



# MEMO

TO H. Puthoff DATE 10 Nov 83  
FROM I. Swann LOCATION  
SUBJECT Training aids for NY CC

As you know, it is quite probable that training of INSCOM personnel will commence on 28 Nov 83 in our new NY location, if it is approved by INSCOM. Since these offices are relatively commensurate to our SRI facility, It would seem that they will approve.

I will need all of my training aids sent to our NY location well in advance of undertaking the actual training, in order to arrange the work and space, and get things organized prior to the arrival of the trainee.

I request therefore that all my training aids that have been long in preparation be dispatched to NY almost immediately. I would hope that the cannibalized portions have been restored.

If not, I shall have to labor myself in NY to recreate these training sites. If this proves necessary, please let me know how many days you wish me to utilize in order to duplicate the sites that Martha and I have worked on accumulating for a long time.

5 November 1983

TO: Dr. H.E. Puthoff that due to the extraordinary  
 FROM: I. Swann Stage four signals, I will not enter into  
 SUBJECT: Scheduling of any personnel who are to be subjected  
 to mid-stage 4 stress tests or class B checks.) (If

Without waiting for an invitation from you to do so, I am  
 herewith taking the liberty of listing the areas of work that  
 could be undertaken during the forthcoming work period, and  
 giving as a "guesstimate" the working time that will probably  
 be required for each topic.)

In addition, I wish to point out that, whereas, in the  
 past, for the health of the project as a whole, I have conducted  
 work in several areas simultaneously, as well as trying to  
 simultaneously satisfy the requirements of different clients,  
 this can no longer continue. The overall workload has become  
 so intense and I am being made now to suffer beyond the call  
 of the duty, and each given area of work is conducted under  
 stresses that are counterproductive.

So, what we have here is a guesstimate for different  
 As you see from the time-estimates below, in some sort, of a  
 new concept will have to come into existence, 230 working days.

While I will continue to be somewhat as flexible as I have  
 in Geophysical correlates to CRV and signal/noise ratios:  
 longer Creating working design: 3-4 months (60/120 working  
 clients days) This topic, in my opinion, is of the highest  
 the priority, not really seem to be appreciated, and  
 second of all because a double time performance on my

The Search Problem: This problem is severe, obtuse and  
 chimerical. Since I truly don't know where to start,

a six-month exploratory program similar to the one  
 we undertook in which we discovered AOL and Ideograms;  
 240 working days. against a feasible scheduling,  
 with a view to establishing priorities, all this against  
 Continuing R&D on Stage 5 and 6: 90 working days.

Designing base-line and control series' program to support  
 area scientific requirements for stabilizing CRV: 60 working  
 five or days. inc While I will help design this program, I will  
 decline in taking part in its implementation.

Creating training monitor's training course. 60 working days.

Creating CRV analysts course. 120 working days.

R&D Stage 7: 30 working days.

4 New client selected trainees entering standard CRV  
 Stage 1 training course: 90 working days, (this a very  
 loose guesstimate).

4 New client selected trainees entering non-standard Stage 1  
 (training with eclectic ~~sess~~ external testing imposed,  
 stress tests, contract-monitor arbitrary ordered viewings,  
 etc.) 240 working days.

November 1963

Entering 1 INSCOM personnel to Stage 4: 30-60 working days. (Please note that due to the extraordinary subtlety of Stage four signals, I will not enter into the training of any personnel who are to be subjected to mid-Stage 4 stress tests or class B checks.) (If trainees on DIA's payroll wish to submit themselves to such testing it shall be done prior to commencement of Stage 4 and after completion of Stage 4, and Stage 4 attempted bracketed between these two test sets will be considered non-standard.)

Telepathy research: 120 working days. (It is my hunch that telepathy is not really understood, and I somewhat believe that a new comprehension of it will give some answers to both search and person-to-person communication. Therefore, I take here the liberty of stressing what I think is a new importance, at least for the record.)

So, what we have here is a guesstimate for different categories of work you might wish me to participate in, but which together total, give or take, some 1,230 working days. While I will continue to be somewhat as flexible as I have in the past, I believe it is time to state that it is no longer desirable or rewarding to piggyback projects or clients into the same working period. First of all, because the effort does not really seem to be appreciated, and second of all because a double time performance on my part has come to be expected by others.

If I commit to the year, my contract specifies 260 working days. I would therefore appreciate it if you would review your needs against a feasible scheduling, with a view to establishing priorities, all this against what is feasible most and productive the greatest.

Personally, I feel that one well-done and successful area will be of more service to all concerned as against five or six incompleting and inconclusive areas.

Creating training monitor's training course. 50 working days.

Creating CRV analyst's course. 120 working days.

740 Stage 7: 30 working days.

4 New client selected trainees entering standard CRV Stage 1 training course: 90 working days, (this a very loose guesstimate).

4 New client selected trainees entering non-standard Stage (training with eclectic tests external testing imposed, stress tests, contract-monitor arbitrary ordered viewings, etc.) 240 working days.

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann  
From: Hal Puthoff  
Subject: Visit by Tom's Boss

Date: 31 Oct 1983

---

Tom's boss will come out to SRI to meet you during the upcoming two-week period. Uncertain yet whether he'll arrive week of 7th or 14th.

I sent Tom a memo reminding him that his sketches were due for the next training period.

*Best regards,*

*Hal*

*discussed 4 nov. one week only.*

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann  
From: Hal Puthoff  
Subject: Upcoming Training Period

Date: 31 Oct 1983

---

This is to confirm that I have made reservations for you and Turchuk at the Mermaid, beginning the night of Sunday, 6 November.

I received a call from Tom's supervisor, who informed me that because of a medical problem in his (Tom's) family, he can't leave the 6th to be here on the 7th, but can leave on the 7th to be here on the 8th, and is planning to do so. He asked me to pass that on to you.

*Best regards,  
Hal Puthoff*

MEMO

To: Ingo Smann  
From: Hal Puthoff  
Subject: Lavelle Absence

Date: 28 Oct 1983  
Location:

---

Just a short note to let you know that Leslie will be away from SRI from 7 November to Christmastime (or perhaps a week before). Jeannette Bulkeley, whom you have seen take her place before, will be her substitute.

5 November 1983

TO: Dr. H.E. Puthoff  
FROM: I. Swann  
SUBJECT: Invitation from you re: creative inputs

Thank you for your recent memo to begin putting creative inputs into the search problem. As stated in another memo, I need a little more information in order to take a decision to participate or not.

Analogous to this, I should wish in this individual memo to advise you that because of the rather continual noise status of working in house at SRI (i.e., the confrontations, etc.,) and my problems with being isolated in Menlo-Park, and in motels, etc., that the SRI ambience is not overall conducive to creative processes. It is because of this that almost all of our progress and breakthroughs have taken place in my tired head while away from the standard difficult interproject difficulties at SRI.

I believe that only one new understanding of psychic processes was achieved at SRI, and that was the importance of AOL's we together achieved in 1978.

As of this writing, the only time I have charged to SRI is the time spent physically at SRI, and I have come to SRI only in order to set up experiments to confirm or deny new understandings that have been achieved in a comparatively safe atmosphere that does not seem to be possible at SRI itself. This also means that the extraordinary amount of time and effort that has gone into my original creative inputs (if you wish to call them that) has been neither supported by nor paid for by SRI. I have pursued these areas because of my personal interest, relatively on my own time, and ~~attento~~always on my own resources.

Neither are creative inputs the result of a 9-5 commitment, but are more in line with a creative creation that can and often does involve one even in one's own dreams while asleep. I am aware, of course, that many of our affiliated people don't give a shit how the product is brought about, so I suppose this little memo is some of my vaporings.

But I think it is now time to accept an issue: if you mandate me and I accept a project that involves creative inputs, I may wish to have the option to conduct no other time-consuming, confrontation-laden, contrasting work simultaneously.

Cordially, Ingo

5 November 1983 5 a.m.

TO: Dr. H.E. Phthoff  
FROM: I. Swann  
SUBJECT: Scheduling vis a vis work topics

In order to reduce memo's going back and forth, as regards invitations to me to work on certain topics of interest, I would consistently need to know the following:

1. Topic for work
2. How much time or days you wish me to allot for the work.
3. Physical accommodations, budgets, affiliated personnel, research aids that would be available during the work pursuit
4. What kind of reports (intermittent or final) you require
5. Which client is sponsoring the work
6. And what is required as an end product within the days allotted.

## Record Memo

TR 4 Nov 83 1230 telephoned Hal to  
ask him to set up different  
viewing room hours.

read him cessation memo.

Asked that my <sup>sole</sup> responsibility for  
product in training be stipulated  
as terminated in project record.

Discovered Buscom was coming for  
two weeks, asked Hal to reconfirm  
the one week stint & get back to me.

8.00 short conversation  
with Hal to confirm above. We did  
not confirm Jim of the last point.

This memo consists of 3 pages

-2-

4 November 1983 5 a.m.

To: Dr. H.E. Puthoff  
From: I. Swann  
Subject: Cessation of formal CRV training development

As you are aware, our research into CRV phenomena ultimately has led us to attempts to bring into an existence a formal CRV training program. To this end, we have engaged two proto-type groups of individuals to act as R&D training personnel. The first group was abandoned due to extraordinary personality conflicts. A second group, consisting of four individuals had been underway. In addition to this latter group, certain clients have provided personnel. We consider that these are entered upon training that is past the R&D stage, provided that these individuals agree in advance to the protocols we have established.

I have always considered myself solely responsible for the condition of the R&D trainees, due to the fact that the regimes they are submitted to are carefully designed and controlled. This includes lecture materials, essays of understanding, a very carefully established and controlled gradient of simulated sites they are to be submitted to. Each day's work is summarized by them in a daily report form. In other words, everything is accessible, and within a form that is easily monitored, and furthermore, brought into a standard form of application.

As of 2 November 1983, the DIA contract monitor informed me that he was entering a series of testings into this system, to consist of 5 class B sites to be executed within one day's time. I was furthermore informed that if I did not like this, I could "look for a job elsewhere." My memo for the record on this matter was submitted to you yesterday.

*Contract*  
What this means, essentially, is that the trainees are now to be subjected to what amounts to a stress test, using simulated sites of the monitor's own selection. I can therefore not survey or monitor the complexity of these sites, their gradient of complexity, or, nor can I bear oversight as to their attempts to fulfill this stress test, their psychological reactions nor their performance under this condition.

As you are aware, and as everyone has been aware, one of the basic conditions of undertaking training has been to ensure and have the agreement of all that the training paradigm is maintained intact, solely in the best interests of saying that we have had control of all identifiable aspects of those subtle factors that constitute the training program and the trainee's responses to them. This integrity is now broken. I can therefore not consider myself solely responsible for the condition of the trainees, nor their overall product. I must therefore inform you that the formal training program as we have attempted to design it and provide it for the client must be now abandoned, and of this writing, I am no longer willing to put the full force of my conviction as to efficacy of what we have tried to design.

I very carefully wish to remind you that the contents of this memo should not be interpreted as coming as a surprise. In the past, from the outset, that should the trainees gradiently controlled acquisition of the abilities we are seeking to bring into robust existence become temporarized or influenced and confused by outside work, contrasting training attempts or attempting sites the complexity of which may be judged outside their trained aptitude, that the individual or perhaps the training program as a whole must be considered terminated, in the carefully controlled form in which it is designed.

Analogous to this, I wish to remind you that under the working contracts in force between myself and SRI during the last several years, the contents of this training course remain proprietary to myself.

My three-year report to you, as well as the training records and documentations as we have accumulated them, must now constitute the final condition of what we have endeavoured to achieve as a controlled training procedure in R&D. These records during the last few months have been brought into good shape, and I will endeavour, time permitting, to round them off into accessible form.

I request that you inform the trainees that they are released from the tightly governed training protocols, and if they wish to continue to participate in any form, that this form is no longer within the R&D training program, and that they are responding to ad hoc sequences within the SRI, etc., framework.

The INSCOM participation is not included in this problem. As you are aware, the INSCOM desire is one of achieving tactical status, and our training for them is not one of R&D but delivery of a package. Additionally, we are assured that their candidate(s) are not to be submitted to stresses and sites outside our recommended protocols, and we have reasonable evidence that their commitment to these protocols is in process of being adequately maintained.

Analogous to this, I might submit that if DIA wished to test for the efficacy of the training package, they might have long before now provided preselected candidates from their own house. This would then have fulfilled almost all their presently stated problems of interpretation of the progress of the training course, and it would not have been necessary to enter into active control of our own R&D line.

Please let me know in writing if you wish me to participate in some other version of training research. It must go now that any proposed participation must be governed by advance specifications which we shall assume binding on all parties. Please also be so kind as to advise me in writing that you have received and read this memo.

## Memo for record:

3 NOV 83 - 3 pm - message on my machine from Hal saying Jim has consented to the 5 trials being run in two days instead of 1.

Called Julia 3.15 pm. She states neither Jim nor Hal has been in touch with her to advise her of this change or acquire her consent.

3.50: Tried to get Hal: mix up on time change

TR 5:30

o  
Long conversation with Hal:  
Discussed issues: brought out the necessity of splitting up the simultaneous work load read him memo: search project dated today & working assignments. I pointed out Army was being robust & deserved their fair share without their personell being tangentially subjected to confrontations from DIAs side, etc. He said he agreed & understood.

3 Nov 83

TR 8.00 pm Hal called to say Julia  
agreed.  
I asked Hal to solicit  
Jacques & Morsha on  
behalf of Jim's demand.  
Asked that there be no  
confrontation, during  
next week.

To: Dr. H.E. Puthoff  
From: I. Swann  
Subject: Running 5 consecutive Class B sites as demanded by J. Salyer

This memo is in response to a memo to me in the mail by J. Salyer, which I have not yet received, but which you kindly read to me over the telephone; in response also to your report of your conversation with J. Salyer, summarized by 14 points, of 2 November 1983.

In responding to this situation, it should be borne in mind that on 1 November 1983, J. Salyer informed me verbally that he was taking over as defacto science director and project manager and that anyone who did not carry out his orders could go elsewhere for a job.

My objections as to the desirability of running 5 consecutive Class B sites during a single working day are therefore, as objections, academic.

For the record, however, I should wish to state the following:

1. Historically, many individuals have sought to assume that ESP data might be producible in any form, if it is real, somewhat analogous to turning on a machine and letting the data roll out.
2. Our in-depth research during the last several years has clearly indicated that no such expectation is real, and that the human being is a delicate system in so far as ESP performance is concerned.
3. Each individual is different, with different tolerances, intelligences, emotional reactions and powers of comprehensions as to correctly interpreting the nature of the ESP data he or she finds themselves required to process.
4. Attempting to bear in mind these factors, a system for viewing is in process of being designed which hopefully takes most or many of these factors into direct application.
5. In being concerned about the presence of these multileveled factors, it has become possible to identify many of the formerly unacknowledged defeats in experimental or testing procedures. The first and foremost of these is that the viewer should be taught how to proceed at his or her own pace and within their own tolerance for mentally monitoring the incoming data, all judged against the presence of inclemencies, if these can be identified in advance.
6. One of the major defeats in contemporary parapsychological laboratory or experimental practice has been the utilization of forced performances - that is runs of trials that exceed the several tolerance factors of a given subject. It has been one of our steps forward in the state of the art to discover the nature of these tolerance factors, and to tutor the trainee into recognizing their presence and thence recommending the best actions of handling these.

7. The realization of all these subtle factors has brought us into the necessity of identifying the factors associated with overtraining and attempted overperformance, this last, belonging to our most recent attempts to comprehend the deleterious effects of these.

8. Our research, additionally, has provided for us the opportunity to observe at least three states of performance which, predictably, will not yield useful results, and which should be now by all of those who have had sufficient opportunity to observe them, as Mr. Salyer has, be judged as counterproductive.

a. Most people can not perform ESP tasks well under psychological duress. The decision to tell our volunteer trainees they must submit to a run of 5 or leave the project may constitute such psychological duress.

b. Often, the mental phenomena associated with the viewing of one site needs time to dissipate before attempting to view another site. If these mental phenomena have not had sufficient time to dissipate, they persist into the next viewing and often get unintelligibly integrated into the new data line. It is not unusual after an in-depth or stressful viewing that a full twenty-four hours is needed for the dissipation.

c. While we have not yet had time to build an iron-clad case for it, we have had ample opportunity to suspect that certain geophysical conditions constitute inopportune times during which to undertake concerted viewings. Mr. Salyer told me, when I attempted to bring this up, that since this was not yet a science-proved fact, he was not obliged to acknowledge its presence or deal with it.

separately

The above factors, each in themselves ~~xbakxxak~~ significant, but taken together, describe a certain recommended procedure in an effort to obtain meaningful performance from each potential viewer. This procedure, for those who have had lengthy exposure to its many-faceted features, should speak for itself. The direct decision to ignore these several issues and proceed on a course of action that demands forced performance during a limited time period is not a correct decision.

By way of discussion, I can point out that forced performance and its manifestations and repercussions, has long been a study in the field of parapsychology. I believe that now the general consensus is that forced performance is one of the sources underlying the emergence of the

2 NOV 83

psy-missing or extinction phenomenon. But I can do no more now than to once again remind our little system of this potential factor; and to say that if one of the trainees begins to exhibit psi-missing phenomena, that the days or weeks it might take to restore this trainee will constitute a hardship withon our forthcoming research and training schedules.

These then are my considerations. I hope that each volunteer trainee that is to be subjected to this 5 consecutive Class B sites be asked to volunteer. Some of them might wish to attempt this with eagerness. I should point out that this current set of volunteers consist of rather high-class and intelligent individuals, all of whom have altered their lives considerably to undertake the substantiation of this proto-type training course. If they are to be thrown out because they might object, or not wish to be forced into the kind of performance Mr. Salyer wishes, I believe we will have to totally rethink a few things.

- 4. 5 I believe we should provide the best data possible as a result of our lengthy work, and I believe that the client certainly has a right to request that some of our procedures be changed in an effort to incorporate necessities that are important. I object to the habit of doing by fiat and nearly overnight with out adequate ppeparation. And I seriously must ~~doubt the psychological~~ wonder if the "do it and do it now or get out" approach constitutes anything else except severe psychological duress.

The working-time that has gong into this issues has been two days of telephoning (all summarized by myself as memos for the record) and 1 sleepless night. Three dgas total.

need to hold some experiments

\*\*\*

8. Reminded of collapsing Hella. But just wants to collect data himself say he did it himself. will learn as we go along.

9. Reminded of other factors.

2 Nov 83

Jim said. as to protocols

1. Training R&D. people only.  
Not Tom
2. Had written it up.  
in mail to me.
3. Feels that to save his own  
face, needs hands on stuff.
4. 5 B first day with Julia.
5. Periodically. will do same.
6. Will cooperate with other ideas
7. To get out of box they were put in.  
need to have some experiments
8. Reminded of collapsing Hella.  
But just wants to collect data  
himself say he did it himself.  
will learn as we go along.
9. Reminded of other factors.

10. To keep people off his back.  
A single day to run 5 things.
11. Is unyielding on it.
12. Hal reminded him of stress  
of past experience.
13. Needs something really  
simple.
- 14 Needs cooperation.

my. responses

1. Jim must act the people.
2. Read to me  
Hal reads to me the memo.

a. responses  
not science.

b.