

For 6-months, you and I would work closely together to 'data-reduce' the project into a manageable form for proper review by the NAS. I would suggest the following approach to spark our discussion on the 28th.

## I. Applications

Given access to the Ft. Meade data and protocols, we would amass a 'success' book, a 'faleure' book and repeat customer hits. (Any other critical analysis that we can think of would also be added.) Giving the NAS anything short of a 'reduced' data set would be impossible to interpret by any honest review scientists. All this might include positive and negative testimonials that exist. Also, we might include selected examples—I am generally not in favor of showinf gee—wizz examples because they can significantly mislead, but perhaps in this case it might be instructive to illustrate specific points.

[ I define application-oriented research as that which is primarily aimed at improving the AC output. Basic research is that which is primarily aimed at understanding the mechanisms.]

## II. Application-Oriented Research

We will provide a single (readable) document that describes a meta-analysis (psychology jargon for quantitative review) of all the government-sponsored research in this domain. That would include selecting receivers (i.e., human subjects), training them, assessing (analyzing) their output, and Approved For Release 2003/09/16: CIA-RDP96-00791R000200190065-6

Approved For Release 2003/09/16: CIA-RDP96-00791R000200190065-6 protocol issues (e.g., what are the procedural, physical, and psychological cercumstances for optimal performance.) Such an analysis would include what is "known" and why, what is suspected, and what seems not to be true. It might also include what would done in the future, given that the programs continues.

## III. Basic Research

We will provide a single document that describes a meta-analysis of all the government-sponsered basic research. That includes issues like physical parameters (e.g., grad(Shannon Entropy), brain wave activity, and information transmission characteristics). Knowns, unknowns, and future directions would also be included.

- IV. A number of 5-year plans have been written. We would up-date the most recent one as a template on how to procede, IF it is decided to do so. This could include a list of knowns, unknowns, and speculations and their justifications.
- V. There have been a number of government-sponsered reviews of this work. We would provide to you ciritical analysis of those reviews and, where appropriate, the rebuttals, and hard copy of the original pertenent publications. That would include reviews by: NRC, OTA, Army, Two OSD, and DIA.
- VI. We will provide access to an agust group of national/international class scientists and government representatives who would be able to provide independent views to and NAS panel.
- VII. Other respected scientists have published in main-stream journals showing the results of their analysis and experiments wich suggest an information-transfer-anomaly (we call Anomalous Cognition). We should provide a review of this literature.

At the end of a 6-month period, we would have a manageable amount of material that could then be properly assessed by the NAS during the last month of the contract (i.e., through the month of September). Depending upon the output of such a critical review, your place can decide what, if anything, you might want to do in FY 1996.

	00.1
	s required.
That includes me and a technical assistant full time, part time ac	<i>m</i> inistrative
assistant, and one consultant	
receiver who has personal memory of the applications back to 1979.	In fact
he was responsible for most of the data to 1983 (or whenever he re	etired).
It also includes travel and the usual fees and SAIC bean-counting.	