

9/15

*start at 7 told
you, it got lost in
the shuffle
of.*

Ken:

As per your request, here is the draft of my paranormal criteria thoughts. I have Xeroxed your copy so that your comments are contained in this copy. I would like to comment on some of your thoughts.

First of all your argument about the false hypothesis criterion being untrue: you are right because I stated my proposition very poorly. The idea I had to get across which I did not was that in "normal science" (as opposed to "paranormal science") when there are competing hypotheses, there can be performed a critical experiment which will distinguish between the validity of the two assertions. Once performed (indeed once even verbalized) a major hurdle is crossed which will distinguish between the competing assertions. To use your example, the concepts of gravity put forth by Einstein and Dicke are not both right (although they both may be wrong) but some day one will be placed in higher credence than the other based on accumulated observations and on experiments designed to distinguish between salient features of the hypotheses. I did overstate the simplicity of discerning between competing hypotheses. However, you will ~~agree~~ agree that the phlogiston hypothesis has been disproved and it was disproved by demonstrating that the assumption of its validity led to erroneous conclusions based on objectively collected data.

Regarding another point, I do not believe that the inability of a "normal scientist" to explain experimental observation in all detail should provide positive proof of paranormal phenomena any more than you are willing to allow that the inability of "paranormal practitioners" to produce identically reproducible results under all circumstances and upon demand is proof positive that paranormal phenomena are a sham. Essentially, I feel that the proof of a "negative" is so difficult that neither side of this controversy should be put in the position of having to prove a negative assertion in order to demonstrate the validity of their claims.

-2-

In my argument concerning the reproduceability of gravity, I did not mean to imply that paranormal phenomena should indeed reach this level of reliability before any utility could be perceived. ~~XXXX~~ However, it must be agreed that some high level of replication will have to be demonstrated before there will be acceptance of the information by customers for intelligence. The question in my mind is something like: What background evidence would I want if I had to brief the President that the Soviets had violated SALT and were planning a pre-emptive strike if my information came from some astral projection kind of experience? (Granted this is a loaded situation! But we must consider the level of incredulity of customers for intelligence and the risks associated with misleading ~~XXXX~~ information vis a vis the obvious positive benefits of paranormal ~~XXXXXXXX~~ capability)

SG11

Regarding the statement of an Operational Criterion as per [REDACTED] argument, one must ask what level of credibility resides in the DD for Operations and the DCI vis a vis remote viewing. This is because it is those two humans who will approve or not approve operational plans/entries/maneuvers proposed by the [REDACTED] of the Agency. I think you will agree that the non-stable nature of the occupants of those seats along with the vagaries of human nature make this type of definition very difficult and maybe even impossible. Just in the six years I've been here, there have been 4 DDO's and 4 DCI's. The thought of finding commonalities in such definition for these eight gentlemen is mind-boggling.

SG11

I am ordering for the Library a copy of a book called Fads and Fallacies in the Name of Science. When it comes in I will let you know so you can get it for your perusal. From its title, you know it is negative in orientation but it does produce some thought provoking responses in the reader vis a vis far out science.

Jack
jdf