



# THE BLACK VAULT

This document was obtained from The Black Vault, an online database of declassified government documents. This particular record is housed in the MKULTRA/Mind Control Collection, a compilation of more than 20,000 pages declassified by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

The entire collection is free to download and online at:

**<http://mkultra.theblackvault.com>**

) Draft - TESTING  
33 461 (S)

1. Offices within CIA that were responsible for monitoring or supporting experimentation involving human subjects are the Office of Technical Services (OTS), Office of Research and Development (ORD), Office of Scientific Intelligence (OSI), and the Office of Security (OS).

A. Describe the functions and responsibilities of the offices.

OTS

Formerly known as Technical Services Staff (TSD), OTS provides a variety of technical and scientific support to the intelligence collection effort.

ORD

a. ORD "is responsible for research and exploratory development directed toward (a) anticipating intelligence problems and analyzing them in conjunction with the responsible or producing components to identify the range of possible solutions, (b) assessing and advancing emerging technologies, processing techniques, and analytical methodologies applicable to the identified solutions, and (c) selectively investigating the feasibility of reducing the new concepts to practical use. Additionally, directed technical support is provided to other Agency components, as appropriate."

b. ORD fulfills those responsibilities through a many-disciplined research program encompassing activities in the physical, life, and social sciences. Research program activities include life sciences research in "behavioral sciences, physiology, and the related physical science materials with emphasis on assessment, health, bionics, narcotics, and biological and chemical warfare materials." These responsibilities are specified by Agency regulation. It should be noted that the responsibility for "narcotics and biological and chemical warfare materials" is misleading. A more correct statement would be "narcotics control and detection/identification methods for biological and chemical warfare materials." We have requested a change in the wording of the regulation in order to convey the true responsibilities of the Office of Research and Development.

75-230

OSI

4/6  
585

The Office of Science and Intelligence is responsible for producing intelligence on foreign scientific and engineering research and advanced technology in the physical and life sciences. As part of this mission the Life Sciences Division produces intelligence on Soviet and PRC biomedicine; ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~; ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~; biological and chemical warfare; worldwide food research, technology and practices; and on worldwide human and animal epidemiology.

OS

Responsible for physical security of CIA facilities, property, and information; security clearances of personnel employed by, associated with, or of interest to CIA; and security support to other components of CIA.

B. Describe the types of human use experiments monitored or supported directly or indirectly by these offices.

OTS

OTS was involved in a program to monitor the behavior of individuals under the influence of drugs. Following laboratory testing, the second phase of the program involved drug testing on voluntary participants. The final phase (1955-1963), conducted in conjunction with officers of the Bureau of Narcotics, involved application on unwitting subjects in normal social situations.

ORD

a. The types of human experiments monitored or supported by ORD were essentially those of:

1) Identifying personality traits, characteristics, skills or aptitudes that may be useful in the selection of Agency employees--including physiological means for establishing (credibility) bona fides of foreign agents.

2/6/

(1375)

Included in this category is research leading to the identification and codification of cultural, psychological, personality and conversational traits having a potential for use in developing models of cultural/personality profiles for assessing foreign individuals. Such models would help to determine observable characteristics that indicate whether the foreign possessor of intelligence information is lying, being evasive, being candid and possibly susceptible to recruitment as an intelligence source. The models will also be used in assessing the reliability and the bona fides of foreign agents who are providing information. Such models would have application in the polygraph interview setting where sensors to measure physiological responses are attached to the subject. They would also have application to direct conversation in which a foreign source may be assessed. In this setting, information could be obtained through proper exploitation of cultural, psychological and personal characteristics of the foreign individual.

2)



OSI

No involvement.

OS

OS studied the effects of various drugs, chemicals, and hypnosis for possible use as interrogation aids.

75-232

zation transfer of functions involving human  
experimentation projects, the reasons for the reorgani-  
zation or transfer, and who ordered it.

OTS

In 1962, OTS management began to orient its behavioral activities toward the use of psychological assessments to support active operations and away from peripheral long-range research. This trend continued until the middle or late 1960's when OTS totally disengaged from human experimentation research.

ORD

No documentation relating to "a reorganization or transfer of functions involving human experimentation projects" was found in ORD files. People whose association with ORD dates back to the 1968-69 period recall a redefinition of ORD/TSD responsibilities at about that time. Under the redefinition, ORD was to have a greater role in research projects with long term goals while TSD would concentrate more on the short term operational aspects.

OSI

No information.

OS

No information.

2. Was Dr. Sidney Gottlieb ever assigned to any office identified in question number 1? Whether or not he was assigned to such offices --

A. What was his position with the CIA?

- 1951-1956 - Chief, Chemical Branch, Technical Services Staff
- 1957-1958 - Assigned overseas with the DDP with no technical responsibilities.
- 1959-1960 - Assistant to the DDP for Scientific Matters
- 1961-1962 - Acting Chief, Technical Service Division Research and Development (TSD/R&D)

451 (58/2)

B. What were his duties?

The organization and functions of TSD changed frequently. The immediately available written records are not precise on Gottlieb's specific duties. The responsibilities of the Chemical Branch in the early 50's were to:

1. Initiate and conduct a research and development program in chemistry and biology designed to provide new or improved capabilities, equipment, materials and techniques to support Clandestine Services Activities.
2. Request initiation of development and production contracts with other Government agencies, private firms, and monitor those activities.
3. Assist when called upon to solve technical problems in the chemical/biological field.
4. Advise and assist when required in technical aspects of operational planning.
5. A thorough study of the intelligence implications of selected drugs was one of the projects of the Chemical Branch.

C. When did he serve?

See 2A

D. Who was his immediate superior?

Dr. Gottlieb's immediate supervisors were:

- 1952-1957 - Chief, TSS
- <sup>57-58</sup>  
<sup>59-60</sup> - Special Scientific Adviser
- 1960-1962 - Chief, TSS
- 1962-1966 - Chief, TSD
- 1966-1973 - The DDP

E. Who were his subordinates?

75-234

██████████ - Retired  
██████████ - Retired  
Dr. Robert Lashbrook - Retired  
██████████

4 1  
(JLS)

As Dr. Gottlieb occupied increasing responsible positions, finally as Chief TSD, a large number of people in very diverse positions ultimately reported to him.

3. Was Dr. Robert Lashbrook ever assigned to any office identified in question number 1? Whether or not he was assigned to such offices --

A. What was his position with the CIA?

From the memory of those associated with Dr. Lashbrook, he served as a chemist/biologist in Chemistry Branch and later in the Research Branch which was formed from the Chemical Branch of TSD.

B. What were his duties?

Dr. Lashbrook's duties would have been to conduct research appropriate to the charter of the Chemical Branch described in the response to question #2. These duties are known to have included a study of the olfactory capability of dogs and work on selected drugs.

C. When did he serve?

Dr. Lashbrook is recalled to have been an employee of the Technical Service Division from about 1952 to 1964.

D. Who was his immediate superior?

Dr. Lashbrook's immediate superior was Dr. Gottlieb.

E. Who were his subordinates?

Dr. Lashbrook worked alone and with contractors. As far as can be recalled, he had no supervisory responsibility.

4. Who authorized Messrs. Gottlieb and Lashbrook to conduct the experiment that involved Dr. Frank Olsen and at least three others as human subjects, and for what purposes was the experiment conducted?

A. ... the drugs or chemicals used in the experiment.

271  
35

On 13 April 1953, Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, approved a program related to research and development of a capability in the covert use of biological and chemical materials. The subsequent experiment involving Dr. Frank Olsen was part of that program and was conducted to observe the effects of a specific drug in a conference setting.

LSD was used in the experiment.

B. How many times and at what dose level were the drugs or chemicals administered to the subjects?

The drug was administered one time, at an unknown but apparently low level.

C. How were these drugs or chemicals administered to the subjects?

The drug was put in a bottle of cointreau.

D. Who administered the drugs or chemicals to the subjects?


The identity of the individual(s) actually administering the drug is unknown, although three CIA officers were reprimanded for their roles in the incident.

E. Was there medical supervision of the experiment?

There was apparently no medical supervision of the experiment.

5. Has CIA ever supported, directly or indirectly, experiments involving human subjects at or through federal facilities for drug research and rehabilitation of drug addicts in or near (see letter of 25 September from Senator Kennedy for listing).

The records available to CIA do not contain a complete listing of federal facilities or other institutions pertinent to this question. From 1952 to 1962, the Agency had a classified contract with the National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Public Health Service with the purpose of finding a synthetic





or after than cocaine. Actual testi of drugs was performed by NIMH at National Institut of Mental Health, Addiction Center, Lexington, Kentucky. Testing was done on animals and human volunteers (patients at the facility in Lexington). The Agency terminated the contract in 1962 with a report that the goals were realized. Apparently the project continued with NIMH financing.

[REDACTED]

Records also show funding of research may have been provided to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. The precise nature of the activity has not been identified.

6. Please provide details of the nature of the records and documents that were destroyed in 1973 pertaining to human subjects.

In January 1973, [REDACTED], advising that he was acting on instructions from DCI, Richard Helms, ordered the destruction of all records association with drug research and testing. On 31 January 1973, seven boxes of progress reports from 1953 through 1967 were recalled from the archives and destroyed. In addition, 25 copies of a booklet entitled, "LSD-25, Some Un-Psychedelic Implications," were destroyed.

7. Prior to and subsequent to 1973, what provisions did CIA make for medical follow-up on human subjects who participated in experiments that were supported or conducted, directly or indirectly, by CIA?

Medical supervision of the drug experiments by <sup>461</sup> the Office of Technical Service varied widely since they were conducted through a variety of different mechanisms. In the case of the ~~Lexington, Kentucky~~ hospital, experiments were conducted by a well-trained and competent staff of MD's and psychiatrists. In other cases experiments were conducted with no apparent medical oversight. The nature of other experiments was such that no medical follow-up was required. 555

8. Prior to and subsequent to 1973, what control has CIA exercised in monitoring and reviewing human use in experiments that CIA supported or conducted, directly or indirectly, and in assuring that there was adequate informed consent from those human subjects involved in such experiments?

Some of the drug experiments conducted by the Office of Technical Service were conducted on unwitting subjects. The bulk of the experiments as indicated in paragraph 1b, however, involved consenting subjects. Prior to 1973 the Agency followed the normal practices and procedures established by the institutions where the work was conducted. Subsequent to late FY 1973, the Agency has required in all new contracts that the institutions involved adhere to HEW Guidelines by requiring compliance with the following contract provision:

"In the performance of this contract, the Contractor will assume responsibility for adhering to established and accepted professional, ethical, and legal practices in the use of human subjects for research purposes. This will include the maintenance of medical confidentiality of the individual subjects' records and the maintenance of anonymity in data forwarded to the Sponsor."

Once the research is underway these procedures are periodically reviewed by the project officer assigned to monitor the research.

9. Have there been any deaths in connection with human use experiments that were conducted or supported, directly or indirectly by CIA? If so, provide details.

We know of no deaths in connection with human use experiments conducted or supported directly or indirectly by CIA other than the Dr. Olsen case.

10. Have there been any injuries in connection with human use experiments that were conducted or supported, directly or indirectly, by CIA? If so, provide details.

We know of no injuries in connection with human use experiments.

9

75-238

4, 51 (155)

This has been done.

12. Has CIA used the J. [redacted], the [redacted] Fund, the Society [redacted] Fund, or [redacted] Inc., as an intermediary in funding or supporting in any matter experiments involving human subjects? If so, provide details.

CIA records show that [redacted], the Society [redacted], and the [redacted] might have been used as intermediaries in funding experiments involving human subjects. Complete details of their use has not yet been developed. In FY 1965, funds were transferred to the [redacted] under a non-U S. Government association agreement for the research described in question 13. Funds were transferred to [redacted] in 1973-1975 for collation and analysis of psychological test data of human subjects. There is no indication the [redacted] was used as an intermediary in funding or supporting experiments involving human subjects.

13. Have CIA personnel conducted experiments involving human subjects other than the experiment that involved Dr. Frank Olsen and at least three other persons?

ORD

The one instance in which ORD personnel have been directly involved in conducting experiments with human subjects occurred in Orlando, Florida during December, 1964. The subject allegedly had transdermal optical perception. The tests were observed by a contractor under a classified association contract that had been funded through the [redacted] Fund. In addition to the contractor, the subject's father was present during all testing. No drugs were used. With this one exception, all ORD sponsored research involving human subjects has been conducted by contractors.



75-239

47 (15/5)

OSI

In 1971 the Office of Scientific Intelligence and the Office of Security, did participate in a polygraph experiment on a voluntary human subject. This subject was a yoga expert who claimed to be able to manipulate his autonomic nervous system and thus be able to "beat the polygraph." Our interest was in studying Soviet countermeasures to the polygraph.

OS

The Office of Security conducted experiments with hypnosis in connection with the polygraph. The experiments (1951-1953) involved volunteer Agency employees.

14. Besides those entities mentioned in question number 12, has CIA used any other domestic fund, foundation, society, private or Government agency, or organization as an intermediary in funding or supporting in any manner experiments involving human subjects?

OTS

The Office of Naval Research was used by the Office of Technical Service as an intermediary to fund a classified contract between CIA and NIMH (1952-1962) to test various drugs.

ORD

See Tab A.

OSI

None.

OS

OS files indicate that the ██████████ Foundation and the ██████████ Foundation were used by other components as ~~funding intermediaries~~ in research, although there is no direct reference to human subject experimentation as a part of the research.

15. Has CIA used any foreign fund, foundation, society, private or government agency, or organization as an intermediary in funding or supporting in any manner experiments involving human subjects?

We are not aware of any use of a foreign funding intermediary to support human experimentation.

16. Has CIA used the U.S. Navy, Air Force, Army, Marines, or Coast Guard as an intermediary in funding or supporting in any manner experiments involving human subjects?

OTS

The Office of Naval Research was used by the Office of Technical Service as an intermediary to fund a classified contract between CIA and NIMH (1952-1962) to test various drugs.

ORD

See Tab B.

17. Has CIA ever made arrangements, directly or indirectly, to have a public, private, or military entity in a foreign country conduct experiments involving human subjects in a foreign country?

We are not aware of any arrangements for a public, private, or military entity in a foreign country to conduct experiments involving humans in a foreign country. We are continuing our search for information on this question.

14. Research Funded Through - Other than Department of Defense

| <u>Contractor</u>     | <u>Dates</u> | <u>Reason For Research</u>  | <u>Description of Research</u>  | <u>Remarks</u>   |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|--|
| Iden #1               | FY 1964-1966 | To enhance our capability to screen personnel.  | Polygraph research that involved attachment of sensors for recording physiological responses. No drugs were used.         | Association with U.S. Government was classified.   |
| Iden #2a              | FY 1965-1967 | To enhance our capability to screen personnel.  | Polygraph research that involved attachment of sensors for recording physiological responses. No drugs were used.         | FY 1965-67 association with Government was classified.   |
| 2b                    | FY 1968-1969 | To examine information elicitation techniques.  | Sleep suggestibility studies that involved the attachment of sensors. No drugs were used.                                 | FY 1968-69 association with Government is classified.  |
| 2c                    | FY 1971-1976 | To examine new techniques for obtaining information.                                    | Interrogation research that involved the attachment of sensors for recording physiological responses. No drugs were used. | FY 1971-76 association with Government is classified.  |
| <del>██████████</del> | FY 1965      | To determine whether unusual sensory processes could be used for intelligence purposes. | Attachment of sensors for recording visual and tactual sensory processes. No drugs were used.                             | FY-65 association with U.S. Government is classified. This act is covered in the answers to questions 12 and 13. |

75-242

1961

16. a) Research Funds Through - Air Force Office of Scientific Research 1 June 1968 17 October 1971

| <u>Contractor</u>  | <u>Dates</u>     | <u>Reason for Research</u>  | <u>Description of Research</u>   | <u>Remarks</u>   |
|--|------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>[REDACTED] Research<br/>Inst. for<br/>Mental Sci-<br/>ences,<br/>[REDACTED]</p> | FY 1965-<br>1972 | To enhance our capability<br>to screen personnel.   | Polygraph research that in-<br>volved attachment of sen-<br>sors for recording phy-<br>siological responses. De-<br>pressants and stimulants<br>(seconal and amphetamines)<br>were used to establish<br>the physiological arousal<br>levels in subjects. This<br>took place in the 1967-<br>1968 contract year on a<br>small number (8-12) of<br>volunteers who had given<br>informed consent. | From FY-65 through FY-68<br>this was a classified ass-<br>tation. The identity of the<br>contractor is included in<br>this instance because<br>contractor has acknowledged<br>the association in the [REDACTED]<br>From FY 1969 through 1972<br>Agency contracted direc-<br>tly with [REDACTED] on an unclass-<br>ified association basis. That<br>decision was in response<br>to the findings of the Katze<br>commission. |
| Iden #3  | FY 1965          | To enhance our capability<br>to screen personnel.   | Polygraph research that in-<br>volved attachment of sen-<br>sors for recording physio-<br>logical responses. No drugs<br>were used.  | Classified association.  |
| <p>University of<br/>[REDACTED] School<br/>of Medicine<br/>[REDACTED]</p>          | FY 1967          | To evaluate speech in-<br>dices and patterns to<br>determine their useful-<br>ness in assessing humans. | Interview techniques were<br>developed and evaluated<br>through personal interviews.<br>No drugs were used.  | Classified association in-<br>cluded in FY-67. Classified<br>association was discontin-<br>ued in the FY-68 in response<br>to the findings of the Katze<br>Commission.   |

75-243  
TAB B

[REDACTED]

461

b) Research Funded Through - Office of Naval Research

| <u>Contractor</u>     | <u>Dates</u> | <u>Reason For Research</u>  | <u>Description of Research</u>   | <u>Remarks</u>  |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|---|
| 1 #5                  | FY 1964-1970 | To enhance our capability to screen personnel.  | Polygraph research that involved attachment of sensors for recording physiological responses. No drugs were used.  | Classified association.   |
| <del>██████████</del> | FY 1966-1969 | To enhance our capability to screen personnel.  | Polygraph research that involved attachment of sensors for recording physiological responses. No drugs were used.  | The identity of contractor in this instance is inc because the Agency contracted direct with ██████████ on an unclassified association basis FY1969. Until the time the association had been classified. The decision for unclassified association was in the response to the findings of the Katzenback Committee. |
| 1 #6                  | FY 1966-1968 | To determine whether unusual sensory processes could be used for intelligence purposes. | Extrasensory research that involved the attachment of sensors for recording coincidence of brain waves in three subjects when only one of the three was stimulated by visual, auditory or tactual means. No drugs were used. | Classified association.   |

75-244

1461



16 c). Research Funded Through - Department of Army

| <u>Contractor</u> | <u>Dates</u> | <u>Reason For Research</u>   | <u>Description of Research</u>                                | <u>Remarks</u>   |
|-------------------|--------------|--|---|--|
| Iden #7           | FY 1971-1973 | Protection of US VIP's based on intelligence indications that the Soviets were actively working on similar substances. | Analysis of the results of drug testing using human subjects. | A review of t activity h- mined the were not us research test human subject were used o. the analysis evaluation of obtained from or from data by others in experiments. |

75-244

1961