

<http://www.mindspring.com/~biomind/Pages/Superpowers.html>

**** AN OMNI EDGE SCIENCE WINNER ****

INGO SWANN 357 Bowery NY NY 10003 (212) 477-4346 Tel & Fax

23 July 1997

Dear Jeffrey Mishlov,

Attached please find a copy of an "e-mail" from Dr. E. May to you, dated 11 July 1977. This e-mail is apparently in wide circulation since I've received four copies of it from different sources asking for my comments. Since it is in public-access circulation I will consider it a published document. So there can be no mistake as to what my comments refer, below I highlight May's for ease of reference.

1. "There seems to be grounds as well to think that the training program developed by Ingo Swann may be effective."

2. "I [Dr. May] was charged with the responsibility of examining Swann's training 'technology.' Where there are many believers out there and while there are some reasonable ideas in the methodology, there are so many flaws in its delivery to render the ideas as yet completely not tested."

3. ". . . [the training is] a game of 20 questions if ever there was one!"

4. "Add to this, that Ingo strongly resisted ANY [emphasis added] double blind independent tests . . ."

5. "So far with regard to Ingo, I, sadly, must dismiss the training not out of hand but out of examining the scientific results."

6. Dr. May also mentions that he asked Tart and Targ for their impressions of "Ingo's" training methods.

In order to shed light upon these difficult statements, it should be stipulated that the EXPERIMENTAL REMOTE-VIEWING TRAINING PROJECT arose within the Psychoenergetics Program established in 1972 by Dr. Puthoff at Stanford Research Institute (SRI) as a result of conceptual proposals he had earlier circulated within the scientific community. One aspect of those proposals was to find ways and means of analyzing certain anomalous phenomena within the contexts of physics and also utilizing a multidisciplinary approach.

The experimental training project was begun in 1974 and Dr. Puthoff invited me to participate. The project then endured for fifteen years. Dr. Puthoff resigned from SRI in mid-1985 to undertake other kinds of research. Late in that year the training project passed from my hands and supervision. It was taken in-house by one of the sponsors, leaving me with a letter of commendation for a job well done and stating that the training methods were in good order.

*

Dr. Puthoff established the training project at the request of certain interested clients, and all subsequent "mission goals" and funding were provided by those clients.

Throughout the fifteen-year period identified above. Dr. Puthoff was not only the administrative but the recognized scientific director of the Program at SRI - and designer and developer of the "training program," of which I was a co-designer-designer.

Additionally, he was the "first level," so to speak, to ensure scientific rigor and safeguards relevant to the training attempt, and without which the training attempt could not have been conceptualized, started-up and continued for the decade and a half it was.

Although I contributed to the experimental training effort to the best of my ability to do so, my function was as a designer only. I have publicly stated hundreds of times that the training attempt was NOT MY attempt alone. I have always endeavored to make it clear that the attempt was undertaken by Dr. Puthoff on behalf of the clients and thenceforth in continued consultation with many other scientists conceptually contributing to it.

*

Dr. Puthoff's excellent scientific credentials and scientific standing were never debated during the fifteen-year period, nor to my knowledge were where they ever cast into a pejorative light. And, to my knowledge, Dr. Puthoff's credentials and standing have NEVER been OMITTED with reference to the training attempt. Furthermore, I do not think those credentials and standing have been cast into a pejorative light since 1985, and I believe them to have increased in luminosity, and deservedly so. In 1972, when I first met Dr. Puthoff, I judged him as a cutting-edge scientist of good and excellent repute.

*

In his e-mail to you and your public-access website, Dr. May, however, has blipped the name, scientific status, and former position of Dr. Puthoff. This equates to a minimalizing of Dr. Puthoff, going so far as to marginalize him in such a gross way that his importance and participation is no longer identifiable even at the margins of the factual history involved. Thus, May indicates questioning Tart and Targ, but omits any mention of Dr. Puthoff.

Indeed, the ONLY reason I am bothering to respond to Dr. May's attempt to rewrite history is because I take great exception to this opportunistic demeaning and defacing of Dr. Puthoff. It is also intolerable, based upon ethical grounds, that Dr. May should even hint that Dr. Puthoff's scientific credentials and standing are of such a low quality that the man need not be referred to AT ALL.

*

All questions regarding the scientific authenticity and oversight of the experimental training program ought really be addressed to Dr. Puthoff - especially since Dr. May early in about 1977 professed himself to have no interest in the experimental training program, instead wishing to pursue "pure science." Dr. May thereafter did not accept any invitations to take active and direct hands-on part in it. This statement is based upon a number of documents and exchange of memoranda, originals and copies of which are contained in my portion of the relevant archives, and which fill some twenty-five standard file drawers.

*

Dr. May's e-mail to you and to your public-access website seems to portray the entire "training" situation in a way that either suggests Dr. MAY had the only direct and continued scientific oversight of it, or in some manner at least had the final determination, final call, or final jurisdiction in this regard.

Thus, it seems necessary to review the manner of how the scientific oversight WAS managed.

Throughout the fifteen-year duration of the experimental training effort, by contractual stipulations with the clients, Dr. Puthoff AND his research umbrella, Stanford Research Institute, were required to provide quarterly and annual reports regarding concepts to be pursued, proof of scientific rigor and safeguards, and tabulations of progress achieved in the light of the concepts and scientific oversight.

After about 1977, certain portions of such reports became classified, but parts of the reports remained stipulated as unclassified. The reports were always accompanied by statistical results expressed both in verbal and visual descriptive form. My archives contain most of this unclassified material, among which are a large number of viewgraphs indicating the status of progress.

During the fifteen-year period, there were approximately SIXTY (60) reports submitted to clients - with an additional large number of ad hoc reports.

*

As already stated earlier, Dr. Puthoff and his immediate support team constituted the first tier in this scientific scrutiny and oversight. After that, all evidence offered was subjected to intensified science review by appropriate SRI oversight committees.

Only after this two-tier process was complete were the reports tendered to the clients, who then submitted the reports and evidence to THEIR OWN in-house scientific oversight committees. If the reports passed muster in that regard, to be doubly sure of adequate scientific oversight, the reports were then forwarded for scrutiny and JUDGMENT to independent oversight committees convened by the clients and populated not only by scientific professionals but, in many cases, by several renowned scientists.

*

In this sense, it is important to remember, or at least to try to recognize, that continued funding was completely, completely, completely dependent on positive evaluations of those client-convened oversight committees which would recommend or dis-recommend continuance of the experimental training program.

Considering the central and quite controversial issue of the experimental training attempts, it is simply foolish to believe that this five-tiered scientific oversight procedure, eventually involving some 500 experts in multidisciplinary fields, was conducted by other than an harder-than-nails approach.

*

When, then, Dr. May states that "I [Dr. May] was charged with the responsibility of examining Swann's training 'technology' . . .", well, it is exceedingly difficult to comprehend what he is referring to. As one might realize via the above description regarding the extraordinary scientific oversight safeguards imposed by THE CLIENTS, no one at SRI, including Dr. Puthoff, would have had ANY final say in this matter. Any idea that I, myself, had any scientific determination in what is alleged by Dr. May to be "Ingo's training" is simply ridiculous in the extreme.

*

I will now address Dr. May's statement "Add to this, that Ingo strongly resisted ANY [emphasis added] double blind independent tests . . .". To get into this, we have to consider that IF the experimental training was ultimately to be seen as resulting in effectiveness and efficiency, then down at the end of the line of the training the trainees

were going to have to tackle "targets" blind not only to them, but to their monitors, and probably blind as well to the clients seeking to utilize them.

This was a situation, or condition, of the proposed training attempt recognized from its outset in 1974. Because of this a general and appropriate guide was established even BEFORE conceptual discoveries were brought to light and confirmed. The guide was accepted, without much debate or hesitation, by all subsequent clients. I will now describe the THREE types of training targets and the situations to which they referred.

TRAINING TARGET, TYPE A: In principle, the experimental training was pursued on concepts quite similar to bio-feedback training, and whose methodologies are quite well understood and accepted. This approach to training involves artificial reinforcement until the trainee develops perceptual and cognitive pathways needed to identify subtle or subliminal signals. When the needed pathways have developed AND achieved a measurement of accuracy, strength and endurance, the artificial reinforcement is no longer needed, since the trainee can now "do it" him- or herself.

TRAINING TARGET, TYPE B: The signal indicator of the "doing it" him- or herself strength and endurance emerges in the trainee when the need for artificial reinforcement decreases and become unnecessary except to indicate that that the "target had been obtained" by the trainee. In the case of Type B training targets, the trainee, but not the monitor, is blind to the target because no reinforcement feedback is given or needed.

TRAINING TARGET, TYPE C: After the trainee has demonstrated strength and endurance regarding Type B targets (indicating new or strengthened neural pathways [and possibly indicating new synapse-cluster formation]), the trainee can then be submitted to Type C targets, but only according to the level and quality of proficiency he or she has achieved. Type C targets were always double-blind, meaning that the monitor had no advance knowledge of what they consisted.

Type C targets were NEVER selected by myself, but by Dr. Puthoff, independent parties within the SRI system, or by overseeing representatives of the clients. With the exception of two unusual instances. I never administered a Type C, double-blind target to ANY of

An extensive training target pool was eventually accumulated, each target being indicated as relevant to the training process, and ranging from simple to increasing complex. Slightly over 2,600 training targets eventually resided in this pool, with 450 of them indicated as Type B.

To ensure that I could not directly or indirectly cue the trainee, additional Type B training targets were independently selected, maintained and administered to the trainees by Dr. Puthoff and others, including the on-site client monitor. NO, repeat NO, reinforcement was given the trainees in the course of demonstrating their Type B and C proficiency. In this case, they either succeeded or failed, and if they failed they went back into artificial reinforcement training to further improve the formation of their neural pathways.

The idea, as expressed by Dr. May, that "Ingo strongly resisted any double blind independent tests" is without factual merit. In addition, that statement can be taken by some as indicating everyone involved with the training project was unbelievably stupid - including Dr. Puthoff, the various clients, and all the members of the extensive system of scientific oversight committees.

*

Very many are laboring under the mistaken idea that the experimental training program trained some form of Psi, or trained remote viewing as a form of it - and this is unfortunately the rather wide-spread common and uninformed understanding.

Although correcting this misunderstanding is probably never going to succeed regarding those who cling to it, the experimental training project NEVER proposed to attempt to train ANY form of Psi.

Dr. Puthoff wished to explore alternative methods that might be effective regarding certain kinds of phenomena. The enigma of Psi perceptions was difficult in this regard, especially with the long history of that enigma having been encountered in parapsychology.

But after a good deal of brainstorming, involving a large number of consultants, it was finally seen that if one detaches the term "Psi" or "psychic" from Psi perception, then one is left with the concept of PERCEPTION. Thus, the training project was approached not as a problem regarding Psi (or any form of it), but exclusively as a matter of perception. This reorientation put the training in a scientific category having a very significant history, one well-documented and well-understood by very many scientists.

*

It is commonly accepted that perceptions can be increased and improved by doing whatever is necessary or discoverable to elicit, increase and expand their scope and acuity. Even in 1974, it was understood that the brain builds new neural pathways and synapse clusters to accommodate new or reinvigorated perception needs, or that the brain adapts old clusters to new usage. If this were NOT the case, then biofeedback methods would not have stood a chance of possibility.

This is to state that the training effort at SRI was not a Psi training one. Rather, it was designed with enormous help from scientific precedent and consulting specialists to pursue the possibility of enhancing latent or unused perceptive faculties and to bring them into higher acuity and usage. Football players, auto-mechanics, typists, computer jocks, musicians, mountain-climbers, technicians of all waters, etc., will NOT even pause to question the possibilities of increasing perceptive acuity. This is taken for granted everywhere.

Thus, anyone who believes that perceptual acuity cannot be enhanced is clearly speaking through the disadvantage of perceptual illiteracy, of not being familiar with perceptual research in general.

*

As to what evidence, documentation, SRI reports, etc., Dr. May utilized to "examine the scientific results," well, this will remain obscure unless he refers to and quotes them.

As it was in historical fact, and as indicated earlier, the "scientific results" were monitored and decided upon by batteries of scientific overseers on a quarterly basis between 1974 and 1985. The decision as to whether the training attempt should proceed or continue was always taken on a consensus basis resulting from those scientists convened by the clients, and which consensus would recommend or dis-recommend the continuing.

If, then, May had been asked to examine the training "technology," one might assume he would examine all the relevant documents. These documents DO exist, because EVERYTHING had to be documented in exacting detail. They are voluminous and complete. Dr. May has never asked to study them.

*

In his e-mail to you, Dr. May indicates that certain individuals who have gone public with their format of "remote viewing" "do a great disservice to those who are interested in genuine scientific inquiry into remote viewing." In the past, Dr. May and I have been in good agreement regarding a number of things, and in this one thing we are still in agreement.

However, Dr. May attempts to connect Dr. Puthoff's experimental training project with subsequent, highly variable efforts of others - and which are productive of little or no scientific criteria or merit (or even examination.) The only correct way to interpret this is that May's attempt by direct implication is a low blow beneath Dr. Puthoff's belt, not mine.

*

That's about it. Except to ask that when you next communicate with Dr. May, express to him that he, in my insignificant opinion, has lost the right to refer to me in the familiar and friendly fashion as "Ingo." He actually means "Asshole," and in future he should have the nuts to express what he really means, and which jolly euphemism might, by simple extension, also be appropriately extended to include Dr. Puthoff and members of scientific oversight committees.

I apologize in advance for the length of this note, and indicate that other aspects of this and similar situations are discussed in the Biomind Website (and which, I've been told, Dr. May has refused to scrutinize on the grounds, as quoted second-hand to me, that "I have no interest in anything Ingo might have to say.")

Best wishes for your own good and insightful dedication and work.

Cordially yours,

Ingo Swann