regimentation. Therefore, Marxism is all wrong, because, you see, it ignores man's spiritual side. If Rhine ever read a line of Marx's writings he did a remarkably fine job of concealing the fact. It is at any rate clear that he hasn't the slightest inkling that considered from a Marxian viewpoint Russia is a capitalist nation, not a Communist Society. If the Dr. would sit down and draw up a list of the similarities between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. he might experience an unpleasant sinking sensation as he came to realize that we here have a Bear and an Eagle that must be classified as mere varieties within the same species.

Both nations have their privileged and exploited classes. The majority of people in both countries are wage-workers or dependent on same, and, states Marx, "wage-labor implies capital; capital implies wage-labor." That is THE basic relationship of capitalism. In both nations any political party which constitutes a real and present danger to the existing rulers is repressed, though a sham struggle is allowed. The nationalism of the one is as silly as that of the other. And so on down a long list. The differences are, today especially, entirely a matter of degree and not of kind. The Russian worker has more "security", the American workers has more "freedom". The American worker gets more money and a pat on the back for working harder or thru longer hours; his Russian prototype gets more money and perhaps a tin medal for doing same. Both get it in the neck, wartime or peacetime. Both are persuaded that they should regard one another as enemies, and both are wrong.

"MARXISM"

Dr. Rhine displays throughout his article on "Marxism" a perfect genius for logical errors of the most glaring sort, which we will also find him exercising in his chosen field, the investigation of the "super-natural". We are told that if we accept the Marxian concept of man we must agree that the Russian masters are correct in ruling thru the use of terroristic methods. This is so, because in Marx's view man is a "machine", and it would be silly indeed to pay any attention to the desires of a mere machine.* Dr. Rhine might just as well tell us that since his wrist watch is a machine, and so is an automobile, that he finds it good practice to feed his watch a quart of oil every few hundred miles. We may of course consider man to be a machine, and for certain purposes it is useful to do so. The fact remains however that man is a very peculiar machine without parallel so far as we know, and he has to be studied as such. That is the contention of Marxists, and we leave to our opponents the foolishness of trying to equate all kinds of human behavior to supposedly corresponding forms found in the animal or physical world.

In one respect Dr. Rhine is a welcome and unusual opponent of materialism, namely, that he doesn't believe in beating around the bush in expressing his opinion. He tells us in his book, "The Reach of the Mind", that he is out to prove that the 'mind' of man includes faculties and powers **impossible to ascribe to the functioning of the brain.** This poses the real issue between Rhine and the Marxists, and not the assertion that some people — or all people for that matter — are gifted with powers of "extra-sensory perceptt-ion", "clairvoyance", etc. We say that granting for the sake of argument that such abilities actually exist, the fact remains that they must be considered as perfectly natural manifestations. To put it another way, they certainly don't exist apart from the people who throw dice, read cards, experience visions, or what-have-you. And so, should Dr.Rhine succeed in demonstrating in an incontrovertible manner a reality behind his spooky assertions, he will be not one step nearer to proving the non-material nature of the human mind.

*Marx denounced the bourgeoisie for looking upon workers as a mere instrument of production.

PROOF?

This brings us down to the question of whether or not Rhine and his associates have actually proven beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the "psychic" powers before mentioned. Close scrutiny of his book leads us to answer: no, not yet. Of course, our preconceptions in regard to this general field of investigation make us tough customers for Rhine & Co. to peddle its wares to, but even people more friendly to spiritualistic beliefs must find a good deal of "The Reach of the Mind" hard to take seriously. Take, for instance, the throwing of dice. What forces, or factors, determine which sides of the cubes will come to rest uppermost, in the pay-off position? We can answer that among those known would be the force and direction of throw, the position of the dice as they leave the hand or cup, the size and shape of the dice, the surface onto which they are thrown. Assuming the dice to be perfect cubes, which they never are; and assuming they remained so thruout their use, which is an impossibility; and assuming they were honestly shaken and thrown, which they often are not, we could expect that in a very large number of throws the points which actually appear would respond to the mathematical odds for that point coming up for the given number of throws."

Two six sided cubes, each numbered from 1 to 6, allow 36 combinations of numbers. Only one of these adds up to the point "2". In other words, the chances against throwing snake-eyes are exactly 35 to 1. But this tells us practically nothing at all about what will happen in, say, one short run of 36 throws. "2" might not come up at all, or it might come up, say, 36 times in succession. The latter case would be startling, but it isn't an impossibility. The laws of probability relating to the casting of dice do not constitute a determinant any more than does Fickle Lady Luck. They only tell us what to expect, we repeat, in a very large number of throws.

Now Dr. Rhine states that he was told by a mathematician that if the mathematical odds against the occurrence of any given phenomenon are a million to one, or higher, chance can be excluded as an explanation of that particular happening. This is the most remarkable statement we have ever run across from any mathematician, and those people can really get off some dillies. Consider a case such as this: if ten million tickets are sold in a raffle, somebody has to win against odds of ten million to one. Granting the raffle to be honestly conducted, this would be an example of pure chance operating for the benefit of the lucky winner. Of course, by "pure chance" we mean that the selection of the particular ticket wasn't fixed, not that it was "uncaused." So far as dice are concerned, they have been thrown night and day for thousands of years, for a total number of casts certainly in the **hundreds of billions.** So, if the odds against some particular sequence of numbers were, say, one billion to one, we could never the less expect that the particular run has come up occasionally in the past and that it will in the future. We will hardly be dissuaded from this view simply by reference to "big odds".

In light of what has been said it is perfectly clear that Dr. Rhine should have excluded the possibility of chance explaining his statistical results in the dice throwing tests. Instead, he makes it the most likely explanation thru the following peculiar procedure. Rhine and his associates would start a group of people throwing dice. If out of that group of, say ten, five threw above the mathematically figured average of hits for a test run, they were kept on for further experimenting. If later their rate of hits fell off to average or below, they were dropped and others put in their place. With