ATTACHMENT 3:   *Comments on Other Portions of the Black Notebook Materials*

The following are merely random comments pertaining a few portions
of the material in the black notebook. In some cases, I tend to agree
completely and have therefore offered no significant comment. In other
areas, the data are sufficiently scarce that no supporting or refuting
comments appear feasible. Nonetheless, comments are offered in the
order of presentation.

Regarding mechanisms on paranormal functioning, I concur that
several interesting hypotheses have been offered, and a few have been
subjected to modest uncontrolled experimentation. I also agree that
none of the theories has been sufficiently tested to warrant scientific
support or, in most cases, rejection. If one is interested in the
establishment of the PK or RV phenomena, then research can be conducted
in the absence of such theory. If one is interested in developing the
underlying theory, then it seems prudent to first demonstrate without
criticism the existence of the phenomenon and then to develop experimenta-
tion to evaluate the underlying theoretical constructs and mechanisms.
Since we have not achieved the first step, I personally find it rather
useless to hypothesize about underlying phenomena.

I totally agree with the comments offered by Dr. Orlansky on the
AMSAA experiments. Certainly, the material he presented is meaningful
and appropriate at the time at which it was written; it is perhaps even
more meaningful and appropriate now that we have had a chance to visit
the AMSAA individuals. The same comments apply to the summary written
by Dr. Cartwright and General Stahl on the AMSAA work. Their suggestions

1

have, of course, been incorporated further in that research. My only other comment is that HEL involvement would certainly be meaningful and helpful to those people, whether or not the Director of HEL feels it is politically wise for him to be involved. Certainly, HEL has been involved in previous classified activities, and that excuse bears no further discussion. If the issue is of sufficient importance to the Army to explore, and if behavioral expertise is necessary to do the exploration, then clearly HEL (or an equivalent organization) should be enlisted to support the research.

I similarly support the summary comments of Drs. Montgomery and Holloway on the MICOM activities. While the individuals at MICOM are competent physical scientists, they are totally unprepared to plan a meaningful program in this particular area, and the best that they might do with their present plans is to simply replicate the work being done elsewhere. Such a replication will give us no additional information, whether or not the results are the same. I would rather see funds not expended on such a replication and put into more meaningful and programmatic research activities.

2

ATTACHMENT 4: Comments on INSCOM and AMSAA Activities

Of the work reviewed on 27 and 28 September, I am extremely
impressed with what we saw at INSCOM and equally unimpressed with what
we saw at AMSAA.

The work at INSCOM shows excellent control, dedication, totally
unbiased approaches by the investigators, large amounts of data on
limited resources, and probably as much meaningful experimental data
as can be found in all the other activities combined. This is not to
say that the INSCOM program is not of a "demonstration" nature rather
than of a programmatic research nature, but it is clear that controlled
research could easily be "piggybacked" on the INSCOM work to produce
meanginful understanding and quantification. The fact that these
people have achieved as much as they have without knowing anything
about the underlying theory is greatly to their credit. The fact they
have the insight to instill the necessary experimental controls without
having had sufficient training in behavioral science is a major credit
to their intelligence. These are the individuals who are making the
most meaningful contribution today, in spite of the major sources of
funding going elsewhere. I would certainly prefer to see the monies
being spent at MICOM be diverted toward INSCOM to further this activity.
At the same time, INSCOM needs some technical assistance to make sure
that their experimentation is well controlled, their statistics are
meaningful, and that their work continues at a steady pace.

Conversely, the work at AMSAA seems to be adequately funded, staffed
by otherwise intelligent people, and decidedly a "random walk" process.

1

Granted they made early mistakes and have improved upon these. However, it also seems obvious that these people are not intrinsically interested in this subject matter, have greatly contaminated their approaches by communication between subjects and experimenters, and are inclined to "do things their way" in spite of appropriate scientific controls in such research areas. Basically, I see the AMSAA research as a continuous one of "targets of opportunity," with nothing rigorously preplanned, no rigid or logical evaluation criteria, no logical selection of viewers, etc. It generally appears to me that they do not know *what* to investigate or *why*, but rather they investigate whatever seems expedient at the time. For example, they have taken coordinates from SRI rather than generating coordinates from "targets." Even though 9 of the 12 "world-wide" targets obtained from SRI were in the San Francisco area, they continued the experiments anyway. This, after registering surprise at this rather biased-appearing sample.

Because of this feeling, I asked them specifically if they knew where they were going, what must be done in the future, how would they know when they achieved the results necessary to prove or disprove appropriate theories, etc. Their answers were vague. Their direction and requirements have obviously not been planned. I find it of questionable value to continue this type of experimentation with these individuals. Rather, I would see them providing mathematical and statistical expertise to people clearly more insightful and adept at conducting this type of research, such as the INSCOM people.

2