that are often set aside in research. The next paper, by Jacob W. Glazier, “Feminism at the Forefront: A Critical Approach to Exceptional Experiences,” raises a variety of gender-based issues and the intersectionality of these problems with feminist theory. Ultimately his recommendations are methodological as well as theoretical.

The first of the final three papers in the issue is Jessica Utts “General and Personal Reflections on Succeeding as a Woman Science Researcher.” Her paper is unique in that she ties her commentary to her original substantive paper and her commentary in the 1991 *Women and Parapsychology* conference, updating it with new research on women’s lives as professionals in science, technology, engineering and mathematic (STEM) disciplines, and to her personal

experience working in parapsychology. Following, Utts's paper is the research report, "Women and Parapsychology 2022 – An Online Survey," by Gerhard, Cedar, and me. The paper reviews the construction of the questions, the data handling and analyses, and the results. Included also are a variety of comments made by the individuals who completed the survey and the conclusions we drew from the results.

The final paper in the issue, Christine Simmonds-Moore's "Feminizing the Paranormal" is a thorough-going treatment of a variety of theoretical stances in which "feminine approaches should be integrated with traditional masculine approaches in a 'both/and' approach drawn from transpersonal psychology" (Simmonds-Moore, 2022: 499). Her discussion presents a variety of theoretical and methodological innovations that have the potential to enhance our understanding of who we are individually, together, and in the natural world.

Some Final Comments

I was unnerved by the 1978 symposium at the time because of the inability of men and women in the United States to do something as simple as guarantee the rights of women and I thought the best thing women could do was walk away. But over time, I have come to see that Drewes, Mitchell, and Drucker did us a service by making sure, even in the Missouri of those years, that the stories of dedicated, intelligent women who made a difference were told.

I was heartened by the symposium in 1988 at Montreal, not only because I had the privilege of a marital collaboration with a man who was as dedicated as I was to making sure that the voices of women scientists and experiencers were heard. But I was also inspired by the point of view that David Hess brought to that symposium through his clear and careful analysis of gendered discourse and its impact on methodology, theory, and the lives of the women in the field.

I was shocked and thrilled to have been invited to bring the project I was working on to the *Women and Parapsychology* conference in Dublin in 1991, not only because Carlos was also invited to be an observer, but because the conference itself was another courageous, thought-provoking step made by the Colys and by Rhea White. The talks in the conference room, and the discussions over meals and in the lobby shined a light on what the field could be for all of us. Of course, there was the letdown afterwards of the otherwise egalitarian men who shrugged it off as a something that was at best, a little bit frivolous and at worst, absolutely not something they wanted to endure.

I was grateful as this project of this special issue was laid out to me, for Cedar's worry about the lack of women at the podium in one of her first Parapsychological Association conferences, and Gerhard's willingness to make sure that the *Women and Parapsychology* conference of 1991 was celebrated and extended in the pages of his journal.

For the first time, I think there is reason to hope that real, sustainable progress on this both/and expansion towards gender equity is coming. I hope that you are as inspired as I am, and if you won't be 101 thirty years from now like I will, that you may see that it is important to begin now to incorporate these ideas into your consciousness, to aim your own professional endeavors towards restoring lost voices, promoting equity in the workplace, and building an intellectual, social, and emotional world based on the fact that we are all in this together.

Enjoy the issue!

References

- Alvarado, C. S. (1985). Research on spontaneous out-of-body experiences: A review of modern developments, 1960–1984. In B. Shapin & L. Coly (Eds.), *Current trends in psi research* (pp.140–167). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Alvarado, C. S. (1989). The history of women in parapsychology: A critique of past work and suggestions for further research. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 53, 235–248.
- Blackmore, S. J. (1994a). Are women more sheepish? Gender differences in belief in the paranormal. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 68–89). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Blackmore, S. J. (1994b). Women skeptics. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 234–236). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Boice, R., Shaugnessy, P., & Pecker, G. (1985). Woman and publishing in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40, 577–578.
- Castellan, Y. (1955). *La métapsychique*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Cerullo, J. J. (1982). *The secularization of the soul: Psychical research in modern Britain*. Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Fodor, N. (1933). *Encyclopedia of psychic science*. Arthurs Press.
- Garrett, E. J. (1939). *My life as a search for the meaning of mediumship*. Oquaga Press.
- Garrett, E. J. (1941). *Telepathy in search of a lost faculty*. Creative Press.
- Garrett, E. J. (1949). *Adventures in the supernatural: A personal memoir*. Creative Age Press.
- Garrett, E. J. (1950). *The sense and nonsense of prophecy*. Creative Age Press.
- Garrett, E. J. (1957). *Does man survive death*. Helix Press.
- Garrett, E. J. (1968). *Many voices: The autobiography of a medium*. Putnam.
- Gurney, E., Myers, F. W. H., & Podmore, F. (1886). *Phantasms of the living*. Trübner & Co.

- Guyer, L., & Fidell, L. (1973). Publication of men and women psychologists: Do women publish less? *American Psychologist*, 28, 157–160.
- Harding, S. (1989). Is there a feminist method? In N. Tuana (Ed.), *Feminism and science* (pp. 17–32). Indiana University Press.
- Heinze, R.-I. (1994a). Life patterns of women active in parapsychology. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 194–208). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Heinze, R.-I. (1994b). Women as parapsychologists. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 214–217). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Hess, D. J. (1989). Gender, hierarchy, and the psychic: An interpretation of the culture of parapsychology. In L. A. Henkel & R. E. Berger (Eds.), *Research in parapsychology 1988: Abstracts and papers from the Thirty-First Convention of the Parapsychological Association, 1988* (pp. 104–106). Scarecrow Press.
- Keller, E. F. (1985). *Reflections on gender and science*. Yale University Press.
- Khilji, A. (1994a). Behind the veil: Muslim women's contributions to parapsychology. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 175–193). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Khilji, A. (1994b). Parapsychology and Muslim women: A contemporary scenario. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 210–213). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Kofman, S. (1985). *The enigma of woman: Woman in Freud's writings*. Cornell University Press.
- Martin, D. R., & Stribic, F. P. (1938a). Studies in extra-sensory perception: I. An analysis of 25,000 trials. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 2, 23–30.
- Martin, D. R., & Stribic, F. P. (1938b). Studies in extra-sensory perception: II. An analysis of a second series of 25,000 trials. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 2, 287–295.
- McMahon, J. D. S. (1994). Eileen J. Garrett: A woman who made a difference. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 124–149). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Odic, D., & Wojcik, E. H. (2020). The publication gender gap in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 75(1), 92–103. Doi: 10.1037/amp0000480
- Over, R. (1981). Representation of women on the editorial boards of psychology journals. *American Psychologist*, 36, 885–891.
- Over, R. (1982). Research productivity and impact of male and female psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 37, 24–31.
- Rhine, L. E. (1961). *Hidden channels of the mind*. W. Sloane Associates.
- Rhine, L. E. (1967). *ESP in life and lab: Tracing hidden channels*. Macmillan.

- Rhine, L. E. (1970). *Mind over matter: Psychokinesis*. Macmillan.
- Rhine, L. E. (1975). *Psi, what is it? The story of ESP and PK*. Harper & Row.
- Roll, W. G. (Ed.) (1979). *Research in parapsychology 1978: Abstracts and papers from the twenty-first annual convention of the Parapsychological Association, 1978*. Scarecrow Press.
- Ross, M. B., Glennon, B. M., Murciano-Goroff, R., Berkes, E. G., Weinberg, B. A., & Lane, J. I. (2022). Women are credited less in science than men. *Nature*, *608*, 135–145.
- Rubik, B. (1994a). Feminine archetype, the: A missing factor in contemporary psi research. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 51–67). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Rubik, B. (1994b). Sister, can you paradigm? A feminine perspective on parapsychology. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 226–229). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Schlitz, M. J. (1994a). Women and parapsychology. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 230–233). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Schlitz, M. J. (1994b). Women, power, and the paranormal: A cultural critique. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 157–174). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Sidgwick, H., Johnson, A., Myers, F. H., Podmore, F., & Sidgwick, E. (1894). Report on the census of hallucinations. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, *10*(26), 25–422.
- Sidgwick, Mrs. H., & Johnson, A. (1892). Experiments in thought-transference. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, *8*, 536–596.
- Simmonds-Moore, C. (2022). Feminizing the paranormal. *Journal of Anomalistics / Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, *22*(2), 499–531.
- Sommer, A. (2013). *Crossing the boundaries of mind and body: Psychical research and the origins of modern psychology*. Doctoral thesis submitted for the PhD, Science and Technology Studies, University College London.
- Tanner, A. E. (1910). *Studies in spiritism*. D. Appleton.
- Tubby, G. O. (1956). My relation to James H. Hyslop as his secretary. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, *50*, 137–142.
- Utts, J. (1994a). Reflections from the past, preparing for the future. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 237–240). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Utts, J. (1994b). Social, institutional, and cultural influences of gender on science. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 28–50). Parapsychology Foundation.

- Verrall, Mrs. A. W. (1895). Some experiments on the supernormal acquisition of knowledge. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, 11, 174–193.
- Wassilko-Serecki, Z. (1926). Observations on Eleonore Zügun. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 20, 513–523, 593–603.
- White, R. A. (1985). The spontaneous, the imaginal, and psi: Foundations for a depth parapsychology. In R. A. White, & J. Solfvin (Eds.), *Research in parapsychology 1984* (pp. 166–190). Scarecrow Press.
- White, R. A. (1991). Feminist science, postmodern views, and exceptional human experience: An editorial. *Exceptional Human Experience*, 9(1), 1–9.
- White, R. A. (1994a). On the need for double vision in parapsychology: The feminist standpoint. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 241–252). Parapsychology Foundation.
- White, R. A. (1994b). Relevance to parapsychology of a feminist approach to science, the. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 1–27). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Williams, E. A., Kolek, E. A., Saunders, D. B., Remaly, A., & Wells, R. S. (2017). Mirror on the field: Gender, authorship, and research methods in higher education's leading journals. *Journal of Higher Education*, 89(1), 28–53.
- Zingrone, N. L. (1988). Authorship and gender in American parapsychology journals. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 52, 321–343.
- Zingrone, N. L. (1994a). Medium as image, the: Power, pathology and passivity in the writings of Cesare Lombroso and Frederic Marvin. L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 90–123). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Zingrone, N. L. (1994b). Women and parapsychology. In L. Coly & R. A. White (Eds.), *Women and parapsychology: Proceedings of an international conference held in Dublin, Ireland, September 21–22, 1991* (pp. 218–225). Parapsychology Foundation.
- Zingrone, N. L. (2022). The formidable women of the SPR. Presentation at the Society for Psychical Research Study Day No. 82, “The Early Years of the SPR and 140 on”, November 26, 2022.