

Yeah, we have a whole lot of activity on the Moon. We've got activity on Mars, too. No, there's no humans involved in any of this, except by unwittingly. When *** that kind of thing, there's a brain wave entrainment that occurs, there's some programming that goes on, there are some nonsense programs that are installed. And people shake it off and say, "My God, did you see that, there were aliens laying there on the ground! I drove the truck over there." But you can't find any of them, because it's all up here. When you remote view those kinds of things, the truck drivers are running around, people are frozen at the wheel, and there's these spheres all over the place. And the whole area is cordoned off, and all the spheres go away, and there's a panic. Trucks driving around, those kinds of things. And that happens at the individual level, too. But mostly when people are asleep.

(Question from audience) (You mean there aren't permanent structures there?)

Yes, there are permanent structures. But they have nothing to do with man. They are facilities of these, this federation, or whatever the heck it is,

(Question from audience) (NASA...)

I have never worked with NASA, except under the table. And, because people don't want to be associated with this kind of thing. They want to use you like a concubine, (laughter) when you have a good thing, right, down the street. But they don't want to publicly acknowledge it. And we respect that. We have to. You've got to respect the conservatism amongst those types of people. Interestingly, it's mostly captains of industry and people who have already made their niche in science that really use our, it's not the middle manager.

Yes, Victoria (Question from audience) (They are treating us like lab rats. What you are talking about is the type of alien that acknowledges the consciousness of humans and can interact on a conscious level. Only two or three hundred humans are in conscious contact. Why is it limited?)

I do have some ideas about the association, about those kinds of operations. Think of the United Nations or of a government, where you have a political body that makes the decisions and the instructions. And you have a military action arm. The guys that are flying around, moving whatever is in the goop, whoever those people are to Earth and to other places, some through time, by the way, whoever they are, seem or appear to be the action arm of something else. We may be dealing with different levels of evolution, and we're all working together. I don't know. It's a big

mess. It's a complex issue. But we do know that generally speaking we're being treated like children. Because we act like children. Not getting smart enough, to do this. One of our agenda out at the contact site is to go there with that in mind. Guys, we see ya! Yeah, we're stupid, we're too stupid to figure it out. But we sure like to learn, and we're here to learn. And, if you want to teach us, feel free. And please do it within the next nine months. Because my contract expires. (laughter)

(Question from audience) (Of those two to three hundred people who you know are working with the aliens or transcendentals, do you regard them as Quislings or ambassadors?)

They look like covert missionaries. Oh, yes. The two to three hundred humans. Do I regard them as ambassadors or Quislings? Traitors? (Audience: yes, to the human race) Hmnn. Traitors. I don't regard them as traitors. They're gathering information covertly. They look just like agents that I have known. I mean, they're doing the same types of things. They have some funny technical devices. And they are in contact with something in deep space. But other than that, I don't know much about them. They...well, I won't go into that.

(Question from audience) (Do you know if these people are from Earth originally?)

I don't know if they are from Earth originally. We haven't tracked the target in time. We look at targets as a continuum, as I said the other day. We haven't tracked them in time. I don't know anything about their origins. Or their destiny.

(Question from audience) (Can you tell us who your client is in this particular problem?)

In this particular case, the client has agreed that we will be free to disseminate a certain amount of the information. We're not free to disseminate the technical information. Only the information in a general manner. So that the public becomes aware. And I act as a cutout for that. I act as a buffer, I take the flak from certain people. So that the hard scientists can do their jobs. The ostracism that some of them, they'll lose their jobs. You can imagine what a chief of state or someone in a leadership position, what would happen to them publicly in the tabloids, minimally, if they associate. No, things are changing a little bit, but not fast enough that we can openly associate with very dignified and respected scientists and engineers.

(Question from audience)

Yes, I'm saying it's very dignified and respected scientists and people, other people.

(Question from audience) (The material that's being transferred, what's its end use?)

The end use is a type of artificial food, almost entirely artificial food for these things that are, for a lot of different reasons. It seems to feed the humanoid types. They just extract the minerals from it and they eat it. But, it's also injected into this goop. It seems to be. We just need to do more work. To feed whatever is in that, living humanoid, in these tubes that are hooked up in banks along the wall. I don't know what they are.

(Question from audience) (Could you talk about the abduction phenomenon?)

Yeah, let's look at a typical abduction. Nine times out of ten, now, there's about one percent that are different, and where things are physically moved, and people go somewhere. A typical abduction, a person goes to sleep, although this can occur when they are driving to work, or they're walking down the street, believe it or not. What we view, we view a person lying in bed. And once again, there's a white sphere, about that big, juxtaposed approximately two feet from the person's head, as they're lying in bed. There's another white sphere about this big, and it's off at an angle from the white sphere on about the same side of the room. There isn't much movement. The small white sphere moves a little bit, like it's on guard duty or something like that. That's just speculation, of course. The white sphere stays there. The person, although they may report that they've gone somewhere and been abducted, the body is right there in bed. We've really spent a lot of time with this. And unless we're missing something, we don't have the software or the hardware, to process the data, for all intents and purposes the person is staying in bed. But their consciousness, when you enter the person's mind, Zoom! you're somewhere else as a remote viewer. You are somewhere else. And we've had tours of the galaxy and God knows how far by doing that. Going through a person's mind during the abduction experience. We've learned a lot doing that, about certain things. But most of it's beyond us. We can't process the data. The only association, the only details we get, for instance if we were to remote view this meeting, if a company were to do that, we could get a rich amount of data that could go on for ever. Ever. We could pick one person and know everything about them, or anything that they were interested in. We don't do that, because that violates privacy. But that's what we could do. In the case of an abduction experience we get a single intangible idea. Only one idea. "Classroom." That is it. No matter how much we squeeze the

problem, look at it any which way, get into the person's mind, feel the globe, try to do anything else, the only concept we extract from that event is the idea of classroom. Strangely enough, so that's what I've got, it's all I have.

(Question from audience) (You said something yesterday that sort of chilled my blood, that the future is set in concrete. Would you comment as to when you think there will be a public release of this information, so that UFO phenomena will obviously be out of the kook stage?)

I stated the other day that the future seems to be locked in as much as the past. Using that as a premise, could we look at when this information would be released, and those kinds of things. First of all, the data that I have, from 1981 through now, indicates that working future targets, it comes about on those targets that we worked, perhaps 80 different things, the details happened precisely. That's not to say that everything is locked in. But when you see that happen that often, as an individual, I like you begin to get the feeling that maybe there's no way out of this. And maybe that's OK. And you try to develop a philosophy around that. I don't know if it's true or not. All we have is data, and we can continue to collect data. But it appears that things that we have looked at in the past have happened precisely, the way it is. When is this all going to come out? We can't do "whens" because we don't know where we are in time. Although, on the ozone contract that we have, that we did, I mentioned that the other day, the ozone problem. That took us out somewhere around 80 to 120 years into the future. We only have a general sense of how far out we are. There is another race present with us. We look differently. We're different. Our body shapes seem to be more durable. The remote viewers have described us as more durable. And you can integrate that into whatever data base you have.

(Question from audience) (It had to have happened at some point in time close to where we are now)

Right, but you think of how long it would take to remote view, how long it takes. It's not like being in this room. It's through a lens darkly. In fact, as I mentioned, we train remote viewers to back off. We don't want them drawn esthetically into the target. They don't do their jobs. They need to maintain a distance so they can pick up as much information in as short a period of time as possible.

(Question from audience) (To what extent have you been aware of military and government involvement with UFOs?)

Military and government involvement? Post, post
Project Bluebook? After Project Bluebook? (I have no idea

what level the country is involved with that.) It is safe to say that the country, the Department of Defense, has tried as hard as it can to crack this problem in other eras when they had a charter to do so. When the problem was perhaps viewed as a national security threat. And they failed. Do they have inklings and have there been events on military bases? Yeah. But nobody's figured it out. It's one of the reasons I'm in business and not still in the military.

(You have not seen the military working with the aliens?)

The military doesn't work with the aliens. No. The aliens do what they want to.

(Question from audience) (With regard to the future, 80 to 100 years, have we gotten rid of AIDS, and would you consider finding an AIDS cure possible?)

When we looked, as part of a contract, we found ourselves in the future looking at the results of a particular problem, did we find that the AIDS problem was cured, and if it was, can we download the technology, get the results? I don't know about AIDS, there were very peaceful people still primarily concerned with survival. I can't go into the contract data, we don't own it. But the other problematic question is can we download cure to AIDS, and the answer is yes.

(Can the world hire you for that?)

When the world's ready it will hire me. For now they have my phone number.

(laughter)

What can I do? I can't go out and beg the world. I'm viewed, and still most of us are viewed as nuts, anyway, outside. Do you think I talk to my clients this way? Clients who have a job who are concerned with building roads and making airplanes and things like that? It's tough enough to get me to the top levels of management, to try to get contracts. Fifty percent of my contracts are with other nuts. Like us!

(laughter)

I can't go in there and talk about ET things because I'll be booted out, on my ear. So it's going to take some time. We're a new company, three years. That's not a long time they've been operating.

(Question from audience) (Another question on the abductions)

How are we doing for time? (various audience replies)

No, we get the same concept every time we view an abduction of that type. We can't squeeze any more information out of the event. The only concept we get is classroom. Now if we go through the abductee, into the abductee's mind during the abduction experience, we're in a rich field, both in terms of astronomy and in terms of data. And there's just too much data to deal with at any given time. There's a lot of religious symbology, a tremendous amount of religious symbology. I wish I didn't have to say that, because it doesn't sound very professional, but it's data. And it's quite a beautiful experience, but we don't get paid to have experiences. We don't have enough time for employees to do that. They've got to get back to down to earth problems.

(Question from audience) (Would you give us a little tour of the galaxy?)

Gee. There's a lot of things out there. (laughter) Remember I told you we looked at, somebody asked about the culture. We looked at, just to get an idea, we looked at the ergonomics. Well, that particular place, we looked at the city, and we sketched the city. It was a very logical constructed city. There were concentrically, concentric circles of transportation routes on the surface, and then went down. It was like a reverse ice cream cone. With concentric circles of transportation routes and radiating spokes that were transportation. The habitats were along each of the spokes, in very orderly fashion, like one would find in Berlin or Munich, except more orderly than that. And people were very peaceful. We didn't look that much at the rest of the city. So a tour of the galaxy is mostly of a technical nature. We're really concerned with how people are travelling from one point to another. We haven't spent a lot of effort on their living places. We're looking at the ways in which they travel. That seems to be science's primary objective and agenda. There we have a lot of information on technologies which we are attempting to cope with as a group, not me.

(Question from audience) (There is a hypothesis, albeit a rather sketchy one, that goes something like this. The people who get interested in certain phenomena may do so because of something that may have happened to them at some point in time in their life. For instance, people involved in studying UFO abductions. There has been the suggestion that these people might be involved in one way or the other. My question to you is, well to your colleagues, have you found that some of you or any of you are in fact involved?)

I realize this is a personal question, but I'd kind of like to raise that because as it turns out, there's even some data that some of the debunkers are involved, too. Is this a coincidence, historically, that you are involved with, or is this just your job?)

There's things I can't say, because of my background. I just can't comment on, for other reasons. Because of, coming from a black background. You know, those kinds of. There is one man, there is one employee who we know has been an abductee. And we gained a lot of information about abduction experiences from remote viewing that employee. In fact, we sprung a fast one on him and had him remote view his own abduction. That was good. (laughter) It recreated all the panic and the claustrophobic effects he felt when, again, we remote viewed him. He wasn't going anywhere. He was frozen outside, standing like this in a catatonic state outside of his home in Texas. But his reports matched what we had in his mind. He was in a claustrophobic environment and felt as if there was something on his face, he couldn't breathe. There was a feeling of panic. Something that kept telling him don't worry about it, those kinds of ideas. He found himself on another world where he was, actually, it looked like a press gang. The idea was, would you like to volunteer for this? That type of an idea. Where you were Shanghaied, literally Shanghaied to do some type of a work. Now, those could be symbolic concepts. When you're dealing with the transcendental side of the house, we've got to be very careful. That's the only type, time where you get symbology, and we're going to assume that we're being monkeyed with, based upon other things that have happened. So, not real solid data. As far as answering the rest of your question, we've thought about it. We just look like a bunch of average guys. I can't say anything else.

(Question from audience) (Do you ever see the grays?)

The grays. The only time I've seen anything remote viewing wise on contracts, the only time we've seen anything that resembles the grays are those guys that service the cargo vehicles in subterranean areas of Mars, and on Earth. We've seen them there. I haven't detect, I have to caveat that. I have to qualify that statement. We caught a glimpse once on an abduction experience, this was a medical doctor that was abducted. She was in her car, and it appears that in this case, it was the ten percent, one of the ten percent cases. That she was physically removed from the car, and we found her on a table, and there were people standing around and at that juncture the remote viewer slipped off the target. We have a sneaking suspicion that that may have been a, I don't know, if we caught a glimpse of something we weren't supposed to see, or those kinds of

things. So, the other ten percent, it's blocked for some reason or edited out by some thing or ourselves. I don't know. Maybe it's something we don't want to look at although our remote viewers are trained to look at, to experience fear at its primal levels. You know, you got to understand what that means. Viewers have to experience every type of experience, to be trained and recognize the experience. The Challenger Shuttle disaster is just one of many examples I could use. A trainee, not knowing what the target is, is inside of that capsule when it's eight minutes to the water. The capsule was pressurized. The people were alive. And they were on the way down. So the remote viewer has to experience in the minds of those people the horror, the grief, the sadness, all the things that eight people at once would realize on the way to the water. All of different backgrounds. Some military, some civilian, school, and it's a tough thing to do to a person. And you ought to see what they look like for the rest of the day. It ruins their day. That's what they have to go through in the long remote viewing course. And it's not an easy thing to do.

(Question from audience) (One of the comments you made yesterday, that caused consternation, was this idea that the future is stuck in stone. If you, as a philosophic experiment, were trying to remote view an event that you knew would have a certain outcome, then why not take personal steps to try to change that outcome?)

We can't remote view an event that we know will have a certain outcome. You mean something that we see happening, and attempt to remote view possible solutions.

(No, No. Actually, yourselves. You can remote view a building that you know is scheduled for destruction on January 31st because the town is going to blow it up. A week before, you personally decide to burn it down. See if you can actually change it. I know it sounds a little radical, but the concept is a matter of your own philosophy.)

For one thing, I can't confirm that the event is going to happen until we remote view it. We don't feel confident about anything anybody says is going to happen. We've got to remote view it before to have the confidence data. If you tell me that there was a bomb explosion on a plane, I'm not going to, that's fine if you're my client, but we're going to go back and have a look first. before we shake our heads and say, oh, yeah, we'll come back with a bomb explosion, where it might have been wind shear or an altercation in the cabin or something like that. If a

building was scheduled for disembodiment on a particular date next week, going to have to remote view it first to be sure that that's going to happen. Then, can we change it? I don't know. But I have to say one thing. I've had enough people, I've talked with enough people here at this conference, they've convinced me to try that. To try to change the future, and especially vis-a-vis that contact site. And that's a more, why not give it a try? I mean, it's probably a better, more healthy attitude towards what we're dealing with than, OK, we know this is going to happen, what can we do to save a portion of the population? Those guys may have the technology to do a lot more than that. And we may simply need to ask. It could be a much simpler process than we think, and it might not be so obfuscated as we all make it out to be.

(Question from audience) (If you were to do something as simple as to view an auto accident next week, and then go in and lock that car in a garage)

No wait. Auto accident next week. The only way we would capture an auto accident by remote viewing is to look at an intersection or to catch it incidental to another project. That's the only way we would see it. And then we wouldn't know how far in the future we were, because we're shaky on dates. Specific dates.

(Question from audience) (Ed, I wondered when you stated this the other day you described the way you worked, it seemed that you indicated you were 100% correct)

The data

(If you were going at it with that attitude, perhaps it presupposes that you're not going to be able to look at events that)

The question is, I stated the other day that it appears that at least what we would turn in to a client, and we can't make mistakes, we're under a lot of scrutiny, and for instance, we came public, for German Public Television, and said we're going to find Mozart's grave. If we can't deliver the goods, I'm finished. If I can, then I've got some more clients. We got to put your money where your mouth is. When we give something to a client, we're stating that what we provide the client is close to 100% accurate. We have other details that are second tier, third tier, information of a lesser confidence. And we don't provide those to a client unless they, the client wants them. So, you're suggesting that perhaps because we're only looking at things that are 100% correct, we may be imposing that percentage on those things. Having come here and talked 23

with other people besides yourself, I think there may be some merit to that. I thought about this question. So I'm going to abandon my idea, it's just an idea now, I mean, I don't know whether it's true or false, but it's my impression. I'm going to abandon that impression, that things are unchangeable. Because I think that that is an unhealthy attitude to have with regard to whatever system that we're in contact with. And so that's changed me.

(Question from audience)

Am I digging into somebody's time? I don't like to do this, folks. (expressions from audience) It's not very polite.

(Question from audience) (Perhaps you could give us some insights into the Roswell Incident? In understand that you've remote viewed that)

From the cursory remote viewing that we've done of the Roswell site, it appears to be mass brain wave entrainment. I know that idea is violently rejected by all the conspiracy theorists, and many other people, (interjection from audience) Roswell incident? Oh, brain wave entrainment. It's actually quite easy to do. You know, most of you in here are familiar with brain wave patterns, the Schumann resonant frequencies? We evolved against a background of Earth pulsating and in tune with the Sun as it pumps the ions, pump the atmosphere. We evolved against that background and the electromagnetic part of us, brainwaves and our clocking frequencies, evolved toward a certain set state. Ever since we were microorganisms or whatever the the heck we were. And those are brain wave patterns and why they are what the way that they are. If you monkey with those brain waves, you're in a different, you're in an altered state. For any engineers in here, electronic warfare engineers, who are familiar with the term "range gate pulloff," where a plane is coming into the target and sending radar at the target and making sure it is locked on to the target. The target has electronic countermeasures to grab that signal from the radar, and very subtly shift it, in a doppler way and other ways, to make it appear that the target is over here. So the bomb is launched in a different direction. It's called range gate pulloff. It is possible, it seems, to do that with the human brain. To pull off the range gate. To pull off the frequencies. To mess with the modulation. And when you do that, you can possibly capture the signal. You can capture the signal, a person's brain wave. And then you can inject your own program. How's that?

No, yes, one, two, three.

(Question from audience) (Is it possible in the event of a kind of a war like Desert Storm, that you could have gone in there and remoted Saddam Hussein's head and come back and reported that this is going to be the way you say it is, that atrocities would happen, and that this would be the worst environmental disaster?)

As you saw from my presentation if you were here, we worked for a major oil company. The contract, we have some contracts we did with Fortune 500 companies and one was entitled The Crisis Profile of Saddam Hussein. It was done during the Desert Shield era. Incidentally, Saddam Hussein has accused my company of making him sick. I think I mentioned that. We can't do that. At least, we don't think we can do that when we are remote viewing. But we were tasked by the client, the client was worried about oil prices, and they needed data to do some extrapolations and develop some algorithms. We went into his bunkers, his command posts, we looked at his battle plans, his deception plans. We looked at a number of other things, and we saw the, we saw some major bomb runs, and devastating, we got the mushroom clouds from the 16,000 pound fuel-air explosives. Big bombs.

The client asked us to do a six month projection. Actually, we went out a year on the territory. We got all the oil well fires, reported those to the client. At first we thought it was a nuclear weapon, because there were so many oil well fires. And by the way, we had trouble with the oil well fires. The remote viewers got all the smoke and clouds, but some of them approach a target, a major strategic area target, from a high perspective. So they can get an idea where they're supposed to be to solve a problem. At that distance we were not smelling the oil, the petroleum products. The aromatic carbons had dissipated, so we only had the black smoke. And at first we thought, well, it's not oil, what the heck is this, let's look at the origin. Only when we followed the smoke back to the origin and saw the oil well fires, could we call it an oil well fire. Most importantly though, for business purposes, was that we went into.

Oh!, Saddam Hussein's mind, that was an interesting thing. Analytically, I thought the man was very much like Stalin. Being an old soldier intelligence analyst. But when you remote view him, and you back track into his mind, you find that some critical events occurred when he was a child. And that he really felt, he hero worshipped the epic Babylonian figure, Gilgamesh. The knight on the horseback, you know, it was a big empire in those days, who loved his people and the people loved him. Saddam Hussein is very much a reflection of his people. What he does, he cannot

make those people angry. Remember, there was a bomb attack, the debris was cleaned up immediately, people were recompensed for the injury and suffering, so that they didn't linger, turn into anger against their leader. That was really what controlled them.

And those kinds of things we provided to the client. But we also told the client that Saddam Hussein would be alive in December of 1991, walking around his palace after two assassination attempts, one a poisoning. And alive and kicking and well. That almost got the messenger shot. Think of Washington, D.C., an oil well company, in Desert Shield, this is before the war starts. We have every armament in the world over there, almost. And the Israelis saying, if you don't get him we will. And coming to the client and saying, he's still alive! But, that's a return client now, so. We have to rely on our data. We cannot analyze the data. We are taught to get it right. The unconscious is taught to solve that problem. Am I going too long, folks? (exclamations from audience)

(Question from audience)

Yeah, absolutely. That's what we do for a living. We explore future technologies. That's the kind of thing. Yes, ma'am?

(Question from audience) (You seem to have been very precise about some of the dates that you have given us. For instance, you said you saw Saddam Hussein in December 1991, he was fine, and that was upsetting.)

No, I did not mean to do that. What I meant was a year afterwards. Ballpark figure. We can't do dates. We can only get general analog senses based upon one's life experiences. Gee, it's been 15 years since I knew that girl, gee, it's been ten years since I've been fishing here, that kind of idea.

(Question from audience) (maybe we could save a portion of the population)

That's our intent now, saving a portion of the population. The idea was to get better at, to get some technological insight as to what we may do. Probably a pretty naive approach. I don't think it's a smart (interrupted by question) It seems that we're, from the data that we have, it looks like we're facing mass die-off. But I don't want to go into that. It's not my intent here. It was done for, that was a contract that was done for Scott

Jones at the Human Potential Foundation in Washington, D.C. I think it's Laurance Rockefeller and Senator Claiborne Pell support that. One's the chairman, one's a supporter of that. And he has that contract now, so feel free to contact him. The institutes, centers and foundations that we work for, I'm free to mention their names, they're not corporate clients. But I can't talk about the other contracts. Yes, I'm sorry, you had a question.

(Question from audience) (What are the ethical implications of the contracts?)

The ethical implications of the contracts. Could you be more specific? So that I don't have to be so general.

(to the effect that some clients will use the knowledge for good purposes, and vice-versa)

I've turned down many more clients than I've accepted. I have not been approached by a client yet that I felt was going to use information that Psi Tech provided them for anything other than business or economic or political analytical purposes. Most of the clients I've turned down wanted to know what the stock market's going to do tomorrow, and were money oriented things, and I just don't want to deal with that. I don't want it. We're limited resources, there are only six employees. We work hard, and we'd rather choose our contracts than monkey around with that kind of thing. I don't know what else to tell you other than what I said the other day. Yes, go ahead, Virginia.

(Question from audience) (Back to the abduction scenario, have you found that the examinations have been happening? You mentioned something about a woman whose body was examined. Has that come up in other contexts?)

No, it's never, uh, yes, it has. There is one other context in which it arose, but in a very different fashion and had nothing to do with this kind of table. We were exploring, some of our students are run through the wringer on archaeological targets. Sometimes because we like to see them, in house. The student doesn't know what they're working, and we'd like to explore it. There was something in South America, in the past, where there was a type of a vault, a room, and a table, and six robed beings, one of which was female, around the person, inside a vaulted chamber. And they walked around. One put one's hand above the solar plexus. There was some type of beam that came down from the apex of the room, and something happened. I don't know what that all means. We didn't explore it. That's the only other time we found that table and a person on it.

(Question from audience) (Is it conceivable that despite historical accounts of other cultures, for instance, that remote viewing has been done, that refinements of this state, this activity, and your ability to train people so well, so precisely to do it, that this may be, in your opinion is it conceivable that this is a gift?)

No. No. There seems to be the hundredth monkey effect here, Sheldrake Principle. My students are better than I, the people who I designate as trainers, who have students, those students get better. And there was a paradigm shift here too. My children, I teach only children. I no longer teach adults. I have a training manager that teaches adults. And he's a superb instructor. He writes for national computer magazines, and his name is Lynn Buchanan. I teach only children. And I can teach a child to read minds and do other things. Once you've worked with a child, it's too boring to work with an adult anymore.

(Question from audience) (Laibow) (Does that mean that you're the worst remote viewer?)

That's correct. I am not the best remote viewer in the company. Not by any means. And I don't pay my children to remote view, either. There's your ethics problem. I'm not paying my children. I give them an increased allowance. That should be it. Thanks.

(Laibow: we need to stop)

Wasn't my fault.

(applause)

file

INGO SWANN
357 The Bowery
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 477-4346

7 August 1993

Dear Ed,

For the record after our telephone conversation last night, I'd like to say that I do admire you greatly, and I think I'm totally cognizant of your fine intellect capabilities. You've undertaken a goal that would encounter enormous difficulties under any circumstances.

Although words alone are not enough, I do appreciate very much your remembering my work and its place when many others seem to minimalize or forget it altogether.

I want you to know that I completely and unreservedly wish you all the best in any of your undertakings, and that I pay homage to the two things you have but which are rare: your openness and courage. I believe that you will ultimately succeed in many things and in many ways.

Very, very cordially,

Ingo

INGO SWANN
357 Bowery
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 477-4346

17 July 1992

Ms. Sandra Martin
Paraview
Box 929, Ansonia Station
New York, N.Y. 10023

RE: PROJECT MINDBREAKER
WGA #072152-00.

Dear Sandra, Ed, and Stephany,

I have twice read through the shoot yourself in the feet "treatment" Stephany dropped or had dropped off in my mail slot, and who asked me "not to hesitate" with my comments. You all are so very enthusiastic about this project that doubtlessly you will consider my invited comments to be sour grapes and disconsolate grumbling. And so I suppose I am writing what follows more for the edification of my archives. But in fact I could not figure out the story, I did not understand the ending, and this from someone who is relatively informed about the background. C'mon, guys.

In order to establish weight to these comments, I am first obliged to review what credentials I have acquired regarding treatments, screen-plays, and movie-making in general. In 1978, I published a novel, Star Fire. It sold 92,000 copies in the USA and 25,000 in England, Canada, and Australia. I designed this novel for a possible movie by taking the time, in advance of constructing the novel, to study movie treatments and screen-plays at the New York Public Library at Lincoln Center. I spent six months doing this preparatory work.

Upon the novel's publication, I received twenty-six inquiries regarding the movie rights, and eventually signed a deal memo for one of them. The novel was represented by Eleanore Friede, at the time a major agent and winner of many literary awards. The legal front was represented in New York by one of the two top "Hollywood-entertainment" legal firms, Greenbaum, Wolff, and Ernst, specifically by Maurice Greenbaum. The Hollywood end of the deal with represented (for a time) by the very visible movie agent Rick Ray, of Adams, Ray & Rosenberg. I also acquired the professional oversight of the Academy Award winning director and movie-maker, Bert Salzman, and Academy Award winning actress, Beatrice Straight, made available other significant resource people familiar and experienced in the abysmal complexities of the Hollywood process. The very successful author and screen writer, Frank Felita, kindly gave me two whole afternoons to tutor me in subtle aspects, and Gene

Roddenberry, who had read the book, gave me two afternoons in Hollywood and four here in New York.

Six treatments were generated in support of this deal and its accumulating progress, and eventually the package was picked up for serious interest by Don Simpson and other executives then in control of Columbia Pictures. Unfortunately, Star Fire as a movie was vetoed by one executive decision -- which later proved to have nothing to do with the project, but with internecine warfare going on at the top of Columbia Pictures. Six weeks after the veto, the entire Columbia executive staff was fired and replaced.

My points here are two: (1) that this project made it through to the top echelons, and did so because of the professionalism of all involved; and (2) that I indeed learned a great deal not only about the movie-making process, but about what treatments are and the purposes they are designed to serve in that process. I know what materials and documents which have a chance of leading to productive outcomes should look like -- and I know what activities look like which will not lead to productive outcomes. I have not made another foray into the Hollywood scene, because the trip is costly -- even if it goes well.

Based on this experience, the text you have constructed is appallingly inadequate and will not fulfill any of the purposes you hope it will. Even if I liked it, it still would not fulfill the demands required of it, and in fact "like" has little to do with anything. You must bear in mind the following: there are thousands of ideas, treatments, and scripts which yours must compete with, and this it cannot do. The brunt of the situation here is that someone is either going to make or lose a great deal of money, and this converts the situation not into a lark but into a very serious one which cannot survive merely by "jazzing up the story a bit," or a "hope [which] will be considered a more cinematic quality".

What has happened, I think, is that when you air-coach around and talk to people, your conversations perk up the buttons of Pentagon psychic-spy intrigues, UFOs, ETs, and actual military-governmental uses of remote-viewing. Any sensible person interested in movie investing will be fascinated and amenable to hearing more. And this gives the impression that a quick big deal can be pulled off. But the basic situation here regards one of careful planning and premeditation, and it begins with the offering of a tight, compelling story -- which is the only thing you will ever own if the deal enters the constructive pathways in Hollywood. What you are doing is inviting someone else to invent-provide that story, to work out what you haven't, and in doing so you are handing it away on a silver platter. You, not someone else, will have to follow through with a

compelling story handled in the recognized formulaic ways which will justify the monetary risks others are to take. Your effort does not do this, and is not competitive with other efforts which may be (I hear there are at least five "Mars" movie proposals circulating in Hollywood). I can speculate that you are ill advised not to retreat and rethink all this, simply because it is shortly going to start costing you money down the hole with very little chance of ever recovering it. For example, my own effort at getting a movie made, which had a great deal going for it, cost me \$8,000 in legal fees alone, to say nothing of telephone bills, travelling and entertainment costs, and etc. Further, the legal risks engendered in this text are ominous with regard to possible libel and defamation of character based on real personalities who have every right to protect their professional reputations.

If asked, I would help construct the compelling story, or if you don't want that, at least could be helpful in tutoring the differences between and functions of A Story (The Movie), story-lines, treatments, and screen-plays, plus techniques for rendering character cameos.

Now, I discussed some of these facts with Sandra yesterday, and in our conversation she revealed to me that Ed thinks I disapprove of everything he does. I was staggered and deeply hurt by this. I don't understand this at all. To counter this, again at least for my archives, I have to point out that I have unflinchingly supported Ed, his associates, and Psi Tech. I have distributed over 100 of his sheets to the best people I could think of, and these include a great many in the former Soviet Union. To mention a few: Anatoly Gerosimov, Alexis Kornetov, Alexander Kusnetzov, A.T. Dubrov, and Barbara Ivanova. I twice lectured from the platform in Montreal on behalf of Psi Tech.

I have featured PSI Tech and Ed Dames in at least fifteen media interviews (some of which Sandra sat in on) during the last year and a half, and eagerly diverted attention from my part in developing remote-viewing to him and his associates as premier examples of it. I have arranged what meetings for him I could with those I consider power people, among whom are Bernard Yoh, Marty Edelston, and a few others simply because those individuals are in a position to distribute wider interest about Psi Tech through others. I have recommended and defended PSI Tech to Elmer Green, Robert Becker, the later Michael Talbot, Gertrude Schmeidler, Drs. Marilyn and John Rossner, Marilyn Ferguson, and many other greater and lesser luminaries. I set up the introduction with Sandra (not that she would not have found him anyway), and I set up the introduction with Ray Wagner, one of the three in an appropriate Hollywood position to run with the project. All these people have extensive lines of communication with hundreds of others, and it was my desire that Ed and his effort be considered in these lines as positively as possible.

Since Ed's speech at the Laibow affair, I have had to defend Ed against at least a dozen prominent and somewhat prominent people who called to inform me that Ed was ripping me off and "using my name in vain". I have had serious confrontations on his behalf with John Anthony West, Boris Said, Bob Durant, Richard Hoagland, and John Keel, for example, as well as with many others who had gathered at and after Hoagland's presentation at the UN. You may think of these people what you want, but still they are functioning and have enormous lines of influence and communication, and even if nothing is immediately visible, still in the longer term importance and confidence is accumulating. I also get numerous calls to utilize my own RV abilities, and I have referred all of these to PSI Tech. I am about to give a feature interview on RV and to John Keel for FATE magazine (and its 300,000 readers) in which I will attempt to describe not only the potentials of PSI Tech, but the merits of Ed Dames, his energy, vision, and the necessity for upsetting the apple carts in many areas. In other words, I have worked very hard to try to help insure that opinion does not turn against Ed and his effort, and it is also for this reason that I have made the frank statements regarding the "treatment" -- if not for your edification, at least for the purposes of my archives and for the history of remote-viewing I am compiling.

I admire Ed, and I do not want him, PSI Tech, or RV to be a short-term nova which disappears quickly, as so many have, if you will but count past novas. I may not be moving (by choice) in the glitz and glamor of the world "out there", but from my little cave on the Bowery the telephone rings constantly, and I have quite large access to almost all of the more serious functionaries interested in these matters. I have used this access to unstintingly, approvingly, and admiringly support Ed and his work, but I certainly do not want to be a stone around his neck. That he might, even jokingly, say I disapprove of everything he does is unreal, an unreality which might be corrected if he utilized the craft I taught him to remote-view me.

Cordially yours, I suppose....

Ingo Swann

INGO SWANN
357 Bowery
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 477-4346

16 July 1992

Maj. Edward A Dames & Associates
PSI Tech, Inc.
P.O. Box 83
Jessup, Maryland 20794

RE: "Project Mindbreaker", a treatment
for a major motion picture
registered as 072152-00 with the
Writer's Guild of America.

Dear Ed,

It is with deepest regrets that the substance of this letter must be entered into the chain of events associated with your movie-making project. As you know, I hold you in highest esteem and fully believe the essential ideas for your project have extraordinary merit. I must, however, on the record, object in the strongest possible terms to the representation of myself in the above-referenced treatment, and further to make this objection available to any associated with or considering the treatment now or in the future.

Throughout the twenty years I have sought to develop remote-viewing and increase its acceptance in legitimate sciences and public appreciation, I have labored ceaselessly to separate it from personalities, stereotypes, and confusions often typical of something which cannot be clearly delineated. I have had my defeats, but in the long run remote-viewing has, for some time now, represented a vital advancement in parapsychology, largely because of the manner in which I have portrayed myself as a psi researcher and investigator. This work has been deemed by some as worthy of both an honorary and earned doctorate, and all but entrenched skeptics treat the work with respect.

The portrayal of remote-viewing in the above cited treatment reintroduces a considerable amount of confusion, if not misrepresentation of its potentials and possibilities. The portrayal of myself is revolting, degrading, and damaging when compared to how I have professionally conducted myself throughout the years and through the many complexities and difficulties which needed to be surmounted. I fully believe this has come about because you are inexperienced in the significant differences between literary license and the laws appropriate as to how a character based on a real person must proceed. But, in

any event, the resulting character description and further interactions of that character with other real-based characters in your fictional treatment cannot be permitted by myself, because doing so would constitute a precedent for many others who might wish to distort facts.

Thus, this letter constitutes a timely advice that you, your associates, or any who may in any way or purpose become affiliated with your project, do not have my tacit, implicit, or express permission to include me or a character built upon my name, my personality, or my place in the history of remote-viewing, in your projected major movie-picture designed for wide consumption by audiences who will not have the requisite background to determine fact from fiction.

This refusal of permission is non-negotiable as far as the above-cited treatment is concerned. This portrayal is damaging to remote-viewing, to myself, my reputation, my hard-won career, my scientific and public image, and to future potentials both real and of popular substance. You must assure me in writing within five days of receipt of this letter that you will conform to the above objections and satisfy them by deleting from the cited treatment all references to me and to any semi-fictional character based upon me and my career, including those copies of the treatment you and your associates have already sent into circulation as a form of publication. If I do not have this satisfaction in hand, I will be obliged to seek legal redress which will include appeals to the bench for an injunction against your entire project until my demands for satisfaction are met.

As of this writing, I do not believe that what I am objecting to is deliberate on your part, but rather proceeds out of inexperience. In this light, my deep friendship for you and my admiration of you in so many other ways is presently intact. And I urge you to consider this friendship and admiration and accompanying larger ramifications before an insurmountable gulf widens. Your co-author, Stephany, has provided me with the copy of "Project Mindbreaker" and has invited my comments as to its merits and demerits, which will be conveyed in a separate letter.

Cordially yours,

Ingo Swann

cc: Sandra Martin/Paraview
and Associates
Ray Wagner
Writer's Guild of America

INGO SWANN