

COMMENTS ON FINDINGS

Finding 1)

The stated finding contains four distinct thoughts:

(a) RV research neither proves nor disproves existence of the phenomenon. (I concur.)

(b) Some RV experiences, however, are difficult to explain on the basis of presently known science. (I concur.)

(c) RV research has not contributed to describing the characteristics of the RV signal, such as bandwidth, form of modulation, attenuation with distance, or absorption. (I partially concur. I believe it to be important to explicitly conclude, given the failure to unequivocally prove the existence of the phenomenon, that isolation of the effect for purposes of characterizing it is unlikely to be fruitful. The experiments done in screen rooms and submarines purported to demonstrate low attenuation of the signal by distance, conduction electrons, and molecular absorption. This conclusion assumed successful RV events during the experiments. The experimental results are still, however, judged problematic—and thus the lack of transmission attenuation remains moot. Description of the signal parameters should be undertaken only after proof of existence is on a sounder basis.)

(d) RV research has not produced a physical model that explains the mechanisms of signal transmission. (I concur with this. I believe, further, that we should point out that until the signal can be parametrically described, attempts to model RV will be quite unsuccessful.)

I recommend, then, that "Finding 1" be split into four separate Findings, with the observations above concerning each one included.

Finding 2)

The finding, as stated, is a compound sentence, thus presenting two separate sub-findings. I believe the second clause is just supportive of the first. Even if the second clause is made adverbial, or even removed, I do not subscribe to the wording. In particular, the finding implies two ideas that I do not believe to be true: first, all RV events posing difficulties of physical explanation were not presented as "successful"—many were exhibited as "suggestive", "difficult to explain" or the like; second, "credibility" is not a binary concept,

This document is made available through the declassification efforts  
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

# The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

**Discover the Truth** at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

credence can be put, I believe, in the possibility of an RV phenomenon.

The "Finding 2", then, I recommend be rewritten into a far less negative statement.

Finding 3)

The finding as stated contains two thoughts the second of which is a recommendation. If the meaning of the second phrase is to say that the committee has not devised an experimental approach which would satisfy scientific requirements of proof, I recommend we so state, and make it a separate finding. I concur with the first clause as a finding.

Finding 4)

I concur with the first statement and disagree with the second. I discerned an explicit recognition of reliability limits in Ohio, Florida and Maryland.

Finding 5)

I believe this to be a general philosophical observation rather than a "Finding", and certainly not uniquely related to RV. Any but the most mundane engineering projects usually experience belief in false premises--beliefs devoutly held. This ubiquitous problem is solved by supervision, and is in fact, one of any management's principal tasks.

Finding 6)

Five thoughts are presented here, all important and, I believe deserving of separate emphasis in separate findings. I concur with each, although I would add the words "review and" after "management." The parenthetical remark goes without saying and should be removed.

Finding 7)

Four thoughts occur here. I cannot speak to the "medical" or "legal" insufficiency. Previous findings address the "scientific" deficiencies, and the lack of management supervision. I recommend this finding be restricted to "medical" and "legal" considerations.

Finding 8)

This finding contains two thoughts. The first I concur with, and recommend it be separated from the second. I cannot comment on the second.

Finding 9)

I would reorder the lead-in paragraph to read:

"The conduct of parapsychological research to first, prove existence of either PK or RV, and then, to characterize these phenomena, would---."

Subparagraph (1)—I would replace "several million" by "a million or more."

Subparagraph (2)—I would delete this in its entirety, since subparagraph 5 covers the intent of this Finding.

Subparagraphs (3), (4), and (5) I agree with.

Finding 10)

I concur.

Finding 11)

I concur.

Finding 12)

Hawke is not funded. I don't know about Phillips. The Finding implies adequacy of PK research funding. The implication, I believe, is false. I would recommend a finding that "non-statistical" experiments on PK are more amenable to scientific measurement than "random number" PK experiments, and are more scientifically attainable than RV experiments. I recommend a further finding that although PK and RV may well not be related, a convincing PK experiment will as well as validated RV phenomenon upset the present physical model of nature, and thus lend some impetus to careful RV investigations.

Finding 13)

I would delete this, first because we did not explore this area, and secondly, so what?

Finding 14)

I concur.

Finding 15)

I would delete this as unnecessary, given the previous findings.

Findings 16) and 17)

I cannot comment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1.

Since the visit to LLL, my assessment of the realizability of PK "proof" has altered. I believe the Hawke-type experiments should be supported. DoD can, and has, supported "basic research"—and has done so on a classified basis. Peer review is crucial, however, and should be accommodated under security restrictions.

Recommendation 1), then, I think, should be withheld pending further discussion.

Recommendation 2.

I suggest deleting 2a. (The statement as it stands implies inattention by management. I believe this can and should be covered in 2c.)

2c should have the words "direction, review" between "adequate" and "resources".

2e I believe the second clause can be left out; otherwise we are micro managing what we recommend be managed elsewhere.

Recommendation 3.

I concur.

Recommendation 4.

I would delete the first clause, thus starting the recommendation with "The \_\_\_\_\_ community---."

Recommendations 5 and 6.

I concur.