



MEMO

TO Dr. H.E. Puthoff DATE 9 Nov 83
FROM I. Swann LOCATION
SUBJECT Setting up memo numbering system CC

I foresee that shortly we are going to have to be able to deal with multitudes of memos.

To facilitate access and location of these memos in a speedy manner, I recommend that we set up a memo numbering system so that each memo can be located by an appropriate number, and also so referred to in ancillary memoranda.

I would hope we can set this system up before my departure for NY as of close of business Friday.



MEMO

TO Dr. H.E. Puthoff DATE 9 Nov 83
FROM I. Swann LOCATION
SUBJECT Computerlink CC

It now seems adequately clear, since everything will be put in some sort of written form, as you and I have now agreed, that we shall shortly have several significant time delays while our written correspondence gets through the surface mail.

Therefore, your idea that I have a computer terminal in NY now seems sensible, and I will take you up on your offer and desire on this matter.

Please let me know soonest if a terminal is available. I would ask that it be sent to my home address via Blue Label so as to be there and operational by next Monday.

Memo for Record.

8 Nov 83

Training Tom McVee SIT/ cong.
Turchak "

10.35 Took the interference problem unofficially to Helen Cochran who recommended I present it to Ray Long, acting director in B. Leonard's absence. Long said he would make an investigation.

8.30 pm. phone con with Hal: he was given orders by Long to inform Salzer that I was within my legal rights and that unless agreement between client & consultant could be reached, no work could take place. Hal asked me to talk with Salzer & I declined. I asked that the issue of noninterference be committed into a memo that completely reflects this phone con. H. said he would provide that memo morning of 9 Nov.



727 EL CAMINO REAL, MENLO PARK, CA 94025

415/323-9481

Luxurious Rooms • Heated Pool • Courtesy Continental Breakfast
Commercial Rates • Air Conditioned • TV - Radio • Telephone

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann
From: Hal Puthoff
Subject: FY '84 Contract

Date: 7 Nov 1983

In the interest of putting together a rational plan for FY '84, it is necessary to chart out milestones for the year, set training period dates, schedule task efforts, coordinate vacation and leave times, etc., and therefore I request from you information with regard to conditions, tasking, scheduling, and so forth, which would permit us to move forward in a timely fashion with regard to setting up a one-year contract with specified commitments. We would then be in a position to give the clients maximum lead time in meshing their schedules and commitments with ours with a minimum of problems.

To: Ingo Swann
From: Hal Puthoff
Subject: Trainee Progress, Documentation of

Date: 4 Nov 1983

As you know, by your efforts RV technology has been brought to a point where technology transfer has become a reality.

We have also learned, on the basis of review of our program by many who have not had direct contact with it, that objective documentation of this fact is an area of our program that has been judged by the consumers to be weak and to require more attention. One outcome has been the introduction of the Salyer protocols.

As I think it over from our perspective, a few thoughts of corrective action come to mind, which I wanted to put down in memo form so that we could think about them.

Basically, with regard to your own remote viewing, we are in a strong position because we have two "bottom lines;" a series of excellent results from sessions taken under Class B conditions, the coin of the realm in scientific discourse, and a series of excellent results for Class A viewings, which is the final bottom line. Neither of these do we have for the recent trainees, which is why the "transferability" of the tech is on weaker ground than the actual demonstration of the tech by your own results. The proper corrective action, obviously, is to bring the former up to the standards of the latter. Basically, what this means is that you have done your job -- the creation of the tech and the transfer of it to your trainees -- it is now time for me to do my job, which is to work with you to demonstrate this fact by the protocols that fall into my hat, the science game.

Since you know your tech the best, what I propose is to sit down with you and the two of us work out appropriate procedures that from your side keep intact the integrity of your tech, and that from my side I know will satisfy the requirements of the science game. Following are a few thoughts that come to mind, but are meant to be simply a stimulus for further discussion rather than a solution.

At a time you thought appropriate (e.g., at the end of the completion of Stage 3 when the viewer has developed proper session control and at appropriate times thereafter), the viewer would undertake a formal series of Class Bs, taking into account proper timing, spacing, aborts, etc., as is congruent with the tech as you have developed it. Once we have developed protocols we are satisfied with, we could have them proctored by others (e.g., Dean Jahn, Schmeidler, etc.), carry them out directly, or do whatever we both thought was appropriate.

A second possibility is simply to collect single Class Bs on a periodic basis as we did with you (and I think also with Gary, Blue and Hella), so that the documentation is integrated as an ongoing process, rather than in the form of "mid-terms and finals."

Yet a third way, as you suggested (for the longer run) is that we export Stages 1 - 3 to Jahn, Schmeidler, etc., and let them validate the procedures independently.

One useful outcome of producing our own quantitative measures of

performance is that individuals that are being trained are bound to have a spread in performance (compare previous trainees), and it might turn out that their overall profiles, which would also differ, could be correlated with their performance measures, thus insuring that future trainees with more optimum profiles would be sent, making the training job easier. A second useful outcome of developing our own control procedures is that we will have a measure of performance which meets both our criteria and those of other scientists which can be juxtaposed against performance criteria set up for us by others.

To summarize, you have done your job in creating and transferring the tech, and I want to do my best in working with you to develop appropriate procedures to demonstrate it. As you have been the first to say, if good RV efforts aren't supported by an equally good science surround, then a disservice has been done both to the viewers and to the phenomenon.

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann
From: Hal Puthoff
Subject: Tasking, FY '84

Date: 7 Nov 1983

Following up on our earlier discussions, I wish to state here as requested the specific tasks that I invite you to participate in, and the amount of commitment associated.

First is the completion of Tom's SIII-SIV training. The time and commitment for this task was set down in last year's effort as a fixed-price contract, which included an estimated time-to-completion given anticipated rates. (I need to locate the estimate, but don't want to hold up this memo to find it.)

I invite you to participate as training monitor to deliver SV-SVI training to Tom, which, based on your estimate, is a 30-man-day commitment.

I also invite you to take on (beginning 9 January) an SI-SIII training of three of Tom's colleagues. Based on your estimate of 24 weeks average requirement, this would be a commitment of 120 man-days of your time.

I have also set up a CRV R&D task for the additional SV-SVI-(SVII?) development, the number of days open-ended as required by you and as you have time for.

In addition, ELF and Search tasks, as I indicated to you previously, could use, again, as much of your time as you are willing to put into it, and I invite you to consider participation in these tasks.

MEMO

To: Roy Long
From: Hal Puthoff

Date: 9 Nov 1983
110983-HP4

Subject: Client/SRI/Consultant Negotiations on SRI Task 9575 (sub 7)

Yesterday you informed me that one of our consultants, Ingo Swann, had approached you for information as to SRI policy on the position and role of consultants with regard to being responsive to SRI client requirements.

Following is a summary of the issues for your information.

During the last three-year period we have been tasked by our client to develop training procedures which could be used to transfer remote viewing technology to client personnel. To meet this requirement SRI chose to go forward with developing a particular procedure conceived of by one of the SRI consultant remote viewers, Ingo Swann. This has involved, first, developing the details of the procedure in a research mode with Swann himself acting as remote viewer, and then investigating the technology transfer part by exposing neophyte remote viewers (additional SRI consultants) to the procedure, with Swann acting as tutor. At this point four participants (excluding other client personnel on another contract) have been brought up through stages roughly midway through the training procedure as part of the R&D effort.

With regard to this particular task (training R&D), the task for this year consists of (1) further development of the training procedures, and (2) applying test procedures to document the efficacy of the procedure, all in preparation for client personnel being brought on board for training in FY 85.

In addition to the protocols being set up by SRI to document the efficacy of the training procedure (which are now being worked out), the client's COTR, as part of his documentation effort, has included a requirement that he obtain an independent data set with the present trainees in accordance with a specified protocol.

While recognizing the necessity to cooperate with independent efforts by the client to document the training procedure, the consultant has raised technical objections to the specific COTR protocols, set into motion, involving the present trainees. Based on what he sees as his responsibilities to deliver a product to SRI and the client, and referencing the noninterference clause 3 in the standard SRI contract, the consultant then approached you for information as to his prerogatives with regard to submitting to, or bringing about a change in, externally-generated protocols, as at this point he feels he cannot meet his obligations under the present circumstances.

After examining the issues, it appears to me that the consultant is within his rights to decline participation in a task he has major responsibilities for if he feels cannot meet his obligations under constraints set by SRI or the client, and the client is within his rights to set requirements, and to terminate a task in which

requirements he sets cannot be met.

I have discussed the issues with both the consultant and the COTR, and it is clear to all that either a rapprochement between client, SRI and the consultant is reached on the issues, or else SRI will not be able to pursue this task.

As of this point, discussion has begun to determine whether the consultant's responsibilities, SRI's obligations, and the client's requirements can be met under conditions mutually agreeable to all parties concerned, or whether this particular task will be terminated.

MEMO

To: Hal Puthoff
From: Ed May *EM*
Subject: Terminal for Ingo

Date: 09-Nov-83
Location: g-220

I read, with interest, Ingo's request for computer access. Recognizing the urgency of his need, I recommend the following interim solution.

I can provide Ingo with a Silent 700. He has used them in the past so there will be little new for him to learn. Since it is a small unit, he can carry it with him when he leaves this time.

The Silent 700 will give him immediate private access to you through the Unix mail facility and vice versa.

I will provide Ingo a written step-by-step procedure on how to get to our system, how to log on, how to use mail, and finally how to log off.

Another advantage of this system is that it does not require any special installation thus Ingo can do it on his own.

I request that Ingo be made aware that a lot of the potential unreliability of the entire network comes from sources over which I have no control.

- a. Tymnet must work.
- b. SRI Gandolf internal network must be on line.
- c. SRI Micom must be on line.
- d. Our LSI-11/23 must be on line. This is the most reliable part of the system.

Dave Saunders uses the mail with little trouble, and Bev has 6 months experience with programming from Denver. Ingo should have little trouble with just using the mail.

If this meets with your approval, let me know, and I will provide Ingo with the necessary instructions (written) and hardware.

sounds good. Does it have a screen or printer so that he can get my mail? If he prints up something to read me, does he retain his own copy? If the answer to both is yes, this is even better for his purposes than an APT.

Hal

9 Nov 83

4.30 pm

5.00 pm two long telephone conversations with Hal on general issues of establishing future protocols. talks OK. one issue surfaced. He indicated that if I worked only for one client that my fee (\$400) might be called into question. will ask for clarification tomorrow.

We also discussed taking the work to Dean Jahn etc. I requested Hal, for the fourth time, to be in touch with Dr. Jahn as to feasibility of doing this.



727 EL CAMINO REAL, MENLO PARK, CA 94025

415/323-9481

Luxurious Rooms • Heated Pool • Courtesy Continental Breakfast
Commercial Rates • Air Conditioned • TV - Radio • Telephone

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann
From: Hal Puthoff
Subject: Memo Numbering

Date: 9 Nov 1983
#110983-HP1

Re your memo of today on memo numbering, I suggest the following natural system (which I hve used above under the date): the memo is numbered by the date, followed by the author's initials and a number indicating whether it is his first, second, etc., memo of the day.

My first two memos for today would be:

110983-HP1
110983-HP2

and for tomorrow

111083-HP1
111083-HP2

while your first for tomorrow would be

111083-IS1

This gives us immediate information as to the date, author, and an additional identifier to separate a particular author's memos of a given day.



MEMO

TO Dr. H.E. Puthoff DATE 9 Nov 83
FROM I. Swann LOCATION 7 a.m.
SUBJECT Salyer memo CC

Attached is a copy of Mr. Salyer's memo addressed to me and dated 1 November 1983. Is it this memo that you stated you had never seen?

At your convenience, if you wish, I will show you in my memoranda for the record where you read me A Salyer memo over the telephone. To the best of my recall it was this one.

To: Ingo Swann

From: J. Salyer

Subject: CRV Training During FY 1984

Reference: Phoncon - 1 November 1983

1. You requested, in the referenced phone conversation, that I submit my plan for changes in the CRV training during FY 1984. This is a very simple matter. As I have expressed to you, I did not have as much data as I needed to fully support the concept that improved RV quality results from training. The actions I propose will insure that I will be able to do this at the end of this fiscal year. The plan is as follows:
2. Before any RV sessions are conducted in FY 1984, each trainee will be required to do five Class B targets. I will select the targets, conduct the sessions and evaluate the results. Then as we proceed through the year, additional Class B sessions will be held with each trainee either at the beginning or at the end of each of the training sessions. If training is effective, a plot of quality over time would show a positive slope. This is the convincing evidence that science requires to support the statement that CRV is a transferable technology.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Salyer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.



MEMO

TO Martha Thomposon DATE 9 November 83
FROM I. Swann LOCATION
SUBJECT Packing boxes CC

Please see if you can obtain from packing about twelve boxes that are approximately one half the size we are currently trying to deal with.

When these larger boxes get through the shipping system, they are often broken open. The smaller one's seem to survive much better.

ASAP, and thanks for your effort.

10 Nov 83

430. Hal & I had a talk about creating a proper test sequence for training efficiency. I indicated the R&D line & proto trainees must remain intact, so that we can have an unbreathed sample of the very phenomena we would seek to detect. A testing line separate from the R&D line needs to be established. He said he understood, but I wonder.

10 Nov 83

2:30 pm.

Memo for record.

Called Jim & told him that I had discovered that my little contract with SRI & his big one were not in accord, and that mine stipulated a treatment for me that his probably did not. Indicated that management probably would need a little time to consider a new approach. Indicated my work with Bus com & invited him up to show how I would lease RV Room. He said he understood all. (I hope.) Said I would respond to Protocols request next week. He said there was no hurry.

3:40. Jim & I had a civilized talk. He explained to me the status of his position so: DIA/Controllers/ Legal/ Defense funds/ Congress. He asked me to read the classified report he & Dale prepared, and which has, I take it, brought the current sit. down on overheads. I said I could read it tomorrow.

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann

Date: 10 Nov 1983

From: Hal Puthoff

Subject: Protocols for Client Documentation of Training Progress

I have discussed with Jim the issues and considerations concerning protocols for client documentation of training progress.

In response he asked that I request from you a memo describing your recommendations as to protocols that he can look at, after which we can get together and discuss the options.

MEMO

To: Record
From: H. Puthoff
Subject: Next Training Period, Dates of

Date: 8 Nov 1983

This is to document in memo form that the next training period for higher-stage training (Tom and Julia) will take place beginning Monday, 28 November, and lasting through Friday, 9 December.

With regard to location, at my request Audley Williams, Sr. Business Manager for the Systems Research and Analysis Division, has arranged for our requested two-office space in the SRI NY facility. Contingent upon approval of the space by Col. Buzby during a visit to NY during the week of 13 November (being arranged between Buzby and Swann by telephone), the training will take place in the NY facility.