

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 experimentation 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

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>

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.

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 meaningful 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.

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.