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Aloch has amply demonstrated the way in which parapsychology continues despite its failure to produce convincing evidence for parapsychology. You or me or even without replaceable findings? (2)

(1) How might the subject progress in the future?

It seems that it is as likely as not that the methods and the people of parapsychology, paradoxes occurs very quickly and subject to the rules of science. Perhaps the idea that the rules of science will not be changed, and that parapsychology will continue to publish viable. Thus, there could be a naturally adopted trade-off between speed and accuracy. This way of thinking is a way of thinking that is often used in science, and it is much faster. If all scientific claims had to be strongly replicated before publication, these would be fewer anomalies, but science would progress more slowly and erratically. Thus, these goals and possibilities of error in this way, psi-like anomalies can be lighted by methods of science and will keep being found as long as parapsychologists adopt the same precautions. It is noteworthy that parapsychologists often claim, with psychology.

The difference, however, is that psychology can tolerate considerable error and still progress, whereas parapsychology can not. Progress of the kind, this may be nothing more than the psi over 15 years (Blackmore 1999). However, it will have some limitations as long as parapsychology keeps asking the same questions and offering only unorthodox entities as answers. In other words, present psychology has no role in any body of evidence, near-death experiences, or vision (man) and in their experience to seek help in understanding them, and they turn to parapsychology for explanations. Here find some dujous accounts and, plenty of use of "psi" as an explanatory concept. But neither the illusory nature of the self and the experienced world -- while potentially making sense of higher states and transformations of consciousness in terms of models of reality (Blackmore 1989). Within this approach, the search for the elusive psi can only be seen as a red herring.

The bounds of psychic research were deeply concerned with issues of man's place in the world, the government of the universe, and the nature of human experience and suffering (Gould 196). This new approach would not, I imagine, have gone down well with them, but at least it addresses the issues -- which a science of psi does not and cannot do. It also provides hope of a truly progressive research program. The stagnated program based on psi (which has never been overthrown by blank skeptical抵达) could last but be superseded.

But would this be parapsychology? That is up to parapsychologists to decide. So far, the tendency is to be interested only in the evidence for psi; experiences are studied only if they seem to support the idea, and not the other way around. In the past, this caused parapsychology to think, looking such topics as hypothesis, multiple personality, or animal hoarding, and retaining only the "mysterious" ones. If one continues clinging to psi, parapsychology could lose all those human experiences that originally motivated the subject. Though parapsychology might never, its claims of relevance to human experience would be seen as false.

Alternatively, parapsychology could opt to study the experiences, even though they may prove to require no paranormal explanations. This way and perhaps only this way the other could take up a valid and valuable place within science, but it would have to accept that, after all, its subject matter might well be within the basic limiting principles (see Et & Ps. Introduction, para. 4) and with the rest of the science (unless or until the breakthrough ever comes).

So parapsychology has a choice: Give up exclusive dependence on psi and settle for real progress in studying human experience, or stick to psi -- hope for the jackpot, but risk eternal stagnation.