

Memo to File - BY TERRY SMILJANICH

RE: Noreen Renier - Telephone conversation with NR 2/5/90 at 3:45 P.M.

On this date I received a telephone call from Dr. Gary Posner who advised me that he had a message on his telephone recorder from Noreen Renier telling him that she had just found out about our quarterly meeting for the meeting of February 5, 1990 and that had she known about it sooner, she would have been happy to attend. Dr. Posner and I agreed that I should return the telephone call and urge her to attend our meeting, and also explore the possibility of creating a test of her psychic abilities. I called information and obtained her telephone number and called her. I identified myself as Terry Smiljanich with the Tampa Bay Skeptics. She immediately told me that someone had sent her the pages of our latest newsletter which set forth the story Dr. Posner wrote concerning the motion filed by John Merrall's attorney. She said that she wished we would have called her before writing the story so that she could have corrected the "errors" in John's motion. I told her that our story simply set forth what was contained in John's motion, and that we did indeed want to get her side of the story so that we could follow through on our stories on this matter. She told me that her attorney was going to be filing something and that when he did, she would send me a copy so that we could include that in our story. I asked her if she could send us a copy of this information now so that we could have it ahead of time, and she told me that she couldn't do that since her attorney had not filed it yet. She then asked me why we hadn't contacted her concerning the story that ran. I told her that the newsletter came out just after John Merrall's attorney filed his motion, and I also told her that the motion could not be made public until it was actually filed. I suggested to her that this was the same reason why she was telling me that she could not send out her attorney's motion ahead of time. She agreed that this was true, and then told me that all she wanted to be sure about was that in any follow up stories we did, we included the allegations she is making against John Merrall. I told her that we wanted our stories to be complete and fair, and that if she sent us information in that regard, we would certainly put into any future stories the allegations she is making about John Merrall and his motion. I pointed out to her that our story did include a history of the lawsuit, including the fact that she had won her case and appeal. She then reiterated that John Merrall's motion had several errors and that she was going to point these out to us in future correspondence. She also told me that the information concerning her association with Rollins College was inaccurate. She said that Joan Straumanis was incorrect in stating that Renier was not a member of the school faculty. She told me that she was a "adjunct professor" and [received a paycheck from Rollins college.] I told her that she should be sure to include this information in her future correspondence with us so that we could print her statement and make further investigation to determine what her true status was at the college.

I am not absolutely certain she made this statement. She said words to this effect.

Memo to File
Page 2
RE: Noreen Renier
conversation 2/5/90

I then asked her whether she could make it to our meeting on the evening of February 5, as we would be glad to have her there and let her present to us her complete side of the story. I told her that if she did that, our newsletter could include that in future issues. She told me that she had other commitments and would be unable to make it to our meeting. We then got into a rather lengthy discussion concerning the validity of parapsychology and the appropriate attitude to take toward it. I told her that the Tampa Bay Skeptics would love to test her psychic abilities. She asked me why we would be interested in testing her, and I told her that if in fact she had psychic powers, and if she could pass a validly constructed scientific test of such powers, "we would all be famous" and would have furthered the cause of truth. She told me that since we were skeptics, we were not the appropriate people to test her. I got into a rather lengthy justification for the fact that skeptics are indeed the ones who should be conducting any such tests, because that is the only way to truly subject the claims to adequate testing and zero in on the truth. She told me that parapsychology had already been adequately tested in the past and that many of her friends were parapsychologists who were constantly telling her about positive results they had achieved. I pointed out that positive results on a few occasions don't prove anything and that parapsychologists may not have the appropriate attitude to test subjects. She told me that many parapsychologists were skeptics, and when I asked her to name me a few, she told me about a "Lloyd Somebody", who she said was a parapsychologist in the San Francisco area who was a skeptic and had obtained many positive parapsychological results. She also mentioned "that fraudulent James Randi" and told me that he had been proven to be a fraud many times. I asked her what she meant, and she made reference to "all those lawsuits he is involved in." I then reiterated the fact that our test would be fair because she would agree to it. She asked me what kind of a test we would create and I told her that that depended on what she claimed she could do. I gave the example of being able to hold an object and give specific information about the individual. She told me she did that all the time, and I told her there would be ways to appropriately test that ability by making sure that the object conveyed no information of its own and that the information she had to give out would be specific enough. I told her that before we could create a test she would have to be specific about what she can do. She then told me that "psychometry" was the ability she specifically had. I finally gave in and told her that we would go ahead and try to come up with a generalized test for psychometry and send it to her. I told her she could then look at the proposed test and let us know whether she thought it was fair. I told her that if she didn't think it was fair, we could work

Memo fo File
Page 3
RE: Noreen Renier
conersation 2/5/90

together and try to come up with a mutually agreeable test of some sort. She again told me she saw no reason why she should go through with this testing procedure since she is a "professional" and has no need to prove her abilities to our organization. I told her that as a professional, she should be the first one to want to have her abilities tested so that if they are in fact real powers, the world could find out about them. **She remained non-committal on the subject of testing,** and that basically ended the conversation.

I ended the conversation with her by reiterating the fact that we wish to follow up on our story concerning John Merrøll's motion and the fact that she should send any motion her attorney files to us. She then told me that her attorney had already filed such a motion this past Friday and that the judge was going to rule on the pending motion by February 8, 1990. I told her that I had misunderstood her earlier and thought that the motion by her attorney hadn't been filed yet. She assured me that the motion had been filed. I asked her if she would be willing to send me a copy of that and she said that she would. I gave her the address of the organization and spelled my name for her so that she could send me a copy of the motion. That basically ended my conversation with her.

TAS/ds