

28 Feb 73

MEMORANDUM FOR : C/ORD  
INFO : DC/ORD  
SUBJECT : Discussion of 'Paranormal' Issue with [REDACTED]

SG11

SG11. Per your instructions as conveyed by [REDACTED] I called and met Mr [REDACTED] ( [REDACTED] ) on 27 Feb and we discussed paranormal and related matters for an hour and a half. The salient points covered were, briefly, as follows. SG11

a. I briefed him on the genesis of our (ORD)) involvement--i.e., the SRI presentation, my paper, discussions with you and C/TSD, the decision to explore a joint approach, the outcome of the 1 and 16 Feb meetings with TSD and SRI and our tentative plans for further pursuit of the basic research with TSD and SRI.

b. Mr S then briefed me on the background from his perspective and on his views, to wit: early developments with Mr TARG when he still worked for SYLVANIA; SG1G some of GELLER's alleged exploits [REDACTED] his (S's) early attempts to ensure that appropriate Agency elements were aware of the potential represented by the phenomena (if validated)--with his primary concern being that, as a brand-new and wholly extraneous 'technology', it would fall between the stools. This fear seems to have been substantiated by the indifference and/or lack of comprehension which he has run into in virtually every quarter. He fears that there might be a large flap potential in it for the Agency--almost no matter what we do--but that it is incumbent upon us to proceed in any case. He has been trying to convince C/DDS&T that a quick, 'big bite' immersion (even multi-millions, if necessary) may be called for--but with uncertain success thus far. He also believes that the DCI should be briefed and warned of the flap potential but, so far as he knows, this has not yet been done. Mr S's basic position appears to be that : he believes in the existence of some phenomena (tho he doesn't exclude the possibility of, in part at least, some trickery by GELLER); and that we may never fully 'understand' the phenomena any more than we understand gravity--but that isn't necessarily important as long as we can quantify, predict and--to some degree--control its performance.

c. We agreed on the need for a well-reasoned, integrated approach by all Agency elements having a legitimate interest (CI Staff, Security, OMS, ORD, OSI, TSD)--and on the need for keeping the matter as low key as possible until all the evidence is in. We also discussed the possible procedures should the 'big bite' philosophy prevail--e.g., setting SRI up in a new lab near here under our control and possibly with [REDACTED] setting up a 'clean' overt screening mechanism for new subjects, etc. When I asked if I was right in assuming that ORD & TSD should proceed with the joint program in the interim (possibly to the extent of our putting up the 100K necessary for a full year of SRI research), he emphatically agreed--stating that he felt C/DDS&T would be critical of us only if we moved too slowly and, for instance, let GELLER get away from us. He accepted and seemed pleased by my description of the wholly cooperative TSD/ORD atmosphere. SG1H

2. I invited Mr S to the next TSD/ORD meeting (tentatively scheduled for 2 March) but he had a prior commitment. I left him copies of my paper and the Memo of Record on the 1 Feb [REDACTED] to keep him informed of future developments. He intends, I believe, to do likewise. SG11 [REDACTED]