

21 February 1984

Dear Dr. Puthoff,

I've now read and thought about your memo on documentation, the whole picture. According to my memory as to how it came about that we landed in this present impasse leads me to make the following statements, for whatever they are worth.

At the time when we had culminated the prototype training patterns with the first three volunteers, I myself held forth on the fact that we then should not any further advertize to other clients that training was tentatively available until we had seen to at least basic forms of documentation. As it came about however, the project as a whole was then in one of its many funding cul de sacs, and since another client was hot to begin training and had money, a joint decision was taken to go forward in that direction. This decision was mostly taken by the COTR at the time, but conditions suggested to all that there was not much choice otherwise. This then, at the time, was not all that erroneous a decision.

I, however, in my position as consultant, advised that documentation was, under those conditions, likely to catch up as a "problem" and we would never thereafter be able to conduct documentation procedures in an orderly manner; and further when that time did arrive, that the entire team would have to be mutual supportive of each other, and ensure the time and space to put in the documentations that otherwise had been set aside at the time, for the reasons above states.

The lack of documentation, therefore, was not exactly an oversight, as is currently being suggested; but rather the result of decisions taken at the time to keep the entire work alive. I further advised that the danger in commencing training with the other group was in that the training would be seen to be workable, and that when this was understood that this special group would come forward with increased funds and ~~increased manpower and enlarged~~ funding and a work schedule which would imply that we would have to forfeit R&D and other alliged work in order to provide the deliverables which would be expected under the working mandate.

We arrived at this point a short time ago. The trouble is that no one wishes to decline funds ~~whix~~ in order to commit themselves to other areas - ultimately necessary. On top of all this now exist the antagonisms that have come to result.

If therefore, you wish to hold yourself solely to blame for all this, that is your business; but it would be my opinion that you need not and that indeed to do so is just adding one more incorrectness into an already large heap of them.

In fact, considering the peripatatic course of the overall concept of the project as a whole, the many different difficulties it has consistently encountered, it would be my belief that under each of the changing situations, almost all parties concerned did more than their share to keep the project afloat at all. The current situation is one that has come about from critics who seem to hold that all the work should have been perfectly done all along. This in fact was never possible; and to try to make haste, save face where no face-saving is really needed, all with limited and very small resources for documentation - when indeed a rather large effort is required - is, in my opinion, to continue to be dismal and unproductive.

But, in whatever light various people interpret it all, the fact is that for several reasons each of which were valid in their time in the past, what went down at each of those times is what went down. I don't truly think we can change that history by trying, amid increasing antagonisms, to conduct uneconomic gestures in the present.