

Review of: "HUME, Paradigms, and the Debate on Psi"

Jens Ole Schmitt¹

¹ Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author aims at discussing whether Hume's treatment of miracles within his *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* allows for application to parapsychological phenomena as well, particularly for use in arguing against the scientific nature of such findings, which the author denies. This is based on a recent debate that the author summarizes.

This is a noteworthy and rare combination of topics, and the paper is written in a convincing manner. It should be published.

On a general note, some minor points could be mentioned or addressed in more detail. Firstly, those parapsychological phenomena, some of which the author lists, could perhaps have been defined in a clearer way, as to where and how the borderline to established psychology should be drawn. Secondly, one wonders what the focus on Hume in particular, apart from having been introduced in that aforementioned debate, yields for the question of whether psy phenomena can be considered scientific in contrast or addition to other concepts of scientificity, such as by Popper. He already includes Kuhn in this regard in section 6.2. For the reference to incompletely understood causality, which the author discusses in section 6, could be raised against phenomena in established sciences as well. Likewise, the bias mentioned in 6.1 could also be found with researchers in the fields of other established sciences; perhaps this thought could be more peculiarized. Thirdly, one wonders whether the intention of being acknowledged as fully scientific or being considered an established science might add as an incentive to commit fraud regarding psi experiments to the carefully discussed list in 5.1 as well.

However, the author should explain this article's relation to his own earlier "Should We Accept Arguments from Skeptics to Ignore the Psi Data? A Comment on Reber and Alcock's 'Searching for the Impossible'", *Journal of Scientific Exploration* 33 (2019), which already covers many similar topics. Even though it mostly has a different focus, it also briefly touches upon Hume's role. As it is only referred to in footnote 11, but not listed in the bibliography, one wonders whether the present paper is just a continuation of this topic in the former or meant to replace it. This should be clarified for publication.

Regarding stylistic matters, the reason for giving Hume's name in capital letters in the paper's title is not clear, as this is not followed for other proper names in the text. The author could also check whether all definite articles before 'psi' are always needed; some seem grammatically unnecessary, especially in the Abstract. In the Bibliography, Chevassus-au-Louis's volume is the English translation by Elliott, who is not mentioned in the entry, and the entries for Peneluhm and Kuhn (italicization) need revision. The same applies to occurrences of 'ganzfeld' in some places, rather than the usual

ganzfeld, which he mostly employs in the text (but sometimes in a capitalized form; usually, it is used in lowercase form).

In section 1, the sentence should perhaps read “make questionable,” and a preposition after “I’ll argue” seems to be lacking. Also, the Abstract refers to Hume’s chapter as “On Miracles,” but often as “Of Miracles,” which should be unified. In section 2, some words seem to be missing, namely, ‘to’ in “used to facilitate repeatedly” and ‘be’ in “should be treated as unreliable.”