

MEMO FOR THE RECORD

25 August 1995

SG11

SG11 Subject: Telephone conversation with [REDACTED]

SG11 I called [REDACTED] about 0930 and noted that I wished to speak to him about a program that he was involved in as a user when Jack Vorona was the principal sponsor. After we "fenced" around abit to identify the program of interest, he recalled the program and his involvement with it, noting that he had not spoken to Jack in many years. Mr. [REDACTED] was responsible for Coast Guard intelligence at a west coast location and recalled that he utilized the paranormal RV services several years ago, he thought 3 or 4. The function of his organization was to intercept merchant ships and search those that were believed to be transporting drugs or other illegal materials. He used the RV's both at his location in conjunction with his people and also tasked them for inputs at the Program Office location. He indicated that the RV's he used were government employees (vice a contractor).

SG11

In the initial portions of our conversation, I asked [REDACTED] if he had ever used the RV inputs as a basis to task other resources and/or had he ever confirmed RV information based upon other data after the fact. His initial comments were enthusiastic and positive, e.g. , "yes they had taken action based upon the RV inputs". For example, his crew would board incoming merchant ships and look for materials of types and locations defined by the RV's. However, when asked if they ever had any success, he noted that this was open to personal interpretation, but probably not. He quoted one instance where the RV's indicated a specific white powder in a specific ship, and when they boarded the ship they found that it was full of exotic animals and some type of powder, but not a drug. He thought his group had reported their evaluations of the RV inputs back to the program office and that their comments should be in the Program Office files.

He noted that their "success" with the RV's was much better when they were at his location than when they were tasked at their home office, noting further that the RV's then had a better idea of what his people were looking for and how they operated. He stated his belief that there is really "something valid" about the phenomenon but that it needs more research so it is better understood and so the user can be given more assurance about what to expect. He noted that he didn't think we really know how to use the phenomenon to the advantage of organizations such as his.

At about this point he seemed to hesitate and his enthusiasm for the activity seemed to wane somewhat. I asked him if he thought the utility was sufficiently positive that, as a government user, he would be willing to for pay the RV services from a private contractor. He stated that "the probability of success is very low, but I think there is something there, if only we had a better understanding of the phenomenon and how to use it". He said that paying for the service would be a problem because of the "bosses" attitude. I asked him to explain this and he said that the boss was initially interested in the use of the service probably because it was so highly classified which gave the

program an aura of mystery and legitimacy, i.e., it must be good if it's so highly classified. However, this support died after a while due to the lack of success. I told him that if he was going to be in the DC area we would be pleased to talk further. He noted that he gets up here occasionally, but didn't think he'd be up here before the end of September (I told him we had a hard schedule commitment). He reiterated his belief that there was "something" to this phenomenon but more research was required. He noted one case where an RV provided him with information on a ship that described it so precisely that when he saw it, e.g., shape, color, he was convinced that the phenomenon existed. But, he said, it simply is not understood well enough as yet to be relied upon for applications.

SG11

We completed the conversation about 0950. [REDACTED] never asked me for any identification nor even for the spelling of my name. He was very open and forthright in his comments, his demeanor was most cordial and gracious and his comments were made in a most convincing tone of voice. He responded to my questions without any apparent hesitancy in spite of his initial cautionary attitude regarding the sensitivity of the program. Considering his intelligence background, the nature of this project and the facts that he didn't know me and claimed to not have spoken to Vorona, I was very surprised at his openness and direct responses to my questions. I noted that we thought the program was going to be declassified and he thought that was good, but even without that prompt, he hardly hesitated to respond to anything I asked him once we started discussing his involvement.

I came away with the belief that he was trying to support continuation of the program (especially the R&D) but was not a great supporter of its use for operational applications at the present time. His stated belief in the validity of the phenomenon could account for this, although I found his support a little strange given that he is retired and no longer engaged in Coast Guard activities. On the other hand, this could be interpreted as support for an old friend's request. While he was most convincing over the phone regarding his lack of recent communication with Vorona, he is a retired intelligence officer and may be accustomed to portraying things differently than they are.

Follow-up information - 8/30/95

SG11 On 8/29/95, I went through the Star Gate files to extract any available records regarding the Coast Guard tasking and subsequent results. I located about seven tasks that were clearly done for the Coast Guard group in Long Beach, CA (based upon Mr. [REDACTED] name referenced in each) during the period from July 1990 through calendar year 1992. Four of these were discussed in a single document with a transmittal memo from [REDACTED] (at the time Capt.) to Headquarters, Department of Army. For each of the four tasks (called Projects in the document) the document includes a detailed task description, the desired EEL's (Essential Elements of Information) for that task, a paragraph - titled the Output - which apparently summarizes the information provided by the RV (or RV's??) (the "raw" RV inputs are not included) and a brief paragraph - titled the Results - describing the results from any subsequent

SG11 use of the RV information during an operational action. In my earlier conversation, Mr. [REDACTED] mentioned that some of the Coast Guard tasks were accomplished with the RV's on-site and I presume these four tasks are representative of that situation. This presumption is based upon two facts, 1) the raw RV data is missing and 2) the review package contains a complete scenario for each task, i.e., a task description, RV input and subsequent results; no other tasking data that I have reviewed had this type of tooth-to-tail completeness. I also presume that the EEI information was provided to the RV's, i.e., they had substantial inputs regarding what was desired and important as a result of their deliberations (unlike many of the other operational tasks where they would be provided only the name of the tasking organization and , for example, the name of something, i.e., a person, place or thing, and simply asked to "tell me about that thing".)

SG11 Note also that [REDACTED] noted that their use of the RV information had better "success" for the tasks wherein the RV were on-site.

Before discussing the contents of this package and the four 1990 tasks, I note that the 1991 and 1992 task folders contained only: the tasking input from the Coast Guard, the raw information developed by the RV's and the subsequent report sent from the Star Gate office back to the tasking organization, i.e., no subsequent feedback or evaluation information from the Coast Guard appeared in any of these folders.

Returning to the 1990 document, all of the four tasks or projects (numbered 1 to 4) concern possible illegal narcotics activities conducted via commercial shipping traffic in and out of the US West Coast. Project 2 related to communications intercepts and either was scrubbed or the RV information was not evaluated. It's hard to tell which since the comment in the Results states: "The **evaluation** (emphasis added) of specific CIE intercepts was determined to be a project that would hold less potential for success than the other projects covered.... Subsequent evaluation of these intercepts maybe accomplished by HQDA." No information is provided for this project regarding any RV inputs or the lack thereof, but the suggestion of future evaluation leaves that issue ill defined.

Project number 3 requested a review of information provided by an Advanced Tracking Prototype to determine the activities of three designated vessels (apparently the vessel designation was provided elsewhere). The Results of this project note that: "... the information... was unable to be verified but the general pattern of activity indicated is believed to be typical of this region."

SG11 The Output for both Projects 1 and 4 were credited in the Results sections as having some match with subsequent information obtained from operations. In the case of Project 1, the "contraband" and its location was described for three vessels. Only one of these was subsequently boarded by a Coast Guard unit (this appears to be the case the [REDACTED] recalled in our discussion). The Output paragraph for that vessel describes in some detail the location and wrapping of the contraband including: "The items were described as white, granular and lumpy similar to laundry detergent that has been wet and then is dried." The Results section noted that the boarding personnel found over one thousand pieces of white coral and eight sea turtles. No other

information describing where the items were found, any description of their wrapping (hopefully the turtles were not wrapped in plastic sheets as defined in the Output for the contraband) nor any explanation of why white coral looks like dried laundry detergent. In spite of that apparent omission, it concludes with the comment: "Of specific interest in this seizure was the **virtual match** (emphasis added) of the original team (i.e., the RV's) and that of the situation involving the [name of ship- deleted here]." If there was anything that **matched** other than the fact that the alleged laundry powder and the coral found on the ship were both white, it was not identified.

Project 4 concerned a suspicion that an American shipping company was involved in smuggling narcotics into the San Francisco Bay area. The Output paragraph: describes a generic adult male alleged to be the owner, describes narcotic sources and operating ports, provides some information on the operational procedures used by the company and the equipment on their ships and the names of the vessels involved. Note that an adult male was indicated as the owner in the task description; further that the drug sources and operating port information replicates information that was included in the task statement and which (I presume) had been provided to the RV's initially. The Output information concerning operational procedures and the names of the vessels were both in error when compared with the comments in the Results portion. **In spite of these observations**, the Results state: "A large portion of the information supplied by the team has been verified as correct and corroborates our **belief** (emphasis added) that these facilities are being used for smuggling."

- SG11 Given the analysis and comments above in conjunction with the comments provided earlier by [REDACTED] I can only conclude that the any utility is in the eye of the beholder, i.e., as I've noted elsewhere, this is a very subjective process and, given the nebulous and generic type of data provided by the RV's and the breadth of the possibilities surrounding any given operational situation, one can always "find" something that appears to match. Whether this match is a coincidence, a "forced fit" on the part of the user or a manifestation of a true phenomenon is not of any great consequence. The fact is that it is not specific enough nor detailed enough when it occurs to have been of any real intelligence value prior or even during the operational activity. [REDACTED] comments that no real successes were achieved is certainly valid in that context and the withdrawal of his Admiral's support for lack of success provides further substantiation and confirmation of that conclusion.
- SG11