

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Deputy Chief, I & J Staff

DATE: 27 October 1950

FROM :

SUBJECT:

There are a few answers to certain questions which were brought up at the conference which, because of the time limitations, I was unable to discuss at the time.

I am more convinced than ever concerning the necessity of the preventing of the dissemination of knowledge that we are using a hypnotic technique. Because of this, it seems inadvisable to rely upon the oral technique of drug administration. Although this method may well succeed in a large portion of cases, in those in which it fails, the subjects would have reason to know that hypnotic attempts had been tried and might well pass on such information to other people. In our recent research project, no word or manipulation which could be construed by the individuals affected as the commonly recognized hypnotic technique.

The same general objections would be applicable to the surreptitious use of drugs by the agents in that the attempt to use anything similar to a hypnotic technique might be recognized by the subject. As you know, since time is so important, attempts have been made to extract information from individuals under the influence of alcohol, so often with success, often with failure. As a matter of fact, other drugs used to affect the state of consciousness are not much different in their effects than that of alcohol. It is probable that the intravenous use of solutions of alcohol might be just as efficacious as that of any of the preparations we are now using. In a comparison between the effects of alcohol and the other drugs, it must be remembered that there is a wide difference in individual response to any of them.

We shall continually strive to attain more knowledge and better techniques. In the meantime, my general feeling is that because we have accomplished things which seem almost impossible, the authorities concerned almost believe that nothing is impossible. As you know, there are definite limitations, especially since we are so greatly handicapped by popular and official prejudice against some of our methods.

Concerning the discussion of the work at the University of Indiana as to the development of a better Polygraph, it is my opinion that the operators will always be more important than the machine. I really believe that successful D. D. machine operation technique is essentially a hypnotic one. This also explains why it seems important that the subject be screened from an elaborate intravenous injection used because the latter, if visualized by him, would greatly divert his attention and might well upset the successful completion of the technique. On the other hand, the very mystery of the subject's not knowing what is going on behind the curtain enhances the psychological aspects of the method.

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted text]