

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249929567>

The laughter of the 1962 Tanganyika ‘laughter epidemic’

Article in *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research* · January 2007

DOI: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.003

CITATIONS

11

READS

9,750

1 author:



Christian F. Hempelmann

East Texas A&M University

85 PUBLICATIONS 2,013 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

The laughter of the 1962 Tanganyika 'laughter epidemic'

CHRISTIAN F. HEMPELMANN

12 *Abstract*

13
14 *The present article¹ discusses the role of laughter in the much cited 'laugh-*
15 *ter epidemic' that occurred in Tanganyika in 1962. Despite its extraordi-*
16 *nary nature, the veracity of the event is confirmed, crucially on the basis of*
17 *similar reports. But most current representations are flawed by their exag-*
18 *geration and misinterpretation of the role of laughter in the event, relating*
19 *it to a humorous stimulus, a virus or environmental contaminant, or identi-*
20 *fying it as contagious laughter. It is argued that the event is a motor-variant*
21 *case of mass psychogenic illness of which laughter is one common symp-*
22 *tom. Therefore it cannot serve as support for other arguments in humor*
23 *research.*

24
25 *Keywords: Laughter; laughter epidemic; mass hysteria; mass psychogenic*
26 *illness; Tanganyika; Africa.*

27
28
29 **1. Introduction**

30
31
32 In the literature on laughter, reference is often made to an instance of a
33 'laughter epidemic' that is reported from Tanganyika (now Tanzania),
34 East Africa, in 1962 (e.g., Banwell 2000; Boss 1997; Brottman 2002; Car-
35 doso 2003; Colligan et al. 1982; Conley 1963; Ebrahim 1968; Holden
36 1993; Kagwa 1964; Lambo 1965; Muhangi 1973; Provine 1992, 1996; Si-
37 rois 1982; Stearns 1972; Trump 2002; Wessely 1987). A recent citation
38 that spawned much attention can be found in Provine (2000: 113ff).
39 According to these accounts, the laughter epidemic originated in a girls'

Humor 20–1 (2007), 49–71
DOI 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.■■■

0933–1719/07/0020–0049
© Walter de Gruyter

1 school, where students started to laugh uncontrollably, and subsequently
2 spread to their communities to ultimately paralyze the whole country for
3 several months.

4 Because this extraordinary instance, originally reported by Rankin and
5 Philip (1963), is described and misinterpreted frequently and recently not
6 only in popular literature, but also in scientific work, a reassessment of its
7 general veracity and the reported circumstances—in the light of similar
8 phenomena and their analyses—is warranted. This paper will argue that
9 the event is much quoted for two reasons: On the one hand, it is a good
10 story with an ironic juxtaposition of a joyful symptom and a disease
11 event. On the other hand, it appears to provide support to several
12 common-sensical notions about laughter, in particular its contagious na-
13 ture, psychopathological correlates, and cultural universality.

14 The main misapprehension about the event arises from the central fact
15 that the epidemic involved laughter: The assumption is that it must thus
16 have been related to humor, on the one hand, and enjoyed, on the other.
17 In fact, the laughter had nothing to do with merriment or humor nor was
18 its contagiousness instrumental in the epidemic spread. Laughter, in this
19 case, was just one and a fairly common symptom of an uncommonly
20 large case of mass psychogenic illness (MPI), or mass sociogenic ill-
21 ness, that will have to be reassessed to highlight these most common
22 misinterpretations of the ‘laughter epidemic.’ In general, despite the
23 size of the event, both in the unusually large population affected and the
24 long duration, most reports—except for the original one—are exagger-
25 ated, oversimplified and tendentially ignore central facts and pertinent
26 interpretations.

27 It has to be cautioned that for these reasons, mainly the non-humorous
28 nature of the laughter involved, the ‘laughter epidemic’ itself may appear
29 to fall outside of the purview of humor research. But this article, which
30 aims to address this very point for the sake of humor research, is of
31 course well within its limits. Accordingly, the present discussion is rele-
32 vant mostly for humor scholars, but also psychologists and sociologists,
33 whose fields centrally contribute to an understanding of the likely circum-
34 stances of the event, as well sociologists and anthropologists of science,
35 who will find in the reception and distortion of the original report a fairly
36 typical case of misquoting motivated by wishful thinking. In short, the
37 good news is that there is a real event underlying the reports, but the
38 bad news is that it had nothing to do with humor and only very little
39 with laughter.

1 **2. Current reception**

2

3 I choose to introduce the epidemic by way of its more inaccurate, but
4 more recent citations. This reproduces the usual order in which the reader
5 becomes acquainted with the episode and underlines the intended empha-
6 sis of the present discussion, which lies not only on the event itself, but
7 also on its presentation and reception. The most detailed, carefully pre-
8 sented, and original source will be presented in depth in the following
9 section.

10 The aim of this paper is not to discredit the journalists, like Trump
11 (2002), who seems to have used the archive of his own paper that contains
12 Conley (1963), or Sebastian (2003), who interviewed this author at a
13 presentation of the present research. They largely depend on the work of
14 the researchers and their purposes are those of journalists: to report the
15 researchers' results and opinions, and to entertain. But since they are a
16 main source, even for some academic approaches, their simplified ac-
17 counts of the event dominate its reception. Banwell (2000) is a typical
18 example:²

19

20 It was 1962 in Tanganyika. A group of teenage girls were hanging out together.
21 Something made them giggle—maybe someone told a joke, maybe they were
22 giddy after a long day of school? The giggles quickly escalated from guffaws to
23 belly laughs to shrieks to wild hysterics. The girls laughed, then cried, then
24 laughed some more. When they met up with neighbors, they started to laugh too.
25 The laughter spread from community to community. Soon, Tanganyika was
26 caught in a full-scale laughter outbreak. Those people who did get to sleep woke
27 up laughing again. Work halted; schools were shut down. The laughing in Tan-
ganyika lasted for six months!

28

29 As I do not want to develop the present discussion against the back-
30 ground of an obvious strawman, let us turn to a more typical example:
31 Holden (1993), referring to Rankin and Philip (1963), claims “[t]he au-
32 thors wrote an account of a *delightful* social phenomenon in which whole
33 African villages would be infected *en masse* by highly contagious bouts of
34 laughter.” While it would be desirable for an author of self-help literature
35 (cf. Holden’s webpage: <http://www.happiness.co.uk/>) to find evidence for
36 such a “delightful” phenomenon, delight is far from the feeling of despair
37 and confusion Rankin and Philip report the victims of the epidemic to
38 have experienced, as we will see soon. Holden’s misrepresentation con-
39 tinues (1993: 82; my emphasis):

1 The laughter would occasionally reach such a point that work and schooling
2 would have to be postponed until the *merriment* died down. On one famous occa-
3 sion, one or two pupils at a Catholic girls' school began to *giggle*. The *giggling*
4 gathered pace and soon the whole class was *merry*. Teachers were *tickled* by this
5 spontaneous, *joyful* outburst and joined in. Soon the whole school was swimming
6 in a tide of laughter. Word spread to the village, and when mothers came to col-
7 lect their children they too became dizzy with laughter and chuckles of *delight*.

8 In these sources we always find an emphasis on positive emotions that are
9 claimed to have accompanied the laughter symptom, e.g., “merriment,”
10 “joy,” “delight.” As we will see, these emotions were not underlying the
11 symptoms reported of the event.

12 Typical for a more reliable, yet still centrally flawed, account in scientific
13 literature is Provine (2000: 130–131) who presents an accurate summary
14 of Rankin and Philip (1963), with additional interpretations of his own:

15
16 The first symptoms appeared on January 30, when three girls started laughing.
17 The symptoms of laughing, crying, and agitation quickly spread to 95 of the 159
18 students [...] Although temporarily debilitating, the laugh attacks produced no
19 fatalities or permanent aftereffects, but teachers reported students being unable
20 to attend to their lessons for several weeks after a laugh episode. [...]

21 Before finally abating two and a half years later, in June 1964, this plague of
22 laughter spread through villages ‘like a prairie fire,’ forcing the temporary closing
23 of more than 14 schools and afflicting about 1,000 people in tribes bordering lake
24 Victoria in Tanganyika and Uganda.

25 Provine focuses on the contagiousness of laughter, which he considers to
26 be the main factor in the epidemic (cf. Provine 1992, 1996; also Stearns
27 1972: 40). As we will see, the event rather illustrates the contagiousness
28 of hysteria, of which laughter may be a symptom, in a predisposed popu-
29 lation. Provine (2000) attracted much journalistic attention and when it is
30 reviewed, the Tanganyika episode is almost always among the quoted
31 topics, as a tale too good not to be told, a tale about laughter having
32 been too much of a good thing.

33 Finally, a typical attempt at an assessment of the event with a different
34 focus can be found in Cardoso (2003; cf. also [http://www.humourwise](http://www.humourwise.co.uk/)
35 [.co.uk/](http://www.humourwise.co.uk/)). It aims to find physical causes for the symptoms reported of
36 the epidemic, again, centrally for the laughter involved:

37
38 I find it improbable that a purely psychological mass reaction would last so long
39 and be so widespread. [...] The American neurologists Hanna and Antonio

1 Damasio suggest that abnormal laughter occurs when structures in the basal part
2 of the brain are damaged. The pathways that normally automatically adjust the
3 execution of laughter to be appropriate to the stimulus for it are disrupted
4 and the brain gets incomplete information about the cognitive and situational
5 context of a potential stimulus—it gets it wrong about whether or not to
6 laugh—resulting in chaotic behaviour. Based on this model, I suggest that a viral
7 infection, probably some kind of encephalitis in the basal part of the brain, pro-
8 voked the 1962 epidemic.

9 I will not pursue such physical cause explanations further. The details of
10 the spreading pattern clearly exclude a viral infection as a potential expla-
11 nation, and pathological laughter and crying show no contagiousness and
12 a different progression (see 5.1).

13 Setting aside the information on details like location, affected popula-
14 tion, and duration until their detailed report from the original source
15 in the next section, the interpretation of the events in current sources
16 presents the following picture, reflecting the most common notions about
17 the event: Young females laugh, possibly because of a humorous stimu-
18 lus, but they also cry, both with increasing intensity; these symptoms
19 spread, possibly by contagion or a viral infection, interrupting everyday
20 life and lasting between 6 and 30 months; despite their graveness and
21 duration the symptoms are accompanied or even caused by merriment.
22 The present paper aims to correct these notions and to suggest a different
23 interpretation of the events on the basis of the original and other contem-
24 porary sources and more convincing analyses of the 'laughter epidemic'
25 as a case of mass psychogenic illness.

26

27

28 **3. Contemporary sources**

29

30

31 **3.1. *The original report***

32

33 Since it is the central source on which all other accounts rely and the first
34 published description and careful assessment of the epidemic, I now turn
35 to the concise³ report by Rankin and Philip (1963) in detail in this sepa-
36 rate subsection. Their reports begins as follows:

37

38 The disease commenced on 30th January, 1962, at a mission-run girls' school at
39 Kashasha village, 25 miles from Bukoba [...] when three pupils commenced to
act in an abnormal manner. From that date until the 18th March, 1962, when
the school was forced to close down, 95 of the 159 pupils had been affected.

1 Fifty-seven pupils were involved from the 21st May, when the school was re-
2 opened, until it was again shut at the end of June. (1963: 167)

3 The further progression of the epidemic can be divided into five stages. As
4 the report is high in content of factual data, for the sake of clarity it is
5 best presented in tabular form:
6

7 3.1.1. *Initial breakout*

8 Kashasha (25 m north of Bukoba) boarding school for girls (dormitories)
9 prodromal group: 3 students

10 symptoms: Attacks of laughing and crying lasting for a few hours,
11 in a few cases up to a maximum of 16 days, with an
12 average of 7 days, followed by a respite and then a re-
13 currence in the majority of cases; general restlessness,
14 persecution complex; no clear physical symptoms.
15

16 1. First phase

17 beginning: 1/30/1962
18 end: 3/18/1962
19 duration: 48 days
20 number: 95/159 pupils
21 [school closed between phase 1 and 2]

22 2. Second phase

23 beginnning: 5/21/1962
24 end: ca. 6/31/1962
25 duration: ca. 47 days
26 number: 57/159 pupils
27

28 3.1.2. *Spread through cases from A. who were sent or went home*

29 1. Nshamba village (55 m west of Bukoba)

30 beginnning: ca. 3/28/1962
31 end: ca. 4/30/1962
32 duration: ca. 34 days
33 number: 217/10,000 villagers (school children, young adults of
34 both sexes)

35 2. Ramashenye girls' middle school (outskirts of Bukoba)

36 beginning: 6/10/1962
37 end: 6/18/1962
38 duration: 8 days
39 number: 48/154 pupils

- 1 3. Kanyangereka village (20 m south of Bukoba)
- 2 concurrent with B.2.
- 3 number: 3 (family of a case from B.2. who was sent home)
- 4 4. Further spread at the time of the writing of report, 2 further school
- 5 closures (boys' schools)
- 6 5. Milder occurrence in a Mbarara primary school (Uganda, 100 m
- 7 north of Bukoba)

8 After the synopsis of the facts, Rankin and Philip turn to a preliminary
9 analysis. It is still relevant today as their argument proceeds cautiously,
10 refrains from speculation and, as I will argue, already points in the direc-
11 tion of a general explanatory model, which will be found most appropri-
12 ate. According to the report, in order to exclude potential physical causes,
13 selected subjects were tested for food poisoning and signs of toxic sub-
14 stances, with negative results. No known form of virus is assumed to
15 account for the symptoms. Although I consider it unlikely, the possibility
16 of a viral infection can, of course, never be excluded on clinical grounds.
17 Yet, in view of the further argumentation of the present paper will make
18 clear that it is an unlikely explanation.

19 Rankin and Philip conclude: "It is suggested that this is mass hysteria
20 in a susceptible population. This is probably a culturally determined dis-
21 ease." (1963: 170). Accordingly, the next section will briefly present re-
22 lated and similar cases of culturally determined diseases, that is, MPI,
23 previously known as mass hysteria, before I will continue to outline the
24 relevant research on MPI in general and to analyze to what degree it per-
25 tains to the case at hand, including a focus on the cultural determinants
26 of the Tanganyika 'laughter epidemic.'

27 28 29 3.2. *Similar cases*

30
31 This subsection presents similar contemporary cases of MPI in the vicin-
32 ity of the event under discussion here. This will serve two purposes: First,
33 as crucial support for its general veracity, it will establish that the Bukoba
34 case and its spread is not a singular and isolated event. Second, it will
35 show that laughter is just one of several symptoms in these additional
36 cases, as much as in the Bukoba event itself, all of which are common
37 for a specific variant of MPI.

38 Kagwa (1964), citing Rankin and Philip (1963), and Ebrahim (1968)
39 discuss the Bukoba case as an instance of three connected events, the

1 other two being “running manias,” which broke out in the area around
2 Lake Victoria. One outbreak occurred in Kigezi (southwestern Uganda)
3 in July 1963 with ca. 600 affected people. The second instance took place
4 in Mbale (eastern Uganda) in November 1963 involving about 300 vic-
5 tims. Both cases are characterized by aimless running, general hyperactiv-
6 ity, as well as violence, and these symptoms spread predominantly among
7 school populations in a pattern identical to the Bukoba event. A fur-
8 ther similar event is reported by Muhangi (1973) for Ankola (southwest
9 Uganda) in July 1971. Fifty of the 287 students of a Rugarama male pri-
10 mary school show grimacing, vulgar language, and aimless walking, as
11 well as laughing. Another similar, but much shorter, incident from neigh-
12 boring Zambia is reported by Dhadphale and Shaikh (1983).

13 With the help of these reports, it can be established that related events
14 took place in the same region in the same period and that additional sim-
15 ilar events are reported. In addition to placing Rankin and Philip’s report
16 into context, these reports point to the main problem with the alleged
17 laughter epidemic, namely that it didn’t just involve laughter, but “[t]he
18 epidemic was characterised by episodes of laughing *and crying* (Rankin
19 and Philip 1963: 167; my emphasis). That is, first of all, it is not a *laugh*
20 epidemic, but an event involving seeming expressions of strong emotional
21 disturbance in general and, in some specific cases, laughter in particular.
22 As such the laughter found in this event is clearly not elicited by humor,
23 but rather a symptom of mass psychogenic illness.

24

25

26 4. Mass psychogenic illness

27

28 4.1. General

29

30 This section will establish the complex of mass psychogenic illness (MPI),
31 its general features, populations typically affected, patterns of spreading
32 from initial to later stages, general variants, and possible causes. All these
33 aspects are closely related so that the argument will repeatedly have to
34 anticipate certain points in later subsections. The focus in the discussion
35 will be on factors that pertain to the initial outbreak (A. in section 3.1).
36 Seminal surveys of cases have been compiled and analyzed by Sirois
37 (1974; reported in Sirois 1982), and a follow-up by Boss (1997), as well
38 as the work of Bartholomew and associates (e.g., Bartholomew and
39 Wessely 2002) and Wessely (e.g., 1987). In addition to numerous case

1 studies reporting events similar to our focal case, these surveys are the
2 main sources for this section. It will become obvious that MPI is a para-
3 digm example for Fleck's (1981 [1935]) observation that diseases are con-
4 structed models on the basis of pseudo-theories of causes and symptoms;
5 that is, they are functionalist answers to urgent and often biased ques-
6 tions. Since the Bukoba case is an almost prototypical example of MPI,
7 and references abound in the work introduced in this subsection, it is as-
8 sumed necessary to introduce another additional detailed example in this
9 section.

10 The following list summarizes the characteristics of the typical course
11 of MPI (Seldon 1989: 893):

- 12 – absence of physical findings about organic causes
- 13 – preponderance in girls/women and (pre-)adolescents
- 14 – transmission by sight/sound
- 15 – hyperventilation/syncope (as signs of anxiety)
- 16 – rapid spread and remission of symptoms
- 17 – relapses in original settings of outbreak

18 as well as the generally assumed underlying causes:

- 19
- 20 – unusual physical/psychological stress in general
- 21 – evidence of prior physical or mental stress of the prodromal cases in
22 particular

23 Based on these general observations, I will discuss, in turn, those charac-
24 teristics in more detail that are relevant for the Bukoba case.
25

26 4.1.1. *Affected population.* All surveys over case studies confirm that
27 “the prevalence of illness is almost always higher in females than in
28 males.” (Boss 1997: 235). Sirois (1982), for example, observes that “[o]f
29 the 70 reviewed outbreaks [in Sirois 1974] 34 appeared in schools, [and]
30 [w]omen were almost exclusively involved (80%), [. . .] [t]hey were young,
31 below 20 years of age, often in the first years of adolescence” (104). The
32 reason for the prevalence of females in affected populations is not com-
33 pletely obvious, but the general disenfranchisement of females in most
34 cultures leading to higher psychosocial stress is assumed. McGrath's ar-
35 gument is typical:
36

37 Perhaps the high incidence of females, as both affected and non-affected members
38 of the settings in which MPI occur, simply reflects our tendency to put females in
39 low status and otherwise unrewarding jobs. If so, then ‘female,’ along with

1 'young' and 'poor,' should be treated as a variable that signals 'low social status,'
2 not some character flaw like 'hysteria' or 'hypochondria.' Perhaps the MPI symp-
3 toms represent a 'last resort' means for low-status persons (female, young, poor,
4 etc.), in high stress situations, to express their distress. (1982: 73)

5
6 The gender question is not central to the present study, but it can be
7 observed that the unequal gender and age distribution is reproduced in
8 the Bukoba case. I will return to the more general point that MPI is a
9 last resort to escape stress situations for powerless "low status" people
10 below, as it is a key part of the present argumentation.

11
12 4.1.2. *Settings.* It is not astonishing that school settings are often indi-
13 cated for MPI, as a population of young age is likely to congregate in
14 such a setting. But there are specific additional factors that make a school
15 population a likely breeding ground for MPI, independent of gender dis-
16 tributions and partially independent of age. Sirois observes that "some
17 outbreaks in the school setting occurring at the beginning of the school
18 year could be seen as 'rites of passage.' They would be useful to bind anx-
19 iety linked to the formation of the group and act as witness of collective
20 cohesiveness" (1982: 106). Furthermore, in the case of boarding schools,
21 where students are living together around the clock, stress is intensified
22 through the separation from family settings. An additional factor is
23 observed by Boss: "Outbreaks in schools may have been reported more
24 frequently than those that occur elsewhere because of the importance at-
25 tached to investigating outbreaks involving children" (1997: 239), an ar-
26 gument also valid for the many reported MPI cases in Western schools
27 (e.g., Helvie 1968; Jones et al. 2000; Small and Borus 1983). Yet another
28 reason may lie in the fact that in colonial settings, as in the Tanganyika
29 case, schools are the point of contact between the traditional local popu-
30 lation and Western teachers/missionaries. As we will see below (subsec-
31 tion 4.2) such a point of contact is also a point of friction, leading to
32 additional stress. Furthermore, the local population may in general be
33 susceptible to MPI, and may just be the fact that a Western observer hap-
34 pens to be present to document the outbreak.

35
36 4.1.3. *Spread.* In the initial or prodromal stage, before the epidemic
37 spread, the first or *index* cases involved are often "unusual ['hysterical']
38 personalities," easily affected by stress; this facilitates spread to 'normal'
39 personalities (Kerckhoff and Back 1968: 40). In contrast to this, Sirois

1 sees the typical pattern involving hysterics rather as second and third
2 cases after the index case (1982: 112), while the index case is not necessar-
3 ily susceptible to hysterical reactions, but more importantly of high social
4 status. Teoh and Yeoh (1973: 288) confirm that in the prodromal stage,
5 the index case is usually dominant in the given population, and the sec-
6 ond and third cases are troubled personalities in the orbit of the index
7 case (cf. also Benaim et al. 1973). This sociometric pattern, in which
8 “the regressive effect of crowd behavior on intellectual and emotional
9 processes—and a small minority of unstable or emotionally labile indi-
10 viduals which often can be found to gravitate around index cases” (Sirois
11 1982: 104)—plays an important role, can unfortunately not be confirmed
12 for the Bukoba event. The the relevant data has simply not been recorded
13 by Rankin and Philip, although “three pupils” were identified as the ini-
14 tial group affected (1963: 167).

15 The general spreading pattern of MPI after the prodromal stage is
16 characterized by a snowballing effect with early satiation, the quick
17 drop-off being accelerated through outside forces (Kerckhoff and Back
18 1968: 35). At first sight, this appears not to be the case for the Bukoba
19 event, which lasted long without drop-offs, yet these are better under-
20 stood as relapses, in particular the case in the original population (A.2 in
21 subsection 3.1) and in individuals. Rather, Sirois identifies the Bukoba ep-
22 idemic as a case of “diffuse outbreak” (1982: 107) combining the spread
23 pattern of closed and open settings: “Its prodromal stage is obscure, but
24 the epidemic spread starts in the typical explosive manner in a closed set-
25 ting, the school, but then spreads into the community, and the subsequent
26 “rebound stage is spectacular” (ibid.).⁴ The Bukoba event started in the
27 school environment and then spread into the communities/families (cases
28 under B. in subsection 3.1), where it lingered. Thus, it appears to combine
29 the propelling factors of the two typical developments: “the most com-
30 mon outbreaks—those in schools and places of business—tended to be
31 of short duration, whereas those in communities and families tended to
32 last longer” (Boss 1997: 238).

33 The general problem of the lack of information on the social composi-
34 tion of the affected population in the Bukoba case is grave and obvious,
35 as Sirois recognizes: “When the outbreak lasts longer (Kagwa 1964; Ran-
36 kin and Philip 1963), it is often found that the reservoir of susceptible per-
37 sons is much larger than originally suspected. this meant that important
38 and more general aspects necessary for the understanding of the situa-
39 tion were missed and the original group was only instrumental in the

1 outbreak” (1982: 108). This points to the importance of identifying not
2 only clinical aspects and the underlying triggering event of the epidemic,
3 if any, but also the sociocultural context, which Rankin and Philip (1963)
4 were not able to do sufficiently. This is not so much a fault of oversight,
5 but the Bukoba case occurred when the model of MPI had not yet ma-
6 tured as a concept, and a main issue in ‘mass hysteria’ research was to
7 eliminate potential physical causes.

8
9 4.1.4. *Anxiety vs. motor variant.* In the previous paragraphs, different
10 types of MPI were described mainly with respect to their development.
11 But a more important variance is characterized by different types of
12 symptoms. This is reflected in Wessely’s (1987) convincing distinction of
13 two main types of MPI: “mass anxiety hysteria covers outbreaks demar-
14 cated by the phenomena of anxiety abdominal pain, chest tightness, dizzi-
15 ness, fainting, headache, hyperventilation, nausea and palpitation” (1987:
16 112) and “mass motor hysteria,” which such symptoms as seizures, drop
17 attacks, hysterical dancing, running, and, in three cases, described in
18 Dhadphale and Shaikh (1983), Ebrahim (1968), and Rankin and Philip
19 (1963), respectively, also laughing. Accordingly, Wessely classifies the
20 Bukoba outbreak as “mass motor hysteria” (1987: 112). A difference cor-
21 roborating this classification is that, in contrast to anxiety types, motor
22 hysteria attacks “may persist for months or even years” (Wessely 1987:
23 113), which holds for the case under scrutiny here and makes the ac-
24 count of the episode appear less fantastic. A case described in (Nandi
25 et al. 1985) is assumed to have involved relapses over a period of ten
26 years.

27 The distinctive symptoms of motor-variant MPI must be discussed in
28 connection with the underlying causes, namely the possibility of escape
29 from stress situations, which will be attempted below (subsections 4.2).
30 The motor variant can be used for that purpose only if its more extreme
31 symptoms are accepted as symptoms of illness in the cultural context in
32 which they occur. This social acceptability of motor-variant symptoms
33 appears to be lower in Western cultures. These cultures have ‘clinicalized’
34 scripts of disease, into which symptoms like dancing, laughing and
35 running cannot be accommodated. This would also explain, why in the
36 motor-variant epidemic originating in Bukoba “[n]o literate and relatively
37 sophisticated members of society have been attacked” (Rankin and Philip
38 1963: 167). From a historical perspective, Boss points out that in the
39 period from 1872 to 1972, surveyed in Sirois (1974), motor-variant

1 symptoms are more commonly reported, while in the period from 1973 to
2 1993 anxiety variant symptoms prevail (1997: 238). In short, today and
3 in so-called Western societies, dizziness and fainting can earn you a day
4 home from work, while laughing and dancing will earn you odd looks.
5 In the period until 1972 and in so-called traditional societies, laughing
6 and dancing will also have been considered as symptoms of disease.

7

8

9 4.2. *Causes: Sociocultural transition and stress*

10

11 Rankin and Philip stress that “[t]he type of mental disorder that affects a
12 community is influenced by the culture of the particular community”
13 (1963: 170). More specifically, as we saw in the previous subsection, the
14 culture of the community also strongly predicts the variant of MPI that
15 may occur in it. These observations about types of symptoms point in
16 the direction of a meaningful explanation for underlying causes of MPI,
17 which will turn out to be more complex and tentative than previous at-
18 tempts in humor-related and other literature that have aimed to reduce it
19 to contagion or viral infections. Sirois summarizes that a “state of ideo-
20 logical or cultural transition is frequently noted to be associated, as well
21 as periods of uncertainty and social stress like wars, endemic diseases, or
22 technological changes” (1982: 106). Tanganyika clearly underwent such a
23 period at the time of the epidemic. Therefore, the analysis of the Bukoba
24 event in terms of cultural factors and stressors will be facilitated by a brief
25 outline of the political situation in Tanganyika (cf. Ofcansky and Yeager
26 1997), before I will turn to the specific local factors at the mission-run
27 boarding school in Bukoba and similar settings.

28

29 The area of Tanganyika was a colony since the late 1880s. It was con-
30 trolled first by Germany, officially as “Deutsch-Ostafrika” since 1891,
31 and after World War I became a mandate territory of Great Britain in
32 1919 and practically part of the British Empire. Like in other African
33 colonies, no strong independence movement developed until after World
34 War II, when the U.N. as the successor to the League of Nations renewed
35 the mandate to Britain with the obligation to prepare the country for
36 independence. The most prominent African figure in the intensifying
37 struggle for Tanganyikan independence, Julius K. Nyerere, formed the
38 openly anticolonial Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) with
39 collaborators in 1954. During Nyerere’s term as first Prime Minister, the
country achieved full independence on December 9, 1961. It appears

1 likely that these political events, less than two months from the outbreak
2 of the Bukoba event on January 30, 1962, and in addition the abandon-
3 ment of racial division in schools since January 1, 1962, increased the so-
4 ciocultural stress situation in the young country in general (cf. Wessely
5 1987: 114). Very similar developments occurred to the neighboring
6 countries, mainly Uganda, independent since 1962, but also Rwanda, Bu-
7 rundi, Kenya, and Zambia, from which the related motor-variant epi-
8 demics are reported (cf. subsection 3.2).

9 As briefly mentioned above, the local situation in the school setting can
10 also increase stress as it is a point of friction and transition where the
11 students from the traditional tribal society are confronted with Western
12 methods of instruction, educational expectations, and religious-moral
13 values (Boss 1997: 234). In addition, the transition of the students through
14 adolescence takes place while they are separated from their families.
15 Stearns agrees that these factors result in “anxiety, guilt feeling, loss of
16 identity, feelings whose repression by schooling and discipline finally re-
17 sulted in aggressive-compulsive behavior or conversion hysteria” (1972:
18 43), his term for a specific type of MPI.

19 The high indication for MPI of the specific situation at boarding
20 schools in countries in transition is corroborated by the research on
21 motor-variant cases by Teoh and colleagues (e.g., Teoh and Yeoh 1973;
22 Teoh et al. 1975). Teoh and Yeoh (1973) focuses on cultural transition
23 as the central stress factor for a group of young college women involved
24 in a MPI episode in Malaysia. In particular the way these changes affect
25 the educational system is considered a crucial environmental factor for
26 MPI (1973: 284):

27
28 [W]ith higher educational expectations of the Malay rural parents for their
29 children, greater pressure is imposed on these children [...] These adolescent
30 girls, away from home, seek alternative culturally-sanctioned modes of expressing
31 their frustration in this transitional period, in the form of outbreaks of epidemic
32 hysteria.

33 Sirois summarizes the general factors of this endemic propensity, which
34 correspond to observations of Muluka et al. (1985: 251) for a similar Ke-
35 nyan case, as follows: “outbreaks in Malaysia were detected in schools in
36 1970–1971, after the 1969 troubles and in a context of administrative and
37 educational changes” (1982: 109).

38 In sum, we find a transitional stress-inducing situation both in the
39 country, which is in the process of consolidating its recently gained

1 independence, in general and in the specific circumstances of the affected
2 population in particular, namely, separation from family, adolescence,
3 and confrontation with Western educational and other standards. Which
4 of these factors is more important, and which may not even pertain, and
5 which may have been overlooked, especially at the individual and prodromal
6 group level, can no longer be clearly decided for the Bukoba event.
7 But I argue that a combination of these factors creates a stress-inducing
8 context that is the indirect cause of the epidemic event described by Rankin
9 and Philip (1963).

10
11

12 4.3. *Potential purpose: Advantages of the sick-role*
13

14

15 Although it is neither instrumental for the assessment of the veracity of
16 the reports on the Bukoba case, nor for the analysis of the role of laughter
17 in the event, a central point for the general understanding of the epidemic
18 as a case of MPI is the question for possible motives of the affected
19 population. Since they are experiencing a disease event, the victims are
20 normally not consciously aware of the reason for their symptoms: “The
21 common feature of the stressors underlying outbreaks of mass motor hysteria
22 is an inability on the part of the subjects either to comprehend the true
23 nature of the threat facing them or to avoid it” (Wessely 1987: 115).
24 This subsection will accordingly be the most speculative and controversial⁵
25 of the present study.

26 As briefly mentioned above and in accordance with most research on
27 MPI (e.g., Boss 1997; Kerckhoff and Back 1968; Wessely 1987), I see the
28 reason for people suffering from severe stress and anxiety to exhibit the
29 symptoms of MPI in that they may afford them an escape from the situation
30 that induces the stress and anxiety. “Outbreaks provide a temporary
31 escape from stress because factories, offices, or schools close while investigations
32 are under way” (Boss 1997: 237). This advantage of MPI is
33 identical to that of the sick-role in general: The sufferer can evade a situation
34 that they are otherwise expected to endure. The central case of motor-variant
35 MPI reported by Nandi et al. (1985) is remarkable in this respect: The eight
36 women affected by the symptoms relapsed over more than a decade (1985:
37 248), and the instrumental nature of their episodes in escaping the beating
38 by their alcoholic husbands is a shared stressor rather directly addressed
39 by their behavior.

1 The symptoms must be socially acceptable in a given cultural context
2 for MPI to fulfill this function, which explains the difference of MPI vari-
3 ants presented above in two ways. First, as Kerckhoff and Back observe:
4 “What occurs in cases of hysterical contagion is that physiological symp-
5 toms, which occur largely as a result of unresolved psychological stress,
6 are explained (and thus responded to) in terms of a newly invented label”
7 (1968: 34). In other words, the purported trigger—in Western societies
8 for example, nuclear fallout, viruses, or environmental contaminants, in
9 traditional societies for example, witchcraft and curses, poisoned food, or,
10 insect bites—as well as the symptoms—*anxiety symptoms and extreme*
11 *motor behavior, respectively*—that provide a socially acceptable rational-
12 ization of the socially unacceptable behavior of leaving the workplace,
13 school, or any other stress-inducing situation, must be socially acceptable.

14 A very telling ‘confession’ by an index case of an epidemic was char-
15 acterized by a falling symptom among adolescent students of a London
16 school supports this escapism argument: “I enjoyed the attention this
17 malady afforded and the general concern of everyone around me. [...] I
18 used it as an escape from the problems I could not face at home and at
19 school, and became completely wrapped up in it” (Benaim et al. 1973:
20 369). In sum, there are “rewards to be gained from being sick” (Muluka
21 et al. 1985: 251). But these rewards can be reaped only if the sickness is
22 presented as evoked by a socially acceptable cause and expressed in so-
23 cially acceptable symptoms. Under these circumstances MPI can afford
24 its victims the advantages of the sick-role. It must be cautioned, again,
25 that the rationalization presented in this section is the most speculative
26 part of the present discussion, and that the secondary sick-role advantage
27 is usually not an explanation for all individuals involved.

28

29

30 **5. Potential additional explanations**

31

32 On the basis of the previous sections, it should have become obvious that
33 the laughter involved in the Tanganyikan epidemic was one of the symp-
34 toms of motor-variant MPI. But before I can turn to a summary of the
35 argument that leads to this conclusion, I want to briefly address addi-
36 tional research and explanatory attempts besides MPI that can help clar-
37 ify what may have taken place in 1962 and what may not, both because
38 the explanations pertain to the case and because they are thought to per-
39 tain to it, but don’t.

1 5.1. *Pathological laughter*

2
3 A different and obviously oversimplified explanation is to declare the
4 laughter involved in the Bukoba event to be pathological laughter of a
5 specific type reported in other cases (cf. Black 1982). This kind of laugh-
6 ter is inappropriate, unmotivated, as well as involuntary (cf. Shaibani
7 et al. 1994: 243) and continuous (Arlazaroff et al. 1998: 184). Apart from
8 brain lesions (cf. Parvizi et al. 2001) and other diseases with organically
9 distinct causes, psychiatric disorders that include pathological laughter
10 and crying (PLC) as a symptom include hysteria. Arlazaroff et al. (1998)
11 describe a patient who has fits of pathological laughter after hitting her
12 head in a car accident. While no social transmission is involved, the spells
13 of this patient occurred mainly in stressful or delicate situations [. . .].”
14 (1998: 186). Thus, while PLC is a related symptom, it cannot account
15 for the epidemic dimensions of the Bukoba event.
16

17 5.2. *Physiology of laughter*

18
19 The extent to which the laughter symptom is reported to have lasted dur-
20 ing the epidemic event can also be evaluated from a physiological per-
21 spective, a research topic since Spencer (1860). Physiological aspects of
22 laughter — prominently respiration and phonation — vary across genders,
23 individuals, and also in the output of one individual along various factors
24 (cf. Black 1984; Fry and Rader 1977; Hauser et al. 1997). In general it is
25 an extremely exhausting activity, resulting in a signal that is more compa-
26 rable in volume to shouting at up to 80 dB (Rothgänger et al. 1998) than
27 to normal speech at ca. 60 dB. The muscles involved in the exhalation
28 crucial for laughter — diaphragm, abdominal and rib cage muscles — are
29 usually not active in that part of the breathing cycle (Ruch and Ekman
30 2001: 432) and thus not well trained for it. In addition, during laughter
31 there is a pronounced antagonism between the opposing sets of muscles
32 for inspiration and expiration, which are normally working alternately.
33 This produces the extraordinarily high levels of expiration and subglottal
34 air pressure in laughter, up to five times as much as in normal phonation
35 (Ohala 1990; Schroetter 1925), which are usually followed by long peri-
36 ods of apnea (Lloyd 1938). Because of all these factors, humans tire
37 quickly from the saccadic contractions required for laughter, as witnessed
38 by the soreness of abdominal and thoracic muscles after extensive laugh-
39 ing and, vice versa, the painfulness of laughter after exercising that has

1 involved abdominal muscles. Laughing continuously for long stretches of
2 time—as they are understood by some to be implied by the overall length
3 of the epidemic event in Tanganyika—must be considered impossible.
4 These gelotological results indicate that only short episodes of laughter
5 can be symptoms of a the motor-variant of MPI. They could last for
6 seconds at a time, and only be repeated over short stretches for each indi-
7 vidual, but not over hours, weeks, or even months as claimed in some re-
8 ports on the ‘laughing epidemic.’

10 5.3. *Contagious laughter*

12 A seemingly plausible interpretation of the epidemic reduces the cause
13 to the contagiousness of laughter (cf. Black 1982). This argument is rep-
14 resented most prominently by Provine (1992, 1996), and has received
15 much attention since the publication of Provine (2000) and the subse-
16 quent resurgence of reports on the event: “The power of contagious
17 laughter as a social coupling process is suggested by a persistent epidemic
18 of laughter that began among 12- to 18-year-old girls in a boarding
19 school in Tanganyika and spread throughout a district, requiring the
20 closing of schools” (1992: 1). As we have seen in the preceding discussion,
21 the event cannot be reduced to laughter as the central symptom. Thus,
22 the undeniably contagiousness of laughter at short range, unsuccessfully
23 modeled by Provine’s laughter detector-generator (2000: 149), cannot
24 serve an explanation for an event of the extent of the motor-variant MPI
25 case that took place in Bukoba.

28 5.4. *Viral infection and environmental contaminants*

30 As we have seen above, there are attempts to explain the ‘laughter epi-
31 demic’ as a reaction to a virus (Cardoso 2003) or environmental contam-
32 inant. Rankin and Philip (1963) excluded a limited number of such possi-
33 ble causes. Since no blood samples are known to have been preserved, no
34 update of their falsification of such causes can be attempted. Yet, I would
35 argue that this is not necessary, as there are no known viruses or con-
36 taminants leading to the symptoms described for the event, while MPI
37 provides us with a plausible theory.

38 In oral communication, similarities in symptoms—and more tenta-
39 tively in cause—to Kuru have been pointed out to me (cf. also Conley

1 1963). Kuru, also called the “laughing sickness,” is a well-documented
2 (e.g., Gajdusek 1963, 1976) type of transmissible spongiform encephalo-
3 pathology, in which prions transmitted through the ritual eating of the brains
4 of recently deceased humans cause fatal brain deterioration. One com-
5 mon symptom in the final stages of Kuru are short episodes of laughter
6 (cf. also Virani and Jain 2001). Yet, there is only one connection between
7 the “laughter epidemic” and this “laughter disease”: The ironic associa-
8 tion of a sad event, a disease, with a seemingly happy symptom, laughter,
9 in both cases leads to their analogous names.⁶ This also reflected in
10 phrases like “plague of laughter” (Provine 2000: 1313) and taken to the
11 extreme in the title of Zigas (1990): “Laughing Death.”

12 13 **6. Conclusion** 14

15 The Tanganyika laughter epidemic is a case of motor-variant mass psy-
16 chogenic illness. This is the result of the present reassessment of the
17 original report on the event and corroborated by reports on similar events
18 under similar circumstances. Although emphasized in reports on the epi-
19 demic, laughter in this context is just one of several symptoms, even if it
20 makes a descriptive name based on the ironic contrast between a sign of
21 joy and merriment, on the one hand, and a painful disease event, on the
22 other. Laughter played a much smaller role in the event than most current
23 descriptions claim, not least because laughing on an epidemic scale is
24 physiologically impossible. The laughter in the event is not caused by a
25 humorous stimulus that transmits it. It is not a case of contagious laugh-
26 ter, neither as emotional or behavioral contagion, but only one of several
27 common symptoms of motor-variant MPI, none of which could be trig-
28 gered by or trigger laughter, e.g., running or seizures. For these reasons
29 it is suggested that the present article should be the last to discuss the
30 ‘laughter epidemic’ in research on humor, other than to illustrate the dis-
31 sociation of laughter and humor.

32
33 *Georgia Southern University*
34

35 **Notes** 36

37 Correspondence address: hempelma@mac.com

- 38 1. The author would like to thank Robert E. Bartholomew, Willibald Ruch, and the two
39 anonymous referees for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

- 1 2. An even wilder account can be found in Shibles (n.d.): “Between 1962 and 1964 it is
2 reported that 1000 people in Tanganyika and Uganda (especially girls in Catholic con-
3 vent schools) died in a group laughing epidemic. The report, it would seem, would need
4 detailed checking.” Indeed.
5 3. It comprises only four pages, one of which is taken up by a map of the area around
6 Lake Victoria.
7 4. Sirois (1982: 110) ascribes a report on an episode of “collective running [that] shows an
8 underlying fantasy of being savagely attacked and contaminated by some atomic
9 power.” to “Rankin and Philip (1964) [sic].” It is unclear which source he is referring
10 to as no such explanations are proposed by Rankin and Philip (1963) nor by Rawnsley
11 and Loudon (1964), the next entry in his bibliography that also corresponds in page
12 number to his citation.
13 5. Ascribing psychological motivations is always a speculative business as well as one sel-
14 dom well received by those whose role as sufferers from a disease it evaluates. A prime
15 example for this is the controversy over the Joint Royal College Report on chronic
16 fatigue syndrome, one of the authors of which is Wessely (Royal College of Physicians
17 et al. 1996).
18 6. There is one further coincidental connection at the perimeter of Kuru that has no impact
19 on the present argument: “Five young females, they had allegedly been typical advanced
20 Kuru cases whose progressive symptoms had ceased. All five, like Teirari, were in close
21 contact with other Kuru victims, and being of emotional, somewhat hysterical tempera-
22 ment, had developed what was obviously a hysterical mimicry of Kuru” (Zigas 1990:
23 285).

21 References

- 22
23 Arlazaroff, Aharon, Roberto Mester, Baruch Spivak, Colin Klein, and Paz Toren
24 1998 Pathological laughter: Common vs. unusual aetiology and presentation. *The
25 Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences* 35 (3), 184–189.
26 Banwell, Wilson
27 2000 Laughing. *University of Alberta Employee and Family Assistance Program
28 Quarterly* 5 (1).
29 Bartholomew, Robert E., and Simon Wessely
30 2002 Protean nature of mass sociogenic illness. From possessed nuns to chemi-
31 cal and biological terrorism fears. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 180, 300–
32 306.
33 Benaim, Silvio, John Horder, and Jennifer Anderson
34 1973 Hysterical epidemic in a classroom. *Psychological Medicine* 3, 366–373.
35 Black, Donald W.
36 1982 Pathological laughter. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases* 170, 67–71.
37 1984 Laughter. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 252 (21), 2995–
38 2998.
39 Boss, Leslie P.
1997 Epidemic hysteria: A review of the published literature. *Epidemiologic Re-
views* 19 (2), 233–243.
Brottman, Mikita
2002 Funny peculiar: Gershon Legman and the psychopathology of humor. MS,
Maryland Institute College of Art.

The Tanganyika 'laughter epidemic' 69

- 1 Cardoso, Silvia
2 2003 Interview by Sophie Petit-Zeman. *Hypnomonthly*. Available at: http://hypnomonthly.com/articles/its_no_laughing_matter.htm
- 3 Colligan, Michael J., James W. Pennebaker, and Lawrence R. Murphy (eds.)
4 1982 *Mass Psychogenic Illness: A Social Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ:
5 Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 6 Conley, Robert
7 1963 Laughing malady puzzle in Africa. *The New York Times* August 8, L+, 29,
8 55.
- 9 Dhadphale, Manohar, and S. P. Shaikh
10 1983 Epidemic hysteria in a Zambian school: The mysterious madness of Mwini-
11 lunga. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 142, 85–88.
- 12 Ebrahim, G. J.
13 1968 Mass hysteria in school children. Notes on three outbreaks in East Africa.
14 *Clinical Pediatrics* 7 (7), 437–438.
- 15 Fleck, Ludwik
16 1981 [1935] *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*. Chicago: Chicago University
17 Press.
- 18 Fry, William F., Jr., and Con Rader
19 1977 The respiratory components of mirthful laughter. *Journal of Biological Psy-
20 chology* 19 (2), 39–50.
- 21 Gajdusek, D. Carleton
22 1963 Motor-neuron disease in natives of New Guinea. *New England Journal of
23 Medicine* 268, 474–476.
- 24 1976 Unconventional viruses and the origin and disappearance of Kuru. Nobel
25 Lecture, December 13. In *Nobel Lectures, Physiology or Medicine 1971–
26 1980*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 305–354.
- 27 Hauser, Gertrud, Hartmut Rothgänger, Aldo Carlo Cappellini, Assunta Guidotti, and
28 Alessandro Vienna
29 1997 The biology of laughter: Medical, functional, and anthropological-human
30 ethological aspects. In Jäkel, Siegfried, Asko Timonen, and Veli-Matti Rissa-
31 nen (eds.), *Laughter Down the Centuries*, vol. 3. Turku: Turun Yliopisto, 9–21.
- 32 Helvie, Carl O.
33 1968 An eEpidemic of hysteria in a high school. *Journal of School Health* 38,
34 505–509.
- 35 Holden, Robert
36 1993 *Laughter: The Best Medicine*. London: Thorsons.
- 37 Jones, Timothy F., Allen S. Craig, Debbie Hoy, Elaine W. Gunter, David L. Ashley, Dana
38 B. Barr, John W. Brock, and William Schaffner
39 2000 Mass psychogenic illness attributed to toxic exposure at a high school. *New
England Journal of Medicine* 342 (2), 96–100.
- 40 Kagwa, B. H.
41 1964 The problem of mass hysteria in East Africa. *East African Journal of Medi-
42 cine* 11 (41), 560–566.
- 43 Kerckhoff, Alan C., and Kurt W. Back
44 1968 *The June Bug: A Study of Hysterical Contagion*. New York: Appleton-
45 Century-Croft.
- 46 Lambo, Thomas A.
47 1965 Discussion contribution. In DeReuck, A. V. S., and Ruth Porter (eds.).
48 *Transcultural Psychiatry*. London: Churchill, 162–163.
- 49

- 1 Lloyd, E. L.
2 1938 The respiratory mechanism in laughter. *Journal of General Psychology* 19,
3 179–189.
- 4 McGrath, Joseph E.
5 1982 Complexities, cautions and concepts in research on mass psychogenic illness.
6 In Colligan, Michael J., James W. Pennebaker, and Lawrence R. Murphy
7 (eds.), *Mass Psychogenic Illness: A Social Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale,
8 NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 57–85.
- 9 Muhangi, Joseph R.
10 1973 A preliminary report on ‘mass hysteria’ in an Ankole school in Uganda.
11 *East African Medical Journal* 50 (6), 304–309.
- 12 Muluka, E. A. P., M. Dhadphale, and J. M. Mwita
13 1985 Family hysteria in a Kenyan setting. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*
14 173 (4), 249–252.
- 15 Nandi, Dhirenda Nath, G. Banerjee, Shibena Bera, Sabyasachi Nandi, and Parthasarathi
16 Nandi
17 1985 Contagious hysteria in a West Bengal village. *American Journal of Psycho-*
18 *therapy* 39, 247–252.
- 19 Ofcansky, Thomas P., and Rodger Yeager
20 1997 *Historical Dictionary of Tanzania*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- 21 Ohala, John J.
22 1990 Respiratory activity in speech. In Hardcastle, William J., and Alain Marchal
23 (eds.), *Speech Production and Speech Modeling*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 23–53.
- 24 Parvizi, Josef, Steven W. Anderson, Coleman O. Martin, Hanna Damasio, and Antonio R.
25 Damasi Brain
26 2001 Pathological laughter and crying: A link to the cerebellum. *Brain* 124 (9),
27 1708–1719.
- 28 Provine, Robert R.
29 1992 Contagious laughter: Laughter is a sufficient stimulus for laughs and smiles.
30 *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* 30, 1–4.
- 31 1996 Contagious yawning and laughter: Significance for sensory feature detection,
32 motor pattern generation, imitation, and the evolution of social behavior. In
33 Heyes, Cecilia M., and Bennett G. Galef, Jr. (eds.), *Social Learning in Ani-*
34 *mals: The Roots of Culture*. San Diego: Academic, 179–208.
- 35 2000 *Laughter: A Scientific Investigation*. New York: Viking.
- 36 Rankin, A. M., and P. J. Philip
37 1963 An epidemic of laughing in the Bukoba district of Tanganyika. *Central Af-*
38 *rican Journal of Medicine* 12 (9), 167–170.
- 39 Rawnsley, K., and Loudon, J. B.
1964 Epidemiology of mental disorder in a closed community. *British Journal of*
Psychiatry 110, 830–839.
- Rothgänger, Hartmut, Gertrud Hauser, Aldo Carlo Cappellini, and Assunta Guidotti
1998 Analysis of Laughter and Speech Sounds in Italian and German Students.
Naturwissenschaften 85, 394–402.
- Royal College of Physicians, Royal College of Psychiatrists, and Royal College of General
Practitioners
1996 *Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. Report of a Joint Working Group of the Royal*
Colleges of Physicians, Psychiatrists, and General Practitioners. CR54. Lon-
don: Royal College of Physicians of London. Available at: <http://dspace.dial.pipex.com/comcare/docs/brisrep.txt>

The Tanganyika 'laughter epidemic' 71

- 1 Ruch, Willibald, and Paul Ekman
2 2001 The expressive pattern of laughter. In Kaszniak, A. W. (ed.), *Emotion, Qualia, and Consciousness*. Tokyo: World Scientific Publisher, 426–443.
- 3 Schroetter, H.
4 1925 Zur Kenntnis des Energieverbrauches bei emotiven Äußerungen des Seelenlebens. *Monatsschrift für Ohrenheilkunde und Laryngo-Rhinologie* 59, 82–108.
- 5
6 Sebastian, Simone
7 2003 Examining 1962's 'laughter epidemic'." *Chicago Tribune* July 29, 2, 1, 4.
- 8 Seldon, Brad S.
9 1989 Adolescent epidemic hysteria presenting as a mass casualty, toxic exposure incident. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 18 (8), 892–895.
- 10 Shaibani, Aziz Taher, Marwan N. Sabbagh, and Rachelle Doody
11 1994 Laughter and crying in neurological disorders. *Neuropsychiatry, Neuropsychology, and Behavioral Neurology* 7 (4), 243–250.
- 12 Shibles, Warren
13 n.d. Humor reference guide. A comprehensive classification and analysis. Available at: <http://facstaff.uww.edu/shiblesw/humorbook>
- 14 Sirois, Francois
15 1974 Epidemic hysteria. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. Supplementum* 252, 1–46.
- 16 1982 Epidemic hysteria. In Roy, A. (ed.), *Hysteria*. Chichester: Wiley, 101–115.
- 17 Small, Gary W., and Jonathan F. Borus
18 1983 Outbreak of illness in a school chorus: Toxic poisoning or mass hysteria? *New England Journal of Medicine* 308 (11), 632–635.
- 19 Spencer, Herbert
20 1860 The physiology of laughter. *Macmillan's Magazine* 1, 395–402.
- 21 Stearns, Frederic R.
22 1972 *Laughing: Physiology, Pathophysiology, Psychology, Pathopsychology, and Development*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- 23 Teoh, J.-I., and K.-L. Yeoh
24 1973 Cultural conflict and transition: Epidemic hysteria and social sanction. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 7, 283–296.
- 25 Teoh, J.-I., S. Soewondo, and M. Sidharta
26 1975 Epidemic hysteria in Malaysian schools: An illustrative episode. *Psychiatry* 38, 258–268.
- 27 Trump, Eric
28 2002 Got the giggles? Join the club. *The New York Times* July 27, L, B7, B9.
- 29 Virani, M. J., and S. Jain
30 2001 Trigeminal Schwannoma associated with pathological laughter and crying. *Neurology India* 49, 162–165.
- 31 Wessely, Simon
32 1987 Mass hysteria: Two syndromes? *Psychological Medicine* 17, 109–120.
- 33 Zigas, Vincent
34 1990 *Laughing Death: The Untold Story of Kuru*. Clifton, NJ: Humana Press.
- 35
36
37
38
39

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39