



University of Pittsburgh

ILLEGIB

Robert McConnell *RAM*
Room A234, Langley Hall
Biological Sciences Department
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260, U.S.A.

Office: (412) 624-4732

To: The Trustees of the American Society for Psychical Research:

Dr. C.B. Scott Jones, President; Dr. Irvin L. Child; Ms. Emily W. Cook, Ms. Eleanor Friede;
Mr. Eric C. Fruhstorfer; Dr. Robert Jahn; Dr. Edward F. Kelly; Dr. Stanley Krippner;
Mr. Alan F. MacRobert; Ms. Marilyn Schlitz; Dr. Nancy P. Sondow; Mr. Bret Suval

Date: October 3, 1991

Subject: The ASPR as Mediator Between the Two Cultures: The Physical and the Spiritual

Please note: In lieu of an Abstract, I have underlined some key passages.

Dear Trustee:

BACKGROUND

As a Voting Member of the American Society for Psychical Research, I have received from President Jones a letter dated 7 August 1991, transmitting, and requesting comment upon, a draft copy of proposed ASPR Bylaws together with six pages of criticism by Trustee Emily Cook.

I am sending this letter of comment to each of the Trustees because they have the legal power to revise the Bylaws and thus determine the future of the Society.

Because of the importance of the matters discussed, I am sending this letter to the Voting Members also and to others who may value the ASPR as a means for advancing the scientific understanding of psychic phenomena.

I hope that members of the ASPR who wish to express a viewpoint will write to the individual Trustees, "care of ASPR," 5 West 73rd Street, New York, NY 10023, marking their letters "Please forward." I would be pleased to receive copies of such letters. Nonmembers of the ASPR who wish to express agreement or disagreement with ideas in this letter may write directly to me.

As most of you know, the ASPR has its 1884 roots in the British Society for Psychical Research and took its present legal form in 1904. The principal assets of the ASPR are two:

A worldwide reputation for scientific integrity, principally established and maintained by the publication of the *Journal of the American Society for*

Psychical Research, but dependent upon all of the activities of the Society.

A net worth of about \$3 million, one million of which is in its wholly-owned home building located in the Borough of Manhattan, New York City.

The ASPR had an operating deficit of \$205,000 in 1989 and \$292,000 in 1990. Unless this trend is reversed, the ASPR will soon cease to exist. Suppositional methods for eliminating operating deficits have been a cause of recent contention within the ASPR. I shall not discuss our financial problems in this letter except to say that stable solvency will require increased membership, increased endowment, and decreased spending.

The ASPR has a mixed scientific and lay membership of about 1100. Ultimate control of the organization rests with some 60 Voting Members whose only legal obligation is to elect the Trustees.

The ASPR is the only sizable open-membership organization in the U.S. devoted to the furtherance of parapsychology as a science, and it is clearly the most powerful such organization in the world. I am writing because I believe that the future of the ASPR as a scientific organization is in danger. I regard this as important because the ASPR is the major bridge between scientific parapsychology and the general public.

In a recent opinion survey of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences membership (*JASPR*, 85[1991], 333-365) it was found that even after 100 years of scientific parapsychological research our

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>

leading scientists will not examine the experimental evidence for psychic phenomena. For that reason, the ASPR remains, in my opinion, the last best hope in our lifetimes of gaining recognition by our nation's civil leaders of the fact that parapsychology is a science and not a superstition.

Now, more than ever, I view the ASPR as belonging collectively to all of us who have devoted a substantial part of our lives to the study of psychic phenomena and not merely to the Voting Members who have accepted the responsibility for the well being and productivity of the Society. In this letter I am speaking not only to the Trustees and other Voting Members, but also to the larger community of all those who believe in the potential importance of psychic phenomena.

ADOPTION OF THE BYLAWS

First, I must deal with a technical matter primarily of interest to the Voting Members.

In his 7 August 1991 transmitting letter our President proposed the following schedule for adopting his revision of the ASPR Bylaws:

15 August: "Draft Bylaws completed and distributed to Voting Members [including Trustees] for comment." [Distributed along with Trustee Emily Cook's criticisms.]

15 September: "Closing date for receiving comments from Voting Members. Bylaws reviewed and revised on basis of comments."

10 October: "Final draft of Bylaws distributed to Board of Trustees."

26 October: "Board of Trustees meeting. Discussion and approval of Bylaws."

This schedule allows little time for interaction among Voting Members and between Voting Members and Trustees. According to the President's 7 August transmitting letter, the 7 August Bylaws draft was created by the President with the assistance of his Executive Director but without input from other members of the Bylaws Committee (the other members being Trustee Emily Cook and Voting Member Michael Knudsen).

As stated in his schedule, after the President has received the Voting Member comments, changes will be made as may be deemed desirable and a modified version, never seen by the Voting Members, will be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

The Trustees, who are mostly busy professional people with little time for ASPR affairs, will be given only two weeks to consider complex issues with which, in some cases, they have had no extended experience. President Jones has said that he

would prefer to get the Bylaws in place without getting bogged down in discussion.

In my opinion, Dr. Jones's schedule for the adoption of new Bylaws is unrealistic. If followed, I fear its practical effect will be to put the future of the ASPR into his hands. The immediate risk in this situation stems from the fact that Dr. Jones has not revealed his organizational aims and intended methods to any of the many Voting Members whom I have queried, and he has no known professional experience in science. His professional track record is only in the military and in politics. I shall have more to say later concerning what is known about Dr. Jones.

As I see it, the issues that must be decided by the Trustees in adopting new Bylaws are so complex and important that I urge the Trustees to delay adoption of any Bylaws at this time.

My detailed recommendation, which I shall state now but justify below, is (1) that the Trustees table any Bylaws draft presented to them at their next meeting, (2) that the Trustees order an independent revision of the Bylaws by a new Bylaws Committee, (3) that the President provide to each member of the new Bylaws Committee a copy of every communication he has received from Voting Members concerning the Bylaws revision, (4) that the ASPR paid staff be asked to provide all possible assistance to the new Bylaws Committee, (5) that the new Bylaws Committee be instructed to develop, by polling or otherwise, a clear picture of what the Voting Members, collectively, wish to have as the ASPR's objectives, and what methods they wish the ASPR to use in pursuing those objectives, (6) that the new Bylaws Committee be instructed to incorporate their findings into a new draft of Bylaws, (7) that this new draft be submitted to the Voting Members including the Trustees with ample opportunity for discussion and amendment before adoption, (8) that, after approval by the Voting Members, formal adoption take place no sooner than at the Trustee meeting after the next annual meeting of the Voting Members.

THE METHOD OF SELECTING TRUSTEES

The proposed 7 August 1991 version of ASPR Bylaws contains a number of technical problems needing resolution. However, in this letter I shall consider only some broader issues.

For reasons I shall explain, the proposed Bylaws appear intended to allow the president to control the policy of the ASPR. Although there are important supplementing paragraphs elsewhere in the Bylaws draft, the heart of the problem lies in the first paragraph of Article IV, Section 3, which I quote here for your convenience.

Section 3. Composition and Officers: The Board of Trustees shall consist of the President, two (2) Vice Presidents, Secretary, and Treasurer, and up to five (5) additional Board members. The total number [of Trustees] shall not exceed ten (10). At least seven (7) members of the Board shall reflect experience, training and education outside the field of parapsychology, and shall not be members of the governing bodies or staff of other psychical research (or parapsychological) organizations.

There are two features in this paragraph that need discussion: The reduction of Trustees from 12 to 10 and the restriction on the percentage of parapsychologists to be allowed on the Board.

I believe it would be unwise to reduce the number of Trustees, both because such a reduction would make capture of the Board by any one ideological faction substantially easier and because I believe that the number 12 allows the election of the minimum numbers of parapsychologists and other professionals needed to ensure wise and diverse thinking from inside as well as outside the field. If a change is to be made, I would hope that the number of Trustees could be increased.

Many persons unfamiliar with psychical research do not realize that among reputable parapsychologists there are widely divergent views about the nature of psychic phenomena and about the best way to advance parapsychology. These views are all legitimate to the degree that they are held by intelligent, knowledgeable persons. In a pre-theoretical science all such views must be allowed to flourish until they can be sorted out by time and experience. While such views cannot all be represented on the Board of Trustees, the Voting Members must be permitted to choose a sufficient number of parapsychologists to ensure breadth of representation and to allow for an occasional poor choice.

The proposal to limit the percentage of parapsychologists on the Board might be examined for advisability and for feasibility. First, as to advisability:

Parapsychology is the scientific study of psychic phenomena, and parapsychologists are those who seriously study psychic phenomena from a scientific point of view.

The ASPR is concerned solely with psychic phenomena. Any change in the Bylaws that will limit for Board membership the number of scientists most knowledgeable about psychic phenomena will change the basic character of the Society. Such a change is outside the power of the Trustees to make and can properly be made only by, or with the permission of, the Voting Members of the Society, whose responsibility it is to elect the Trustees.

Hence, the intention of President Jones to ask the Trustees to change the character of the ASPR without the approval of the Voting Members is improper.

This hasty plan to change the governing structure of the Society, coupled with the position of the ASPR as the pre-eminent bridge between scientists and the lay public, leads me to believe that as an organization we are facing a crisis of grave proportions.

The proposal to limit the number of parapsychologists on the Board to 30% of the total can also be examined for feasibility. In view of the impropriety of the proposal itself, the question of its feasibility is of interest only as it may illuminate the thinking behind the proposal.

According to the Bylaws proposal, at least 7 out of 10 Trustees "shall reflect experience, training, and education outside the field of parapsychology" This clause is intended as a legal basis for permitting or forbidding a Voting Member to be a Trustee candidate. It is essential that we know exactly what these words mean and how they are to be applied.

We have all had some "experience, training, and education outside the field of parapsychology" and, inevitably, our behavior "reflects" it. Hence, on that count, every Voting Member would be eligible to be a Trustee candidate. This Bylaw requirement is meaningless unless it is modified, as by the insertion of the word "only" after "reflect." The sentence then becomes starkly offensive. Perhaps, instead, the word "primarily" was intended? If so, what does "primarily" mean, or who will decide its meaning?

The same Bylaw sentence says: "At least seven members of the Board shall . . . not be members of the governing bodies or staff of other psychical research (or parapsychological) organizations."

Because our field is small, one effect of this rule would be to eliminate as potential Trustees a substantial fraction of those most competent to serve. An analogous rule among the directors of industry would be considered ridiculous or sinister unless some clear and compelling public purpose were thereby to be served.

Upon second reading, this Bylaw sentence becomes even more puzzling. How is the expression "psychical research (or parapsychological) organization" to be interpreted. Several organizations largely concerned with research on psychic phenomena make a point of avoiding use of the identifying words, "psychical" and "parapsychological." Who will decide whether or not an organization is parapsychological, and by what definition? This is not a carefully thought out Bylaw paragraph, and I doubt that it reflects the wishes of the Voting Members.

ASPR OBJECTIVES

When I first learned of Dr. Jones's plan to decrease the number of scientists to a minority on the Board of Trustees, it occurred to me that, even if this decrease were to be attempted informally, it would be necessary to take the following actions to safeguard the essential character and purpose of the Society:

- (1) Create through the Bylaws a legal presumption favoring the scientific principles that have guided the ASPR since its recapture from the Spiritualists in 1941 by Gardner Murphy and George Hyslop.
- (2) Strengthen the role of the Voting Members so that control of the organization could not be wrested from them by a small group of wayward Trustees.
- (3) Specify and perhaps modify our organizational objectives in the light of recent progress in our knowledge of parapsychology and in consideration of the temper of the times in which we live.

To that end, I sent a letter to the Voting Members on 7 June 1991, followed by a supplementing letter on 9 July 1991. For your convenience I have added an appendix hereto, summarizing and extending my earlier thoughts.

In my earlier letters I offered for possible incorporation into the Bylaws:

- A simple, clear statement of the kind of members we wish to serve.
- Ways of tightening the qualifications for Voting Membership and for increasing the power of the Voting Members.
- Some tactical rules of conduct to be followed in reaching our long-range goals.
- Several strategic objectives and activities that the ASPR should avow and pursue.
- Two reputation-damaging activities that the ASPR should avoid.

None of these ideas appears in the 7 August Bylaws draft, and there is no hint that they were considered.

Instead, what appears in the Bylaws draft as "Article II: Objectives" are vague promises and hopes that lack intellectual incisiveness and would allow this or any future president to proceed in almost any direction he chose without guidance or restraint. Under the draft's "Objectives" there would be nothing to discourage the "New Age" equivalent of the infamous Margery Crandon research circa 1930.

The first listed objective in this Bylaws draft will serve to illustrate the illusional quality of all six:

"(1) To promote, conduct, and support psychical research and to disseminate research findings."

These words make beautiful, comforting music, but I find them insulting to common sense because they fail to specify what methods will be used and what is meant by "research." So vague are the Objectives that the quasi-religious activities of the Association for Research and Enlightenment, which is devoted to the veneration of the deceased psychic, Edgar Cayce, could be regarded as suitable for the ASPR.

The absence of any statement of clearcut objectives (other than to continue our archival library), or of principles to guide the attainment of those objectives, or of safeguards against deviation from those principles suggests to me that the 7 August draft of the Bylaws is part of a well-intended plan to take control of ASPR policy away from those unimaginative, foot-dragging scientists.

ABOUT OUR PRESIDENT
(A personal assessment)

Dr. C. B. Scott Jones has a history of distinguished public service. He was a U.S. Navy flier for 30 years. He fought in the Korean War in 1950 and 1952 and later served in Naval Intelligence. After leaving the Navy, he worked for seven years in corporate research under the auspices of the intelligence community and the Defense Nuclear Agency. He was awarded a Ph.D. by American University for his political knowledge of South Asia. For six years ending with 1990, he served as an aide to the Chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In early 1991 Dr. Jones created a private organization called the "Human Potential Foundation." A transitional letterhead suggested that this organization is related to his "Center for Applied Anomalous Phenomena," which has existed for some years at his home address. I have not yet received from Dr. Jones a promised brochure describing his Human Potential Foundation, and, hence, am not privy to its public purposes.

It is reported that Dr. Jones has experienced repeated spontaneous ESP. It is reasonable to assume that these experiences led him to devote much of his energy to the field of psychic phenomena for the last nine years. Dr. Jones is now serving his third consecutive year as president of the ASPR.

Dr. Jones and I share many values and opinions relating to psychic phenomena. We also have differences of a profound nature. If my following estimation of him is in error, I trust he will offer a correction by whatever medium he deems appropriate.

By historically different routes, Dr. Jones and I have been convinced that, in a scientific sense, consciousness transcends the sensory-motor channels to the brain. We both recognize that the acceptance of this idea by the majority of well-educated people would alter the world view upon which Western culture is based and would have profound social consequences.

We both are of the opinion that our scientific leaders have betrayed a trust by failing to examine the evidence for psychic phenomena. My response to this situation is as follows: I think I understand the complex of reasons for scientists' individual and collective failure in this regard, but I also have deep appreciation for the contributions to the welfare of humanity these same scientists have rendered in their own specialities.

Dr. Jones and I agree that, because of scientists' refusal to examine the experimental evidence, their opposition to psychical research will have to be circumvented by appealing directly to educated lay people. However, I believe that the ultimate acceptance of psychical phenomena by orthodox science is crucial and must have our continuing attention and, indeed, that we must exert every effort to earn the respect of our colleagues in other areas of science. It is not clear that Dr. Jones shares this belief.

We both are impatient with the unwillingness of many parapsychologists to consider the possible implications of psychic phenomena, and with their apparent inability to analyze their own motivations for opposing the publication of parapsychological ideas with which they disagree.

Dr. Jones believes that it is time for parapsychologists to begin applying psychic phenomena. I do not go that far. For several reasons I believe it is urgent for parapsychologists to begin research directed toward the useful application of psychic phenomena even though we still have only the faintest glimmer of theoretical understanding and control. However, I believe that the attempted *contractual* use of psychic phenomena at this time would create a conflict of interest and would destroy the scientific credibility of any parapsychological organization that advocated it. I use the expression "attempted contractual use" in a broad sense, meaning, "offering to produce useful psychic effects."

We both believe that the ASPR is in need of rebirth, but I regard this as a dangerous venture that must be safeguarded by public discussion and by a legally binding declaration of our principles, objectives, and methods.

Dr. Jones has spent a professional lifetime divided between the military establishment and national politics. He is a practical man of action. He

respects science in terms of its utility. However, by his public endorsements, by his writing and speaking, and by his August 7 draft of Bylaws as analyzed above, Dr. Jones has led me reluctantly to the conclusion that he does not understand the method and ethic of science.

Dr. Jones has been known to base his judgment of the reality of a phenomenon upon the sincerity and self-assurance of its advocates or upon their standing among their similarly committed colleagues. Perhaps this is because he is unable to bring to bear a comprehensive scientific perspective of his own that could yield useful estimates of the probability of truth in specific pioneering claims. Such estimates are facilitated by knowing the criteria by which one can usually distinguish frontier science from pseudoscience. Without such estimates there can be no escape from the morass of nonsensical claims that constantly threaten to engulf us.

APPENDIX: SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

SCOPE OF MEMBERSHIP

I believe that the ASPR's educational program should be oriented to attract parapsychologists, of course, but also to (1) persons who "think most successfully with the right brain" (e.g., artists), (2) educated persons who believe they have had psychic experiences, and (3) members of the helping professions who might find in parapsychology a promise of an answer to some of their professional concerns.

For bylaw purposes, however, we might write simply:

The ASPR aims to serve all those who seek scientific understanding of the phenomena commonly called "psychic" which they or others claim to have experienced.

GUIDING RULES

We must attract and hold the kind of members who will help us reach our long-range goals.

In dealing with our members and the public, we must act at all times to preserve and enhance the Society's historical reputation for scientific integrity.

There must be no turning inward upon ourselves or away from the Intellectual Establishment even though, for the present, it rejects parapsychology.

PURPOSES AND ACTIVITIES

The ASPR's governing document should contain statements describing its role and expressing its objectives in a way that clearly differentiates it from other somewhat related organizations, such as the Parapsychological Association, The Society for

Scientific Exploration, the International Society for the Study of Subtle Energies and Energy Medicine, the Institute of Noetic Sciences, and the Association for Research and Enlightenment. The role I suggest for the ASPR would be distinguished by the following proposed Bylaws:

[1] The ASPR aims to advance scientific understanding of psychic phenomena and also understanding of the sociological status of parapsychology as a science.

Comment: The sociological status of parapsychology will determine societal support and, in turn, scientific progress. To improve our image, we need to know how we are perceived.

[2] The ASPR provides a bridge for the direct passage of knowledge of parapsychology between scientists and lay persons.

Comment: This is an aim we have always tacitly pursued. It clearly differentiates the ASPR from other existing U.S. organizations and is a crucial implementation of our first above purpose.

[3] By acting as a broker of information, the ASPR will strive to transform the relationship between the Two Cultures, the physical and the spiritual, from one of mutual rejection to one of common understanding.

Comment: This proposed goal is a logical extension of our aim to provide a bridge for the transfer of information. This goal would address indirectly but fundamentally what many consider the most desperate need of our time, namely, the need for common values by which inter-national and inter-cultural differences may be resolved. If we choose this aim for our Society, we shall ennoble our efforts and attract support from new sources.

What is lacking, to begin with, between the physical and the spiritual camps is mutual respect. By its findings, parapsychology provides a scientific basis for such respect. In its work, the ASPR should build confidence by displaying understanding and appreciation for the values of both sides. Unification of views will come in due time, but only on the basis of empirical observation.

The word "spiritual" as used here does not imply the existence of spirits or of a soul having existence independent of the brain; these being matters of which we cannot, at least for the present, speak with scientific knowledge.

[4] The ASPR is concerned with psychic phenomena primarily as they relate to the mind-body problem in its basic scientific, philosophic, and potentially practical aspects, rather than as these phenomena might

have immediate relevance to medicine, spiritual uplift, individual self-development, or to scientific anomalies in general.

Comment: These other concerns are being pursued by other organizations, often necessarily by "rough and ready" methods. Their pursuit by the ASPR in the present state of scientific uncertainty cannot be done effectively without compromising the ASPR's role as a public arbiter of parapsychological knowledge.

Moreover, while these concerns are of great and largely self-centered interest to many people, they are not at the core of the intellectual dispute between the Two Cultures. They are not where the philosophical battle is being fought and where the peace must be won.

[5] The ASPR attempts to separate what is reasonably well established as knowledge in the field of parapsychology from what is only surmised, and emphasizes the gradation of scientific certainty of parapsychological knowledge.

[6] The ASPR encourages uninhibited speculation by experts within its field but requires that speculation be so labelled.

[7] To maintain its scientific status and to carry out its mission, the ASPR is guided primarily by scientists.

Comment: In this way, the knowledge of the scientists can be made available, while their agenda within the ASPR are limited by the Bylaws.

[8] Through its *Journal* and *Newsletter* the ASPR publishes within its field, refereed experimental reports, summaries, reviews, news, tentative theories, and sociological studies.

[9] Within budgetary limits the ASPR financially supports promising parapsychological research projects proposed by qualified researchers.

ACTIVITIES TO BE SPECIFICALLY AVOIDED

Proposed Bylaw:

Except incidentally in its *Journal* and *Newsletter*, the ASPR does not give or sponsor instruction on how to develop or enhance psychic ability.

Comment: There are, of course, widely recognized techniques for increasing the likelihood that psi will occur. However, those techniques are marginal in their efficacy and any attempt to gain members or money for the ASPR by offering training on the use of those techniques would be viewed by skeptics as well as by some parapsychologists as an unethical pretense to more knowledge than we possess.

Proposed Bylaw:

The ASPR does not attempt to test, measure, or certify the psychic ability of individuals. However, the ASPR welcomes information from persons who believe they may have unusual psychic abilities and who might be willing to participate in scientific research. The ASPR will try to assist experimenters in finding such persons. The ASPR assumes no responsibility for, and does not endorse, the conclusions reached by any experimenters (including its own employees) to whom it may have referred potentially psychic persons.

Comment: There is not now, and may never be, an objective experimental procedure by which one can separate those who do, from those who do not, have "exceptional psychic ability." Many highly psychic persons cannot produce psi in a specific test or without considerable psychological preparation. To pretend to assess individual psychic ability would be ethically wrong and legally hazardous. A more useful procedure may be to question an individual about his or her claimed psychic experiences and to make a tentative, private estimate of credibility. That should be enough for informally advising such an individual.

PRINCIPLES AND POLICY

I would like to suggest two guiding principles for the ASPR: (1) Activities must conform to present knowledge in parapsychology. (2) Policies must conform to the ethic of science.

In practice, to be certain of satisfying these two principles, policy decisions must be made, not by one person, but by the Board of Trustees in consultation with ad hoc committees of senior parapsychologists.

Adherence to the first of these principles is illustrated by the above-recommended proscription against certifying psychics. The second principle is more subtle.

What is the ethic of science? Why is it important that the ASPR avoid its violation. I shall speak to the second question first, and then I shall answer the first by giving in the next section an example of what I perceive to be an ethic violation.

Lack of understanding of the ethic of science often leads to its violation by scientists as well as by lay persons. Violation, in turn, invokes social penalties (e.g., restriction of employment opportunities) which, as a rule, are imposed by the Intellectual Establishment under the influence of the scientific community.

Working in a "preparadigmatic science," we must

act at all times with the greatest circumspection to avoid giving the leaders of what T. S. Kuhn calls "normal science," an excuse to ignore or unfairly attack our ideas. At the same time, if we are to marshal the forces of intelligent support, we need the assistance of persons such as our President who are thoroughly skilled in dealing with human resistance to change.

Atlantic University and the Ethic of Science

Shortly before the recent trustee election I sent to our president a selection from the promotional materials I had received over the years from the Association for Research and Enlightenment. My purpose was to sharpen the distinction between the ASPR as a scientific organization and the A.R.E., which is a financially successful, 80,000-member quasi-religious organization built upon the writings of psychic-healer Edgar Cayce.

Subsequently, when the topic of the A.R.E. came up, I asked our president what he knew about its subsidiary Atlantic University. He said that he had just accepted a position as a trustee of that university.

I responded, "What do they teach? A 'university,' by definition, must have a number of schools or colleges covering a wide range of topics. Is Atlantic University accredited?" His reply was that they are seeking accreditation.

Surprised by this turn of events, I visited our university library. Although Atlantic University has been advertising its existence at least since 1987, I did not find it listed in *World of Learning 1991* or in *Peterson's Register of Higher Education 1991*. The latter lists 3600 American postsecondary institutions of learning that are accredited or in pre-accreditation status.

Since then, I have obtained and examined Atlantic University's first catalog (copyright 1991). It does, indeed, list Dr. Scott Jones as a Trustee. Its table of contents follows in detail the format of other university catalogs I have seen, offering information about admission requirements, the add/drop period for courses, incomplete grades, tuition refunds, etc., etc. These details are artfully intended to create an aura of authenticity that should count in this organization's favor in its pursuit of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

As printed in its catalog, the "Ideal of Atlantic University" is a 250-word excerpt from psychic healer Edgar Cayce's inspirational reading No. 2087-1. Its key clause, which is to be "kept first and foremost in the heart and mind of each and every individual," is "that we [should] make manifest *our* love, *my* love, *all* love, for God and man." (Page 8.

"The curriculum focuses on the nature of humanity, the nature of the universe, and holistic living" (Page 9). Depending upon how sharply it is focused, this curriculum could include every subject ever taught at any university. Classes meet one night a week for three hours.

According to the catalog, "The faculty of Atlantic University is composed primarily of adjunct professors." None of the faculty, however, is listed as teaching at another university.

One cannot have a "university" with only one full-time faculty member, no matter how estimable his scientific research. In the jargon of advertising, such misuse of the word "university" is called "hype." Among critical thinkers, it is called "dishonesty." For scientists, it is a violation of the scientific ethic.

As well as one can judge from its catalog, Atlantic University might acceptably be renamed as an "Institute of Religious and Consciousness Skills." Its course titles are largely "New Age" in flavor. Presumably the subject matter taught includes areas of reality long ignored by Western science and only now being nibbled at by cognitive psychology. If these realities are to be effective in changing the world, they must eventually be definitively understood by the empirical-theoretical method of science and not simply remain as nebulous, shifting, quasi-religious beliefs shared by, among others, an organization built around the recent memory of an exceptionally psychic individual.

The ASPR and the Ethic of Science

I shall try to explain why our president's becoming a trustee of Atlantic University and thereby endorsing their deception suggests to me a lack of understanding of the ethic of science and why I believe that, if he continues his close association with the A.R.E., the contempt that many scientists feel for that organization may rub off onto the ASPR.

Among the principles of scientific method, the foremost is honesty in dealing with ourselves and others in matters of science.

Scientists are jealous of scientific truth. They will not deal collegially with those who, while operating ostensibly within the scope of science, are dishonest or egregiously incompetent in their professional representations. Moreover, scientists judge their fellows by the care with which they discriminate between competent intellectual honesty and imposture or ignorance.

The same ideas apply among scholars generally and, indeed, among men of good will in every walk of life, but in science there is a special need for honesty.

The explanation of that need rests with the word "compromise." To live successfully, we all learn to compromise. In matters of physical reality, a compromise may be an agreement to accept less than one wants. However, in matters of the intellect, a successful compromise is a joint statement of opinion so cleverly worded that, given the vagueness of language, each party can believe that the statement represents his or her own point of view. This kind of compromise may be essential for successful day-to-day living, but in science it is anathema.

In science, the objective is not to deceive one's self or one's antagonist and thus preserve a happy relationship. Rather, each side words its position as precisely as possible so that differences can be detected and studied, and so that the truth can be discovered--usually by experiment in conjunction with linear-logical thinking.

The merits of linear-logical thinking aside, the ASPR needs the talents of our president if we are to deal effectively with the fact that most persons, including scientists outside their narrow specialty, do not often respond to reason but only to persuasion. I see no difficulty in being persuasive and conservative at the same time.

My association with our president has led me to believe that his ultimate personal objective is to hasten the universal acceptance of the occurrence of psychic phenomena so that a new civilization can arise conforming more closely to reality. That is an objective that all of us can accept as our own.

To: The Trustees of the American Society for Psychical Research:
 Dr. C.B. Scott Jones, President; Dr. Irvin L. Child; Ms. Emily W. Cook, Ms. Eleanor Friede;
 Mr. Eric C. Fruhstorfer; Dr. Robert Jahn; Dr. Edward F. Kelly; Dr. Stanley Krippner;
 Mr. Alan F. MacRobert; Ms. Marilyn Schlitz; Dr. Nancy P. Sondow; Mr. Bret Suval

From: Voting Member Robert McConnell, Room A234 Langley Hall, Biological Sciences Department, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, U.S.A. **RAM**

Subject: MATTERS OF GRAVE CONCERN TO THE ASPR

Date: February 17, 1992

As a Voting Member of the ASPR my aim in this letter is to present certain information to you as Trustees that may help you decide what actions of yours will best serve to maintain the Society and to advance our understanding of psychic phenomena.

Because I believe that all matters of policy within the ASPR deserve the widest possible consideration, I am mailing this letter to our Voting Members and to others who may be interested in the future of the ASPR.

THE FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE ASPR

As calculated from data furnished to the Board by the Executive Director, for each of eleven years (1980-1990) the ASPR has had an operating deficit (expenses minus revenue), growing from \$93,000 (39% of expenses) in 1980 to \$293,000 (61% of expenses) in 1990. Over these 11 years, the average operating deficit was \$148,000. Even when gifts and bequests are counted as offsetting the deficits, there was a deficit in 9 out of 11 years, averaging \$64,000 per year over the 11 years.

The deficit for 1991 is not yet known, and no 1991 budget was submitted. The situation is summarized in the following table. The 1989 and 1990 figures are from the independent auditors' report found in the Society's Annual report for 1990 (not made available to the Voting Members until May 1991) and omit from "Revenue" any gifts or bequests. The 1992 figures are from the budget approved with 3 dissenting votes by the Board at its 26 October 1991 meeting and do not include gifts or bequests projected at \$15,000.

| Year | Revenue | Expenses |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1989 (actual) | \$206,000 | \$411,000 |
| 1990 (actual) | \$188,000 | \$481,000 |
| 1991 (budgeted) | none | none |
| 1991 (actual) | unknown | unknown |
| 1992 (budgeted) | \$406,000 | \$543,000 |

The minutes of the 26 October meeting of the ASPR Board show no discussion of how the 1992 revenue figure was calculated nor of how such an astonishing expected revenue increase from \$188,000 to \$406,000 would be achieved.

In a separate letter to our Treasurer, dated 3 February 1992, I have discussed the 1992 budget of the ASPR in some detail, as well as the "total return" method of determining endowment revenue, which I infer has been applied, albeit incorrectly, in deriving the above 1992 revenue projection.

Using the traditional accounting method followed in the past by our ASPR auditors, and by projecting the dividends and interest earned by our endowment in the first ten months of 1991, I roughly estimate that our total revenue for 1992 from all sources (including dues, space rental, etc., less possible gifts) will be no more than \$207,000 and probably much less. This would leave a deficit of \$320,000, or 2.6 times the 1992 deficit shown by subtraction in the above table. This is all the more alarming when it is considered that the still unknown 1991 deficit, like the 1990 deficit before it, will probably also be in the vicinity of \$300,000; thus bringing close to \$900,000 the deficit accumulated under President Jones.

For several years it has been recognized by some of us that these annual deficits must end promptly. The Society's endowment as of 31 October 1991 was \$1,656,000. Assuming a constant rate of expenditure and no added income from other sources, as capital is eaten into, investment revenue will drop at an ever-increasing rate so that the Society could be bankrupt in five years under favorable economic conditions or in as little as three years if the present economic depression deepens--as many economists think likely.

THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
 EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT

Among our larger budget items is the employment contract of our new Executive Director. I have submitted this contract for comment to various people

PARAPSYCHOLOGY AND THE ASPR

Emily W. Cook

In my view, parapsychologists now have two primary functions: One is to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the scientific community that we are studying phenomena that have not yet been adequately understood or explained, but that *must* be, because of their possible implications for our understanding of the nature of mind and human personality. This will only be done by adhering strictly to the scientific method, that is, to observation, experiment, critical evaluation and inference, and the public exchange of ideas with peers.

The other primary function of parapsychologists is to educate the general public about the scientific attitude and approach that they too must adopt and apply when confronted with experiences and events we call paranormal.

In my view, therefore, these should be the functions of the ASPR: to uphold without compromise the strict application of the scientific method to parapsychological phenomena, and to teach the general public the critical attitude that the scientific method entails. Obviously, this can only be done by people who themselves understand the nature of the scientific method.

The present leadership of the ASPR, however, seems overwhelmingly to believe that, despite a century of applying the scientific method, we have failed to convince the scientific community, and therefore we must abandon this approach and appeal, not to scientists, but to the general public for intellectual support.

In my view, this will worsen the status of parapsychology even more, since it will contribute further to--not ameliorate--the polarization that has continually plagued this field. The scientists will deplore ever more strongly this occult nonsense, and the general public will fail to absorb the standards of difficult, critical thinking that *all* new knowledge requires. Like the 19th Century's Spiritualism, parapsychology will then be alive and thriving as a religion or belief system, but as a science it will be dead.

who are knowledgeable about the hiring of senior supervisory personnel. Their comments ranged from "fiscally irresponsible" to "preposterous." For reasons that will be evident after reviewing the contract, I think of the ASPR as undergoing a process analogous to a leveraged corporate takeover--with one bizarre twist: the "golden parachute" is for the incoming manager.

Before I refresh your memory as to the terms of the contract, it may be worthwhile to comment on the qualifications of the new Executive Director for whom the contract was written. Although I do not remember ever meeting her, I have been told by many who know her that Patrice Keane has a charming personality, is a highly persuasive speaker, inspires loyalty in her subordinates, and is intelligent and clever.

On the other hand, Ms. Keane has not earned a bachelor's degree, shows no record of having studied science at the college level, and has had no scientific experience beyond that gained in several parapsychological experiments as a student investigator at New York City's Maimonides Hospital 14 years ago (reported orally to the Parapsychological Association: *RIP--1978*, 40-41, 72-74, 82-84).

Ms. Keane's résumé, submitted when she applied for her present position, was too vague for critical evaluation. By personal inquiry I have discovered that when she described herself as being a "Research Associate" with a well known psychiatrist, she meant that she was one of a group of volunteers who met usually once a week under his direction to explore and encourage ESP in their dreams (*RIP--1983*, 145-152). Ms. Keane may be unaware that in the scientific world a "research associate" is a colleague having the same formal education but less experience than his or her mentor.

Before assuming the position of Executive Director in May 1991, Ms. Keane assisted in educational activities at the ASPR, part- or full-time, from 1975 to 1986. From 1986 to 1990, with the title of Director of Education beginning in 1987, she led public discussion sessions and arranged public lectures. President Jones appointed her Acting Executive Director in 1990.

SALIENT FEATURES OF THE CONTRACT

Term of the contract:

Three years, from 15 May 1991 to 15 May 1994.

Compensation:

\$55,000 salary for first year, increasing by \$5,000 each year, plus fringe benefits estimated to cost \$12,250 the first year, plus a \$7,000 lump sum

labelled "Educational Allotment" to be paid at the beginning of each contract year for unspecified use by the employee. Thus, the total cost to the ASPR will be \$74,250 for the first year, \$80,000 for the second year, and \$85,750 for the third--under the unlikely assumption that the cost of medical insurance will not increase.

Extent of Services:

Full time.

Vacation and Sick Days

Six weeks vacation each year "plus a reasonable number of personal and sick days."

Termination and Severance.

Ninety days notice required for termination by either employer or employee. Except in case of gross and willful misconduct, termination and severance payments will be made to the employee as follows:

If termination is by employer in first two years of contract, ASPR must pay the employee the full three years of salaries plus the educational allotments.

Alternatively, ASPR must make severance payment in the amount of one year of current salary plus the \$7,000 educational allotment under the following circumstances:

1. If termination is by the employee for any reason.
2. If termination is by employer in last year of contract.
3. If contract expires and is not renewed.

CRITICISM OF CONTRACT

The term of the contract should, in my opinion, have been no more than one year, especially in view of the minimal experience of the employee and the financial condition of the Society. There could appropriately have been a nonbinding expectation to continue for a second year. Any pay increases should have been decided by the Board at the end of each year on the basis of performance and the financial resources of the Society.

The payment of the so-called "educational allotment" is unjustified. The employee was hired in competition with others on the premise that she was fully trained for the job. How then can one argue that a training grant is necessary to allow her to fulfill her duties? The "educational allotment" has no requirement for accountability as to purpose and results. Consequently, as the Internal Revenue Service would view it, this "educational allotment" is in reality nothing more than a bonus under another name.

Aside from a lack of reasons for giving this bonus, how will Ms. Keane find time to use it for an educa-

To: The Voting Members and others with an interest in
The American Society for Psychical Research.

From: Voting Member Robert McConnell
Room A234, Langley Hall, Biological Sciences Department
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Subject: Information concerning the interests and activities of Dr. C. B. Scott Jones.

Date: February 5, 1992.

Because I am deeply concerned about the financial and administrative disarray of the American Society for Psychical Research, I have been trying to understand not only the factual nature of our problems but also the thinking of the people in charge.

Recently, I received a magnetic-tape recording of a lecture titled "The Dolphin Connection," given in 1988 to a Parapsychology Symposium at the Association for Research and Enlightenment at Virginia Beach, Virginia, by Dr. C. B. Scott Jones. (This Association is dedicated to venerating the memory of Edgar Cayce, a psychic healer.) The only previous information I had about this two-day symposium was a printed announcement at the time, inviting me to participate and saying that anyone could attend for a fee of \$30.

The above-mentioned lecture provides information about interests and activities of Dr. Jones of which I was previously unaware. Dr. Jones has served as a Trustee of the American Society for Psychical Research for seven years beginning in 1985 and has held the office of President for three years beginning in April 1989. In my mind, this lecture raises doubt as to whether Dr. Jones is qualified to participate in the guidance of any scientific organization, including the American Society for Psychical Research. I am enclosing an abridgment of the lecture to allow the reader to judge for himself the evaluative statements offered below.

The enclosed abridgment is complete except for the ellipses-indicated omission of historical material showing that one-way interstellar electromagnetic transmission between intelligent beings is conceivable by some well known scientists; whereas interstellar travel by physical beings is not believed possible because of the time/distance barrier.

In this connection, when I looked in anthropologist Loren Eiseley's book, *The Immense Journey*, I found that a quotation used by Dr. Jones in his lecture is from a chapter titled "Little Men and Flying Saucers," where it is presented in a context gently ridiculing the possibility of finding an information-gathering probe sent by intelligent beings from outer space. As used by Dr. Jones, this quotation suggests that in his book Eiseley is receptive to the idea of finding such an artifact, whereas the reverse is true. (Dr. Eiseley's book is an autobiographical survey for the layman of what is known, what might be discovered, and what can never be known by science about the origins of Homo sapiens.)

I know nothing in the scientific literature of parapsychology that would suggest the prospect of success in a search for an interstellar probe. More to the point, I know of no parapsychologist who would consider the probability of finding under the earth's oceans, through dolphin ESP, a physical artifact sent by intelligent beings from outer space as anything but vanishingly small--a probability that a mathematician might lightly refer to as a higher order infinitesimal. In other words, the rationale of this project is a fantasy with no basis in reality.

Moreover, while I have heard of some slight unpublished evidence for ESP in dolphins, I would expect that any such effect will prove to be as fragmentary and unpredictable as ESP between humans. I know of no evidence suggesting that extrasensory messages "channeled" from living humans to living humans (or between animals and humans) through a third party acting as a psychic medium could provide the kind of accurate detailed conversational information presented in Dr. Jones's lecture. If Dr. Jones's methods can objectively demonstrate that kind of ESP, he will have made a revolutionary breakthrough in experimental parapsychology. (See Arthur Hastings: *With the Tongues of Men and Angels*, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1991).

To: The Trustees of the American Society for Psychical Research:
 Dr. C.B. Scott Jones, President; Dr. Irvin L. Child; Ms. Emily W. Cook, Ms. Eleanor Friede;
 Mr. Eric C. Fruhstorfer; Dr. Robert Jahn; Dr. Edward F. Kelly; Dr. Stanley Krippner;
 Mr. Alan F. MacRobert; Ms. Marilyn Schlitz; Dr. Nancy P. Sondow; Mr. Bret Suval

From: Voting Member Robert McConnell, Room A234 Langley Hall, Biological Sciences Department, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, U.S.A. **ROM**

Subject: MATTERS OF GRAVE CONCERN TO THE ASPR

Date: February 17, 1992

As a Voting Member of the ASPR my aim in this letter is to present certain information to you as Trustees that may help you decide what actions of yours will best serve to maintain the Society and to advance our understanding of psychic phenomena.

Because I believe that all matters of policy within the ASPR deserve the widest possible consideration, I am mailing this letter to our Voting Members and to others who may be interested in the future of the ASPR.

THE FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE ASPR

As calculated from data furnished to the Board by the Executive Director, for each of eleven years (1980-1990) the ASPR has had an operating deficit (expenses minus revenue), growing from \$93,000 (39% of expenses) in 1980 to \$293,000 (61% of expenses) in 1990. Over these 11 years, the average operating deficit was \$148,000. Even when gifts and bequests are counted as offsetting the deficits, there was a deficit in 9 out of 11 years, averaging \$64,000 per year over the 11 years.

The deficit for 1991 is not yet known, and no 1991 budget was submitted. The situation is summarized in the following table. The 1989 and 1990 figures are from the independent auditors' report found in the Society's Annual report for 1990 (not made available to the Voting Members until May 1991) and omit from "Revenue" any gifts or bequests. The 1992 figures are from the budget approved with 3 dissenting votes by the Board at its 26 October 1991 meeting and do not include gifts or bequests projected at \$15,000.

| Year | Revenue | Expenses |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1989 (actual) | \$206,000 | \$411,000 |
| 1990 (actual) | \$188,000 | \$481,000 |
| 1991 (budgeted) | none | none |
| 1991 (actual) | unknown | unknown |
| 1992 (budgeted) | \$406,000 | \$543,000 |

The minutes of the 26 October meeting of the ASPR Board show no discussion of how the 1992 revenue figure was calculated nor of how such an astonishing expected revenue increase from \$188,000 to \$406,000 would be achieved.

In a separate letter to our Treasurer, dated 3 February 1992, I have discussed the 1992 budget of the ASPR in some detail, as well as the "total return" method of determining endowment revenue, which I infer has been applied, albeit incorrectly, in deriving the above 1992 revenue projection.

Using the traditional accounting method followed in the past by our ASPR auditors, and by projecting the dividends and interest earned by our endowment in the first ten months of 1991, I roughly estimate that our total revenue for 1992 from all sources (including dues, space rental, etc., less possible gifts) will be no more than \$207,000 and probably much less. This would leave a deficit of \$320,000, or 2.6 times the 1992 deficit shown by subtraction in the above table. This is all the more alarming when it is considered that the still unknown 1991 deficit, like the 1990 deficit before it, will probably also be in the vicinity of \$300,000; thus bringing close to \$900,000 the deficit accumulated under President Jones.

For several years it has been recognized by some of us that these annual deficits must end promptly. The Society's endowment as of 31 October 1991 was \$1,656,000. Assuming a constant rate of expenditure and no added income from other sources, as capital is eaten into, investment revenue will drop at an ever-increasing rate so that the Society could be bankrupt in five years under favorable economic conditions or in as little as three years if the present economic depression deepens--as many economists think likely.

THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
 EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT

Among our larger budget items is the employment contract of our new Executive Director. I have submitted this contract for comment to various people

who are knowledgeable about the hiring of senior supervisory personnel. Their comments ranged from "fiscally irresponsible" to "preposterous." For reasons that will be evident after reviewing the contract, I think of the ASPR as undergoing a process analogous to a leveraged corporate takeover--with one bizarre twist: the "golden parachute" is for the incoming manager.

Before I refresh your memory as to the terms of the contract, it may be worthwhile to comment on the qualifications of the new Executive Director for whom the contract was written. Although I do not remember ever meeting her, I have been told by many who know her that Patrice Keane has a charming personality, is a highly persuasive speaker, inspires loyalty in her subordinates, and is intelligent and clever.

On the other hand, Ms. Keane has not earned a bachelor's degree, shows no record of having studied science at the college level, and has had no scientific experience beyond that gained in several parapsychological experiments as a student investigator at New York City's Maimonides Hospital 14 years ago (reported orally to the Parapsychological Association: *RIP--1978, 40-41, 72-74, 82-84*).

Ms. Keane's resumé, submitted when she applied for her present position, was too vague for critical evaluation. By personal inquiry I have discovered that when she described herself as being a "Research Associate" with a well known psychiatrist, she meant that she was one of a group of volunteers who met usually once a week under his direction to explore and encourage ESP in their dreams (*RIP--1983, 145-152*). Ms. Keane may be unaware that in the scientific world a "research associate" is a colleague having the same formal education but less experience than his or her mentor.

Before assuming the position of Executive Director in May 1991, Ms. Keane assisted in educational activities at the ASPR, part- or full-time, from 1975 to 1986. From 1986 to 1990, with the title of Director of Education beginning in 1987, she led public discussion sessions and arranged public lectures. President Jones appointed her Acting Executive Director in 1990.

SALIENT FEATURES OF THE CONTRACT

Term of the contract:

Three years, from 15 May 1991 to 15 May 1994.

Compensation:

\$55,000 salary for first year, increasing by \$5,000 each year, plus fringe benefits estimated to cost \$12,250 the first year, plus a \$7,000 lump sum

labelled "Educational Allotment" to be paid at the beginning of each contract year for unspecified use by the employee. Thus, the total cost to the ASPR will be \$74,250 for the first year, \$80,000 for the second year, and \$85,750 for the third--under the unlikely assumption that the cost of medical insurance will not increase.

Extent of Services:

Full time.

Vacation and Sick Days

Six weeks vacation each year "plus a reasonable number of personal and sick days."

Termination and Severance.

Ninety days notice required for termination by either employer or employee. Except in case of gross and willful misconduct, termination and severance payments will be made to the employee as follows:

If termination is by employer in first two years of contract, ASPR must pay the employee the full three years of salaries plus the educational allotments.

Alternatively, ASPR must make severance payment in the amount of one year of current salary plus the \$7,000 educational allotment under the following circumstances:

1. If termination is by the employee for any reason.
2. If termination is by employer in last year of contract.
3. If contract expires and is not renewed.

CRITICISM OF CONTRACT

The term of the contract should, in my opinion, have been no more than one year, especially in view of the minimal experience of the employee and the financial condition of the Society. There could appropriately have been a nonbinding expectation to continue for a second year. Any pay increases should have been decided by the Board at the end of each year on the basis of performance and the financial resources of the Society.

The payment of the so-called "educational allotment" is unjustified. The employee was hired in competition with others on the premise that she was fully trained for the job. How then can one argue that a training grant is necessary to allow her to fulfill her duties? The "educational allotment" has no requirement for accountability as to purpose and results. Consequently, as the Internal Revenue Service would view it, this "educational allotment" is in reality nothing more than a bonus under another name.

Aside from a lack of reasons for giving this bonus, how will Ms. Keane find time to use it for an educa-

tional purpose if she is to give full time to the Society? I would think that "full time" for an administrator from whom so much is expected would begin at 50 hours per week.

The ASPR has no present policy allowing educational allotments to employees and no such policy should be initiated in the light of the desperate financial position of the Society.

(The payment to Mr. Charles Honorton in the same budget, of funds for graduate study at Edinburgh neither established a general policy nor provided a precedent for the bonus given to Patrice Keane since the terms of the two grants are not comparable. Honorton is not an employee of the ASPR. Keane is. Honorton is a scientist of distinction. Keane is not. Mr. Honorton's experimental contributions to parapsychology over a period of nearly three decades are brilliant and painstaking. He is clearly the leader in his own area and one of the leaders of the field. His work with the Ganzfeld is one of the main pillars of the experimental evidence for the occurrence of ESP. His stay at Edinburgh University will be primarily devoted to research, the encouragement of which has been the ASPR's mission since its founding in 1904.)

Six weeks paid vacation is excessive for an employee formally accepting an executive directorship after one year as an acting director in which she achieved no substantial improvement in the Society's financial position. Had she already shown several years of financially successful administrative service, the picture would be different.

A cap should be placed on the number of sick and personal days.

The contractual guarantee of three-year's salary payment if released from employment is outrageous, and the one year's severance pay is excessive. In my opinion, three month's severance pay after three months notification is all that should be given to a person with no more administrative service than Ms. Keane. Moreover, the contracted payment of one year's severance salary in the event the employee quits by her own choice is managerial buffoonery.

As the contract is written, if the Executive Director's services prove unsatisfactory, or if for any other reason such as financial stringency, the Executive Director's services must be terminated at or before the end of three years, she will have received an average compensation that will range, depending upon circumstances, between \$104,000 and \$213,250 per year of service. The fact that such an arrangement could have been written into the contract and signed is a serious indictment of the managerial judgment of both the President and the Executive Director.

ATTACHMENT A TO THE CONTRACT

Attachment A, describing the duties of the position needs a careful review, including especially the 23 numbered paragraphs under "Duties, Responsibility, and Authority." Paragraph 7 needs revision somewhat as follows to discourage the hiring of staff on the basis of friendship rather than competence. "Any contracts between the ASPR and staff personnel must be in writing, must not extend beyond one year, and must be proposed by the Executive Director, approved by the President, and reported in writing to the Board members within one week after approval."

LEGAL STATUS OF THE CONTRACT

The present Board of Trustees held its first meeting on May 11, 1991, immediately following the annual meeting of the Voting Members held to elect Trustees. After organizing itself, the first action of the Board under the leadership of President Jones was to pass a resolution withdrawing the previous Board's offer of Executive Directorship to Prof. Sybo Schouten of Utrecht University. The second motion offered that position to Ms. Patrice Keane with this added sentence: "In order to facilitate conclusion of the contract, the terms of the contract may be negotiated by the Executive Committee plus the Treasurer" [instead of by the Board as a whole]. The Executive Committee members are Dr. C. B. Jones (President), Dr. Stanley Krippner (First Vice-President), and Ms. Marilyn Schlitz (Second Vice-President). The Treasurer, or fourth member of the Negotiating Committee, is Mr. Bret Suval, who began his first term as Trustee in May, 1991.

The negotiations were, in fact, conducted between Dr. Jones and Ms. Keane without participation by Krippner, Schlitz, or Suval. At some point, Dr. Jones discussed a draft of the contract by telephone separately with Krippner, Schlitz, and Suval. Krippner and Schlitz have told me that what was read to them by telephone included no mention of termination or severance pay. Subsequently, Schlitz wrote a letter to the other members of the Executive Committee, dated 12 June 1991 in which she approved a salary of \$45,000, objected to automatic salary increases, and requested more information on the proposed educational allotment. Krippner wrote to the Executive Committee on June 14, saying that the Schlitz letter expressed his own point of view.

Unbeknown to Krippner, Schlitz, and Suval, the contract was signed by Jones and Keane on July 27 and 26, 1991, respectively. The first and only written communication of any kind from Jones to Schlitz on the subject of the contract was a letter dated 5 September 1991 informing her that the contract had been signed and promising to send her a copy. Except for

the above-mentioned letters of June 12 and 14, Krippner could find in his files no correspondence between himself and any member of the Negotiating Committee concerning the Keane contract. Krippner told me that, as far as he was concerned, the signing of the contract was a fait accompli in which he had no part. The contract was first distributed to the Trustees, including the Negotiating Committee, by mail immediately before the next Board meeting, which took place on 26 October 1991. Schlitz got her first look at the contract by requesting a copy at an intermission in the 26 October meeting. Trustee Emily Cook's copy arrived at her home in Virginia on the day she was attending the Board meeting in New York City.

The minutes of this Board meeting show no discussion of, or action upon, the contract.

It would appear that the condition for full exchange of all relevant information among Jones, Krippner, Schlitz, and Suval, implied by the May 11 delegation of negotiating authority jointly to these four persons, was never met and that this contract was not legally validated by approval by a majority of the Negotiating Committee.

Moreover, the terms of the contract, taking into account the charitable nature, size, and financial weakness of the ASPR, and the meager education and experience of the new Executive Director, are so grossly inappropriate as to convince me that the contract was not negotiated competently by the President.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD

It is evident from the information I have provided that the ASPR is in a state of crisis in which its continued existence is at stake.

My foremost recommendation to you as individual Board members is that you take no corrective, as opposed to investigative, action until you have satisfied yourself that you are in possession of all the facts.

For the long haul we need to determine and explicate the objectives and policies of the Society in terms specific enough to provide operational guidance so that the present financial debacle will not be repeated.

Immediately, however, in view of the clandestine manner in which the President and Executive Director have been operating in the year since it became known to the Voting Members that there was "trouble in paradise," it is necessary that the issues of the terms of the contract and the manner in which the contract

was developed be given a full and impartial examination.

As a Trustee of the ASPR you are convinced of the importance of scientifically investigating psychic phenomena and of rationally exploring their potential consequences for the destiny of humankind.

Yours is a public and freely assumed obligation to respond to the challenge of a letter such as this in accordance with your own high ideals. You will be rewarded by the approval of those whose values you share. Toward that end, it will be my pleasure to disseminate the news of your individual actions in this matter.

At a practical level, what seems to me to be needed for the protection of the ASPR and of you as an individual Trustee is the passage of a Board resolution somewhat as follows:

Whereas, claimed gross deficiencies in both the terms and manner of negotiation of the 26-27 July 1991 employment contract between the ASPR and Executive Director Patrice Keane have been brought to the attention of the Board of Trustees by a letter from Voting Member Robert McConnell, it is resolved that:

1. The Board, acting through a member other than the President, will promptly seek from an attorney not currently or previously associated with the ASPR, competent, independent, and disinterested legal advice on how to proceed.

2. If that counsel concurs, the Board will delay any action on these matters beyond the gathering of information until after the next annual election by the Voting Members, currently scheduled to be held 16 May 1992.

3. The Board, acting without the President and staff, will promptly appoint a special Investigating Committee charged with collecting and verifying information related to the matters brought to its attention in Dr. McConnell's letter of [day, month] 1992.

4. The Board hereby formally notifies President Jones and Executive Director Keane of its proposed investigation and of its possible intention to challenge Ms. Keane's employment contract.

5. The Board takes note of the fact that it has not collectively approved the aforesaid contract and orders that the second-year payment of a \$7,000 "educational allotment" to the Executive Director be delayed until it can be considered by the new Board after the next election.

(not for publication)

Abridgment of an unedited transcription of a talk

THE DOLPHIN CONNECTION

by Dr. C. B. Scott Jones

Presented at a Parapsychology Symposium held at the Atlantic University
of the Association for Research and Enlightenment
at Virginia Beach, Virginia, in February, 1988.

(All omissions are indicated by ellipses.)

Our next speaker and the last one before lunch, will be Scott Jones from the Center for Applied Anomalous Phenomena, and he'll be speaking on "The Dolphin Connection."

* * * *

Well, good morning. I'm delighted to be here. . . . What I'd like to do in the time this morning is to describe an inter-species communication research project involving a pod of wild spotted dolphins as a link to extraterrestrial intelligence. . . .

The opening round of the modern-day scientific interest in CETI [Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence] was an article written by two physicists from Cornell University, and these were Giuseppe Cocconi and Philip Morrison. Their article, "Searching for Interstellar Communications," was published in September of 1959 in the British journal, *Nature*. And here was their concluding paragraph in that article:

Few will deny the profound importance, practical and philosophical, which the detection of interstellar communications would have? We therefore feel that a discriminating search for signals deserves a considerable effort. The probability of success is difficult to estimate; but if we never search, the chance of success is zero.

Now we know that some scientists, both in the United States and in the Soviet Union, have agreed with Morrison and Cocconi's conclusion and that a modest CETI effort has been underway in the United States and in the Soviet Union. To this point, however, results have been negative. They have been listening, and they have not received any unambiguous radio signal that is associated with extraterrestrial intelligence life.

I feel that another undertaking, one that looks inward rather than to the stars, has at least as good a chance of establishing the CETI hypothesis that there is extraterrestrial intelligence, and that it wants to, and can, communicate with earth.

Now the current CETI literature is dominated by discussions of radio technology, of their procedures and communication attempts. I am looking for considerations of telepathic and channeling techniques to establish and maintain communications. . . .

It has been speculated by some that there have been extraterrestrial contact activities with earth for thousands, if not millions, of years. Now there is folk literature and modern accounts in great abundance of such activity. Obviously, I am referring to UFO reports.

Perhaps early activity involved automated probes sent to test environmental conditions, to monitor for life forms, and to test for intelligent life and level of technology. Perhaps they are still ambivalent about the results for intelligent life on earth.

Loren Eiseley, in 1957 in his book, *The Immense Journey*, wrote about a possible probe:

So deep is the conviction that there must be life out there beyond the dark, one thinks that, if they are more advanced than ourselves they may come across space at any moment, perhaps in our generation. Later, contemplating the infinity of time, one wonders if, perchance, their message came long ago. Hurling into the swamp muck of the steaming coal forests, the bright projectile clambered over by hissing reptiles, and the delicate instruments running mindlessly down with no report.

Now the research that we have underway is based upon several assumptions. The first and most critical, is that we can establish a cooperative, working relationship with one or more pods of wild dolphins. The dolphins are at the same time subjects of telepathic research and full partners for a larger CETI research program.

There are several theories involved. The first is that the man-dolphin relationship is more special than has ever been realized, that the dolphin has been cast in a very specific communication role between earthlings and extraterrestrial intelligence.

Now this may be viewed in two ways. The dolphin's large brain may have been programmed thousands of years ago by visiting ETI and the dolphin today is a living computer data bank of basic extraterrestrial information. The second theory is that, with or without the first theory being valid, the dolphin is a true master of his ocean environment. The secrets of the deep are his. No extraterrestrial probe or monitoring device that purposefully entered or crashed into the ocean has long escaped his detection and location.

Now the parent issue is whether a cooperative man-dolphin research, discovery, and recovery operation can be mounted. The real issue may be more metaphysical than archeological.

Now I find an interesting parallel here between the A.R.E. effort that was mounted some time ago by Hugh Lynn Cayce to locate the "Hall of Records" in the Giza Plain described by Edger Cayce as being underground between the right paw of the Sphinx and the River Nile. Now I suspect that the Hall of Records will be located when it is time to be found.

I wonder if there is any metaphysical constraints involving locating extraterrestrial probes or artifacts. Now the steps to date: we have had over three or four years interaction with dolphins, our team. We started first with dolphins in captivity to see what capability we had in working telepathically with them. Once this was established to our satisfaction, the next impulse we had--actually guidance--was to go and work with the dolphins in the wild. So last year in July we went to a spot some 150 miles north of where Stephan is located in the Little Bahama Bank, and worked (swam) for about four days with a pod of spotted dolphins.

What we got from them when we arrived was, we asked them what they wanted to do, and they said, "Get in the water." So nine of us did get in the water, and we enjoyed that experience immensely. We had both telepathic and channeled information from this group. We wanted to propose a research project with them and we wanted to ask them what they wanted to do.

It is this exchange of information that has set up the project that we have underway. Without getting into detail, there is considerable hope from this first encounter that they are willing to participate with us as co-researchers in a locating and recovery operation.

There is one constraint on it that is very interesting. After we had swam with them for four days, we had an interesting channel session the last evening we were at sea. We said, "We have a number of questions we want to ask you." And we wanted to gather information about them and their world, and so they said, "OK. What are your questions?"

Well, they pulled us through all the questions before they gave any answers. And at the end they said, "Well, we have something to say about all of your questions, and we have answers to questions more important than the ones that you asked. However, at this time, we are not going to say anything to you."

Which was a bit disappointing, so we asked (as you are entitled to when you are in channeled information), "What's going on here?"

"While you have done well in this week, you have not yet been accepted into the pod. You need to spend more time with the dolphins."

And so we asked how this would be done--if it had to do with them--and they said, "No. Any dolphin group, whether in captivity or in the wild, provided those in captivity are respected and well taken care of."

Now, I've reviewed that tape several times and it appears that what they are suggesting is not telepathic communications at all. It's various forms of nonverbal communication. Because they say, "Watch the dolphins. Swim with us. Watch us swim. Watch our movements."

Well, since that time we--various parts of the team--have been doing that. That's why I was so eager to accept Stephen's invitation to come dive with him, because he says that a group of spotted dolphins frequently come in and join them in their work under water. My wife, Jonie, and I are planning on going down a little later on this year and continue our interaction with the dolphins.

Now this is a very simple project. The dolphins either will, or will not, lead us to an underwater artifact, and we either will, or will not, recover it, and it won't take years and years to do this, except for the possible metaphysical link.

But we'll break it off if we are not getting results. We don't know what we are going to find. I think it is the dolphins' responsibility to lead us to something that they have in mind, and that's their part of the partnership.

If it's there, and it's recoverable, we will recover it, and then we'll decide what we do with it.

Those of you who know my job in Washington, might suspect that there is a particular reason for this, and as far as I am concerned, that step, which is extraordinary in itself--what I've just talked about, the recovery of an extraterrestrial artifact--is merely a step into something that I consider equally important, and that is to get the government, if not the world, responsibly involved in looking at the extraterrestrial problem and to simply be more mindful of the universality of life.

Q. [Can you tell us] why you believe that there is contact with the dolphins?

A. Well, that would take a good deal of time to develop. But, basically, it's some things that have come to me personally in my own meditation and it also came from the dolphins. It was something that they proposed in our contacts with them. . . .