

3 November 1983  
7.30 a.m.

To: Ingo Swann

From: Dr. H.E. Puthoff

Subject: Search Project

TOP Dr. H.E. Puthoff  
FROM: I. Swann  
SUBJECT: Search Project

One of our highest

that can be

on scale

The purpose

input you will

be able

approach

directly

individuals and

iterate the process

a workable technology

there are some

Thank you for your memo dated 28 October inviting me to begin creative inputs into the problem of search, which you state is of high priority during the coming year's work and which has a 'time clock' on it.

While I am honored to be invited to "provide whatever creative input" I can, your memo does not address working conditions, etc.

I would need to know:

- a. How many days am I to devote to this project.
- b. What do you wish to offer as working conditions, including place, space, equipments, associated personnel, and overall budget.
- c. Is this a DIA project, an INSCOM project, or other.
- d. What are the clients asking within their "time clock." As you know of me by now, I probably will not attempt to work on a topic timeclocked that I do not feel is feasible.

We have learned, or at least I have, that creative inputs working against and often in contrast to client expectations have been the source of constant confrontations. in the long run or end run.

Cordially yours,

Ingo Swann

MEMO

To: Ingo Swann  
From: Hal Puthoff  
Subject: Search Project

Date: 28 Oct 1983

---

One of our highest priority tasks this year is to develop techniques that can be used for Search, determining the location of known targets on scales ranging from room-sized to global.

The purpose of this memo is to invite you to provide whatever creative input you might come up with with regard to this requirement. I will be glad to work directly with you on trying out strategies you think appropriate, or, if you have an idea without time to pursue it directly with your own involvement, I will be glad to take a group of individuals and gather data under your suggested protocols, evaluate, iterate the process again, etc., essentially whatever would lead us to a workable technology in the shortest period of time; I understand that there are some timeclock aspects with regard to this requirement.

*Hal*

Date: 3 November 1983 8.00 a.m.

TO: Dr. H.E. Puthoff  
FROM: I. Swann  
SUBJECT: Working assignments

Especially during the confrontations and confusions of the last year, and the first working week of this present year, it has become somewhat clear that attempting to perform research and duties and reports and fulfill separate contract demands with two or more clients simultaneously has proved counterproductive, often now in the extreme.

Furthermore, my work-load has tripled, causing me to work several weeks in excess of my stated working days during the last year; and also extensive infringements into my personal time which includes inconveniences that we have long sought resolution for.

I request, therefore, that my work load be broken into working units for each project item and between each client for whom you are inviting me to perform some service or other, and that I no longer be expected to perform simultaneous services or working duties

The apportioning of these working days between clients and between project titles will enable us better to establish a year-long working schedule and stick to it.

The purpose for setting up this apportioned working system is to eliminate ad hoc arbitrary directional decision making without due notice, the subsequent confusions, confrontations and overall waste of the client's time and money, as well as the condition of my head.

Cordially,

Ingo

Memo for Record

2 November 1983 5.30 p.m. NYT TR

Since the conversations with Jim and Hal bothered me yesterday, I called Hal to ask for clarification on exactly the work that is to be undertaken as of 7 Nov. My assumption had been that we were to try to get Tom and Julia through to the end of S3. With Jim's voiced requirements over the telephone yesterday, I needed to have in written form how Julia's five baseline sessions were to be taken, if they were all on one day or spread over some time; whether she was being asked to do something against her will, etc., and were these sessions to be done at a pace and time that might be detrimental to her control of her trained abilities.

I explained that scientific protocols are written up point by point in advance; usually they are proctored by outside authorities for feasibility and loopholes, etc., and that all this takes time. Here we are with only two days before we all get on planes and go to Menlo Park to live in the Mermaid Inn again.

So what exactly is to be the work procedures during our imminent stay there at SRI? I need to know so that I can accept them or not, or at least make written reservations. Etc. Asked Hal to keep me informed before close of business today as to status. He said he would.

2 Nov 83 9.20 am tried to  
get hold of Dr Verona to  
discuss with him Jim's  
illuminations. He's TDY until  
7 Nov. Asked if he would  
return my call at SRI then

1 November 1983

8 p.m. NYT

Hall returned call. Long discussion over my conversation of today's date with Jim.

The nature and purpose and content of baselines was discussed. The point that we discussed is how do you get a baseline from a new piano student who has never played the piano prior to training. Etc.

I asked that the briefing, first discussed in the first part of October, with Dean Jahn, Schmeidler be set up to review my work at a parapsychological professional level. Hal agreed, and said he would set it up immediately.

CONFRONTATION #2, fy84.

1 November 1983

5 p.m.

Called Martha to ask her where the analysis of the geophysical data was that I had given her an assignment for in August, with a due date of 15 October. She responded that it had been done by the 15th, but she thought I would be coming in November, and was holding it for me then.

I explained to her that I could have studied the data, made my recommendations for the geophysical project this week, had I had the data. As it now was, I would have to do it when I got to SRI. This doubled my work load there then at that time.

I told her I would submit everything to her in written memo with timeclock, and if anything would change during the timing period, she was to be in touch with me.

Gold help us.

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.

CONFRONTATION 1-fy84.

Memo for record  
1 November 1983

Called Martha Thompson to ask the status of the ELF data I had asked her to compile. Learned that Jim has circulated a memo saying "that the training progress had not been substantiated during the last three years." Telephoned Jim very upset. Asked him if this was the case, that probably I should not therefore proceed any longer. In a very round about manner, with Jim talking personal in some instances, and then reverting into official stance, it sort of became clear that he was holding Hal as project directed to blame for failing to set up protocols that should have organized the training in a manner that would have provided the desired data.

This was along conversation, in which Jim *and that everyone kept to unproductively do as he said,* egergetically stated that he was talking over the management, oversight and science directorship of the work, and all those that didn't like it could go elsewhere. I asked him to clarify. He said he was going to ~~h~~ impose science protocols. I suggested that he all by him self could or should not impose them, since these have never laid solely in the hands of one man or through the interpretation of one man. Be that as it may, the conversation got a little non-productive.

I asked why I had not been informed of his memo or the circumstances behind it, and he said that that was not his job. He had given the directive to Hal. And Hal should have informed me. I said well that he had 't and as this was the usual states of affairs, what was the next move.

I asked what he recommended I do, since apparently I was sort of working for him, for SRI and for Army, all of these being different things. He replied that he had no objection to my work, and in fact had recommended it continue. That I should just come and work as usual. I said that normal considerations of daily business were lacking, and that this was now true of him too. I said I was always just a telephone call away, just as our secretary is. And I wondered why no one at all would ever pick up the phone to call and apprise, advise or tell about project business changes and status.

Discussion over paragraph 3 of my contract. Jim said he would need that clarified or interpreted. I said it was very clear and always had been. I said that I had already signed a three month contract, and Army had cut their orders. Or I would not now go forward. I asked that if the psychological confrontations, of which this was one, was not completely brought under control, I would not probably go beyond the three months. He said he thought under his new regime all would work out.

*I also advised him, if I needed correction in future, never again - as twice in the past - to throw his various temper tantrums at me. We agreed, sort of.*

November 1, Cont'd

This state of affairs is very stressful. It had been arranged to start Tom and Julia on their completing training for Stage III on Monday, 7 Nov, with Travel time on the 6th. Now, barely seven days before, Jim proposes setting up new protocols, etc., a job that would normally take two or three months. I will hold that the protocols must be in completed written form with discrete procedures and specified goals or end products. The testings, base lines, etc., can not be open ended.

Jim said that Tom's group had nothing to do with him, but since Julia was getting paid out of his funds, she would have to submit to him protocols. I asked him to inform her. Gave him her phone #. He said he would.

Thus, this represented confrontation #1 for FY 84. Short fuses, demands, untimely requirements, surprising changes of procedures, etc. This is as usual, and what I have many times in past objected to.

1 Nov 83

1:30 pm NYT.

Called Hal to discuss research  
-logics + memos pertaining thereto

Got Leslie: she said he was  
briefing some Air Force person.

Asked her to have him return  
my call after 4 pm NY Time

Memo for record.

27 Oct 83: 5 pm

Telephoned Pathoff.

Long discussion about priority positions in project.

Told him if I help raise 50% - 75% of research funds, my personal status should equal that in respect, decision making, etc.

Lectured him on his "democratic" treatment of all: I said that although everyone should be treated with respect & politeness common everywhere else, actually the people unvalued were dis equal according to their product & original contributions.

We agreed. But I suspect that now he has me in the fold, he will slip back into his old ways.