

~~SECRET~~

*Interim Report*

*October 1979*

## SPECIAL ORIENTATION TECHNIQUES (U)

By: RUSSELL TARG      HAROLD E. PUTHOFF      EDWIN C. MAY

333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, California 94025 U.S.A.  
(415) 326-6200  
Cable: SRI INTL MNP  
TWX: 910-373-1246



~~SECRET~~

NOT RELEASABLE TO  
FOREIGN NATIONALS

This document is made available through the declassification efforts  
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

# The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

**Discover the Truth** at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

(This Page is UNCLASSIFIED)

~~SECRET~~

SRI International

*Interim Report  
Covering the period from 1 May to 30 September 1979*

October 1979

### SPECIAL ORIENTATION TECHNIQUES (U)

By: RUSSELL TARG      HAROLD E. PUTHOFF      EDWIN C. MAY

SRI Project 8465

Copy No. 13

This document consists of 59 pages.

Approved by:

SRI 9-4431

ROBERT S. LEONARD, *Director*  
Radio Physics Laboratory

CLASSIFIED BY: MSG, HQDA (DAMI-ISH)  
dated 7 July 1978  
REVIEW ON: 31 October 1999

~~SECRET~~

(This Page is UNCLASSIFIED)

NOT RELEASABLE TO  
FOREIGN NATIONALS



333 Ravenswood Avenue • Menlo Park, California 94025 • U.S.A.

~~SECRET~~

CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS . . . . .   | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .  | v  |
| I INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 1  |
| II BACKGROUND . . . . .   | 2  |
| A. Remote Viewing Protocols (for the Description of<br>Remote Geographical Targets) . . . . . | 2  |
| B. Judging the Results . . . . .  | 3  |
| C. Transcript Concept Analysis . . . . .  | 5  |
| III ORIENTATION RESULTS . . . . .   | 8  |
| A. Remote Viewing of Geographical Targets . . . . .   | 8  |
| B. Summary of the Six Series . . . . .  | 9  |
| 1. Viewer No. 155 . . . . .   | 9  |
| 2. Viewer No. 292 . . . . .   | 11 |
| 3. Viewer No. 372 . . . . .   | 14 |
| 4. Viewer No. 468 . . . . .   | 16 |
| 5. Viewer No. 518 . . . . .   | 19 |
| 6. Viewer No. 690 . . . . .   | 21 |
| C. Comparison of Blind Judging and Subjective<br>Assessment . . . . .                         | 23 |
| D. Remote Viewing of 35mm Slides . . . . .  | 27 |
| 1. Viewer No. 372 . . . . .   | 28 |
| 2. Viewer No. 518 . . . . .   | 29 |
| E. Remote Viewing of Alphabet Letters . . . . .   | 33 |
| F. Extended Remote Viewing (ERV) . . . . .  | 37 |
| 1. Background . . . . .   | 37 |
| 2. Pilot Effort . . . . .   | 38 |
| 3. Formal Series (Six Trials) . . . . .   | 38 |
| 4. Discussion . . . . .   | 47 |

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| G. | Coordinate Remote Viewing (CRV) with Immediate<br>Feedback . . . . . | 48 |
| IV | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .                            | 52 |

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

ILLUSTRATIONS

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | Stanford Shopping Center--Target, and Viewer 372 Drawing . . . . . | 30 |
| 2  | Mount Alverno Conference Center, and Viewer 372 Drawing . . .      | 31 |
| 3  | Ultra Modern Dome House--Target, and Viewer 372 Drawing . . .      | 32 |
| 4  | Varsity Theatre Arcade--Target, and Viewer 518 Drawing. . . .      | 34 |
| 5  | Victorian House--Target, and Viewer 518 Drawing . . . . .          | 35 |
| 6  | Glass Slipper Motel--Target, and Viewer 518 Drawing . . . . .      | 36 |
| 7  | Copper Pitcher and Viewer 518 ERV Response. . . . .                | 40 |
| 8  | Food Mill Target and Viewer 518 ERV Response. . . . .              | 41 |
| 9  | Tripod Target and Viewer 518 ERV Response . . . . .                | 43 |
| 10 | Straw Hat Target and Viewer 518 ERV Response. . . . .              | 44 |
| 11 | Antenna and Viewer 518 ERV Response . . . . .                      | 45 |
| 12 | Globe Target and Viewer 518 ERV Response. . . . .                  | 46 |

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

TABLES

|   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Results of Transcript Concept Analysis of a Remote Viewing Experiment. . . . . | 7  |
| 2 | 0-7 Point Evaluation Scale for Target/Transcript Correspondence. . . . .       | 24 |
| 3 | Distribution of Target/Response Matchings . . . . .                            | 51 |

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

## I INTRODUCTION

This report presents preliminary results and assessments from the first six months of a one-year investigation of techniques for the optimization of remote viewing among client-selected individuals. The objective of this program is the familiarization of these individuals with the SRI remote viewing protocols, with the goal of producing enhanced levels of ability, and the establishment of screening tests and procedures to enlarge the population from which such individuals are selected.

In Section II of this report we present briefly the background of the remote viewing protocol that is the basis of this attempted technology transfer. In Section III we describe the remote viewing series carried out with each of six client-supplied volunteers. Each of these series consisted of six trials, which are now in various stages of the process of formal evaluation. Two participants from the first series have returned to SRI for an additional two weeks training each, in a variety of remote viewing tasks, and the results of this work is also discussed. In Section IV are presented our overall assessments and recommendations.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

## II BACKGROUND

With the overall objective of improving the reliability of psycho-energetic functioning, we have investigated several different familiarization/training strategies, both with the goal of developing techniques useful in identifying gifted remote viewers, and of providing the most optimal environment for individuals participating in remote viewing.

A. Remote Viewing Protocols (for the Description of Remote Geographical Targets)

As carried out at SRI, the general procedure is to closet the participant, hereafter called the viewer, with an interviewer, and at a prearranged time to obtain from the viewer a description of an undisclosed, remote site being visited by a target team, one of whose members is known to the remote viewer and who thereby constitutes the target or "beacon" person.<sup>1</sup> The target team is assigned their target location by an independent experimenter who has generated a list of targets located within a 30-minute driving time from SRI, and who accesses this list by a randomization procedure. The target pool consists of sixty target locations chosen from a target-rich environment. The target location selected is kept blind to both the viewer and interviewer closeted at SRI. The protocol is thus of the double-blind type.

In detail: To begin a trial, a viewer is sequestered with an interviewer at SRI, and is instructed to wait 30 minutes before beginning his

---

<sup>1</sup>H. E. Puthoff and R. Targ, "A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances," Proc. IEEE, vol. 64 (March 1976).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

narrative description of where the target team has gone. Meanwhile, the target team obtains sealed traveling orders from a monitor who has previously prepared and randomized a set of such orders. After leaving SRI by automobile, the target team opens the traveling orders and proceeds directly to the target without any communication with the viewer or interviewer remaining at SRI. The interviewer remaining with the viewer in the SRI laboratory is kept ignorant of the target, so as to eliminate the possibility of cueing (overt or subliminal) and to allow him freedom in questioning the viewer for clarification of his descriptions. The target team remains at the target site for a prearranged 15-minute period following the 30 minutes allotted for travel. During the observation period, the viewer at SRI is asked to describe his impressions of the target site into a tape recorder and to make any drawings he thinks appropriate. A tentative evaluation is made of his output when the target team returns to SRI. Finally, following the trial, the viewer is taken to the site so that he may obtain direct feedback.

B. Judging the Results

To obtain an initial numerical evaluation of the accuracy of a series of, say, N remote viewing experiments, the results are subjected to independent judging on a blind basis by SRI research analysts not otherwise associated with the program.

In preparation for the judging, the viewer's tapes are transcribed, and the transcripts are edited only to the extent of deleting information which might act as artifactual cues to a judge, such as references to other targets, or phrases which might indicate the temporal order of transcripts. The response packets, which in our case contain six typed transcripts of the tape-recorded narratives and associated drawings, are then presented to the analyst in random order. Working alone, the analyst visits each of the six target locations and in a blind fashion ranks each of the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

viewer's descriptions on a scale 1 to 6 (best to worst match), generating a  $6 \times 6$  matrix. A precise measure of the statistical significance of the matrix of target/transcript rankings is given by a direct-count-of-permutations method of great generality.<sup>2</sup> It is an exact calculation method requiring no approximations such as normality assumptions. Furthermore, the judging process that goes into generating the matrix is not required to be independent transcript-to-transcript nor target-to-target. Finally, numerical estimates of target/transcript correspondences can be made on the basis of rank-order or rating scales (e.g., rank ordering 1 to n, best to worst match; or concept analysis, rating 0-100, zero to complete correspondence; arbitrary scale rating arrived at by some complex procedure involving many factors such as occurs in multiple-judge voting, etc.). The argument is as follows.

In the absence of knowledge as to which transcript was generated in response to which target, one observes that in setting up the target-transcript matrix there are  $n!$  possible ways to label the columns (transcripts), given any particular order of the rows (targets), and vice versa. Thus, there are  $n!$  possible matrices which could be constructed from the raw judging data, all of them equally likely under the null hypothesis that the viewer's remote viewing attempts produce nothing but vague and general descriptions and/or occasional chance correspondences with various target sites. Each matrix has its associated sum on the matrix diagonal corresponding to a possible alignment of targets.

The significance level for the experiment is then determined by counting the number of possible matrices that would yield a result (diagonal sum) equal to or better (i.e., lower sum of ranks in the rank-order case,

---

<sup>2</sup>C. Scott, "On the Evaluation of Verbal Material in Parapsychology," Jour. Soc. Psych. Res., vol. 46 (June 1972).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

higher sum of scores in the correspondence-rating case, etc.) than that obtained for the matrix corresponding to the key, and dividing by  $n!$ . This ratio gives the probability of obtaining by chance a result equal to or better than that obtained in the actual judging process.

As an overall calibration of the remote viewing process, against which specific examples can be gauged, we can take as a background data base the lengthy collection of 51 remote viewing trials collected over a several-year period with nine subjects, and published in Reference 1. In these trials subjects were targeted on local targets (bridges, swimming pools, theaters, airports, computers, machine shops, etc.) within a 20 km range of SRI. The quality of the results was such that the judges, who had to determine in a blind fashion which subject-generated data packages (tape transcripts and drawings) were associated with which target sites, were able to blind match transcripts to targets in first place in roughly half the cases.

#### C. Transcript Concept Analysis

In order to assess quantitatively the degree of correspondence between a given transcript and target, we have recently developed a concept analysis procedure which provides for detailed comparisons. In this new procedure, we begin by analyzing each transcript for its specific content. To accomplish this, the transcript is divided into a list of specific concepts, where a concept may consist of a single word or phrase from the transcript (e.g., "red"), or a single word or phrase that summarizes a lengthy idea (e.g., "shady"). A list of concepts is made for each transcript in a series to be judged. The analysis proceeds by having a judge, who is blind to which transcripts actually match which targets, stand at the first target location on his target list, and for each transcript make an assessment, concept by concept, on a rating scale of 0 to 10. A rating

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

of 0 implies no correspondence whatever between that particular concept and the target site in question, and a 10 implies complete correspondence. Intermediate scores are given in proportion to the extent of the correspondence. Having done this for each of the concepts, one by one, in the first transcript, the judge repeats the assessment as independently as possible for all the concepts in all of the remaining transcripts. He then proceeds to the next target site on the list and repeats the concept assessment for all of the transcripts as applied to that site. Having finished all the travel sites in this manner, the judge computes the average rating score for all concepts in each transcript matched against each target. When there are six trials in the series, there are 36 such averages.

In a second step of the judging procedure, the judge displays his results in a matrix with targets displayed as rows and transcripts displayed as columns. An example from an actual experiment (Viewer 690) is shown in Table 1.

At this point in the analysis, the judge submits his results. The statistical approach used to analyze the matrix is then the direct-count-of-permutations method described earlier. For the results shown in Table 1 the probability of obtaining equal or better matching by chance is only  $p = 1/6! = 0.0013$ .

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Table 1

RESULTS OF TRANSCRIPT-CONCEPT ANALYSIS  
OF A REMOTE VIEWING EXPERIMENT

(a) Ratings

| Targets          | Transcripts |      |      |      |      |      |
|------------------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                  | A           | B    | C    | D    | E    | F    |
| Shielded Room    | 3.55        | 5.85 | 2.20 | 3.80 | 2.90 | 2.20 |
| Alta Mesa        | 3.40        | 4.00 | 6.05 | 2.85 | 3.00 | 4.70 |
| Ely Chevrolet    | 3.50        | 2.60 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 4.45 | 4.30 |
| Four Seasons     | 4.90        | 3.20 | 4.80 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 4.85 |
| Methodist Church | 2.15        | 2.60 | 3.50 | 3.20 | 4.70 | 6.45 |
| Library Stacks   | 4.05        | 3.90 | 3.80 | 3.80 | 4.30 | 6.25 |

(b) Rankings

| Targets          | Transcripts |    |   |   |   |   |
|------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|
|                  | A           | B  | C | D | E | F |
| Shielded Room    | 3           | 1* | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Alta Mesa        | 4           | 3  | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Ely Chevrolet    | 3           | 4  | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Four Seasons     | 1           | 4  | 3 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| Methodist Church | 6           | 5  | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Library Stacks   | 3           | 4  | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

\* Circles indicate target/transcript key.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

### III ORIENTATION RESULTS

In this section we describe six remote viewing series carried out with each of the client-supplied volunteers. All series have been assessed as to the degree of remote viewing exhibited, and in addition, four of these series have been formally evaluated by blind judging; the other two are presently in the process of being blind judged. In addition to these trials, we are now carrying out a more varied series of training exercises in which each remote viewer spends two weeks at SRI. Thus far, two of the original group of six have taken part in this additional training and their results are discussed here also.

#### A. Remote Viewing of Geographical Targets

During the months of May, June, and July, six one-week remote viewing series were conducted, one week each with the six client participants. These series were carried out at the rate of two series per month. The purpose of these initial training activities was to obtain baseline data on each of the participants taking part in a uniform series of trials, and to provide a basis for later evaluation and comparison of their performance in more diverse tasks.

The six remote viewing sessions for each participant were conducted at a rate of one per day, except for Thursdays, when there were two sessions. The investigators divided the interviewing and outbound tasks, with RT remaining with the viewer for the first four trials, and HP acting as interviewer for the last two.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~B. Summary of the Six Series

The following summarizes our impressions of the thirty-six remote viewing trials carried out in our laboratory, May through July 1979, by the six client participants. As indicated earlier, a formal blind judging has been carried out for four of the series, and will shortly be completed for the two remaining series.

In order to present a coherent assessment of the sessions in this summary, we rate each session individually, with regard to our subjective impression as to its correspondences and similarities to the intended target site. This is not intended as the equivalent of "blind judging" since it is post hoc, but it does provide a relative measure from our standpoint as to the success of the various participants. We rate each transcript on a 0 to 7 scale, with a 0 for no correspondence, and a 7 for a transcript that could not reasonably pertain to any site other than the actual target (for example, naming the target correctly.) Identifying boats at a boat dock, would get a 5 or 6 depending on the presence or absence of other noncorroborated items in the RV transcript. Again, the 0 to 7 rating is not a blind measure of the presence of remote viewing functioning, but rather a procedure for comparing the relative performance of the participants. Nonetheless, as we see later, the correlation or agreement between this subjective rating system and the results of formal blind judging is high.

1. Viewer No. 155

Target 1: White Plaza at Stanford University. This trial was the first in the overall group of thirty-six, and also was in our opinion (and that of the blind judge) one of the very best in the series of six with this remote viewer. The viewer correctly identified the main feature of the site as being a plaza with a fountain. He also had a tall column

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

dominating the scene, which is a good match for Hoover Tower, just behind the fountain. Additionally described were a series of arches, which are a recurring feature in the buildings surrounding the courtyard. Rating = 5.

Target 2: Stanford Art Museum. The viewer did not describe this large Greek-columned building at all. He did, however, mention and draw the double colonnade of trees leading up to the building, together with other nearby features, such as arches and red-tiled roofs, and indicated that he felt that it was again a "Stanford type" of target. Rating = 3.

Target 3: Logo. This target is a 6 ft X 12 ft orange metal sculpture on the grass lawn of a chemical company. It is a symbolic chain molecule, consisting of four large diamond shapes connected together. The viewer did not describe anything that pertained to the target. His main features were of a gazebo structure. Rating = 0.

Target 4: Fire Circle. Among other things, the viewer correctly described a circular depressed area, with descending steps, a squared-off far end, and something in the center. This is an excellent description of the target and was accompanied by a corresponding drawing. However, the viewer also described and drew two other fairly coherent scenes which did not pertain to the target. Consequently the judge who eventually did evaluate this series in the blind, ranked this transcript in fifth place, out of six, because of its correspondences to other targets. Simply rating the transcript and drawings to the actual target, our subjective assessment was a rating = 3.

Target 5: Pedestrian Overpass. The viewer's initial description was of a "lacey arch," which is a very apt summary of this wire and pipe structure. He went on to describe his "confined feeling." His description

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

then wandered off into a "narrow alley" and what sounded like a village scene with stucco buildings. His fourth drawing was a good representation of the arched entrance to the overpass. Again there were so many extraneous elements to the viewer's output that our judge ranked this transcript fourth out of six. Rating it only with regard to the individual target, we assigned it a rating = 3.

Target 6: Valombrosa Meeting Center. The main features of his description was a fan shaped structure, closely matching the roof design of the principle element of the target. He pictured it as an "arched cave with bars," which led to the blind judge incorrectly matching it to the pedestrian overpass. Rating = 2.

This remote viewing series was the first to be conducted with client volunteers. It was judged in accordance with the detailed concept analysis described earlier. The final tally revealed only one correct first place assignment, and all others less than third. The series was therefore numerically nonsignificant, according to our evaluation criteria. In this case the judging results agreed fairly well with our subjective assessment, because of the viewer's frequent inclusion of erroneous elements along with strongly correct ones in a given transcript/drawing package, a combination which made blind judging difficult. In our subjective assessment we tended to give a little more credit for correct elements, and exact a smaller penalty for the errors. In engineering terms this would be a good example of a signal-to-noise problem. There were occasional good examples of signal, but it was generally overwhelmed by the noise. Our sum of ratings was 16, the next to the lowest of the six.

2. Viewer No. 292

Target 1: SRI Courtyard. The central feature of this large, enclosed courtyard is a fountain in a square concrete base. The viewer

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

described a number of different architectural forms including domes and columns, which are not particularly in evidence at the target site. He also described a small waterfall, however, which is in fact at the site, in a form well illustrated by one of his drawings. In addition, another drawing shows an eight-lobed circular structure, which closely resembles the inner portion of the fountain. Because of the many nonapplicable elements of the description, however, we gave this transcript a rating = 3.

Target 2: Varsity Theatre Arcade. The target is the entry to a motion picture theatre. From the street one sees a double colonnade running from the street to the theatre entry. To the left and right are stucco walls with movie posters behind glass, and down the center is a row of striped umbrellas. The viewer described a tunnel-like structure, receding away from him, masonry walls, with bright reflections; and he drew and described a kiosk structure with a striped coolie-hat top. The drawings were more coherent than the transcript. Our rating = 5.

Target 3: Glass Slipper Motel. This target is a motel facade on El Camino Real. It is a representation of a fairy tale castle. The viewer didn't describe anything like the target, although he did give a detailed and coherent description of a place that he visualized. Our rating = 0.

Of some interest, however, is the fact that after taking the viewer to the target site, and confirming that it did not particularly match his description, the interviewer suggested that they have lunch at a new restaurant that had just opened up, several miles away. One of the consistent items in the viewer's transcript was his reference to big shade trees, an arbor like effect, and horizontal yellow and orange bands of cloth, supported on wires to make a horizontal awning. The restaurant we visited had all these features. Neither the viewer nor the interviewer

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

had ever seen this, or any similar place before, so one can speculate that the viewer may have experienced overlay from this site.

Target 4: Wallbangers Racquet Ball Court. The viewer had two main descriptive elements: These were a body of water with two or three fountains in it, and a balcony, looking down on a geometrical pattern of some sort. The target building is situated in relatively open country, immediately adjacent to a pond with three fountain spouts in it. The outbound team parked in front of this pond. They then entered the building and spent their entire time on the balcony that runs the length of the building, looking down at the racquet ball courts. The viewer provided a very coherent description of the outbound team's activities with regard to their stay on this balcony. However, he described the scene as though it were outdoors looking at the fountain, rather than being a separate place indoors. Rating = 4.

Target 5: Airport Tower. At the Palo Alto Airport there are two towers. The target team was at a square stone tower, fifty yards from a taller, thinner metal braced tower, which is not presently used. The viewer made a careful sketch of a tall metal tower with diagonal bracing. He called it a mast, with a "plane" at the bottom. When the interviewer asked him about the plane, the viewer said it was a "jack plane" like carpenters use to finish woodwork. (This type of symbolism--there were airplanes at the base of the tower--is often seen in remote viewing transcripts.) The viewer also drew and described a globe and clouds emblem (FAA symbol) on the tower door, which was studied by the target team at the site. Our rating = 6, the highest of the thirty-six trials in this introductory orientation series.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Target 6: SRI Shielded Room. The viewer had a repeating view of an outdoor, turning disk, which condensed for him into a drawing greatly resembling a merry-go-round at a nearby park, a well known target described in our published work. Little of this description resembled the actual target. Our rating = 0.

In spite of two zero scores, this viewer ties for third among the six participants. His sum of scores was 18, which may under-rate his ability (which is so highly variable) to do remote viewing; we found his descriptions of the small waterfall, the Varsity Theatre entrance, and the airport tower very compelling.

3. Viewer No. 372

Target 1: Stanford Art Museum. The viewer described a stone building with a higher central part, and two wings, one on either side. He then drew the building in a careful pen and ink sketch. His drawing strongly resembles the target. However, there are seven other, less carefully executed sketches on the same page, and on other pages there are sketches suggesting tombstones, which caused this transcript to be ranked first place match to a cemetery. The transcript itself had many elements which pertained to items in the museum entry, including column design. The judge gave this a second place rank out of six. Our rating assignment was = 4.

Target 2: Baylands Nature Preserve. For reasons yet to be determined, this is the target which in our seven years work is most often described excellently, and in a somewhat characteristic manner. The main feature at this botanical garden at the San Francisco Bay is a wooden walkway from the shore to an observation platform a quarter of a mile away in the salt marsh. This walkway is crossed at right angles by a similar one that follows a row of high-voltage transmission towers. In recent

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

memory, every viewer who has had this target described a "large cross on the ground." This viewer was no exception. He also had it as an outdoor site with no other buildings. Rating = 5.

Target 3: Alta Mesa Memorial Park Cemetery. The remote viewer reported a recurrent feeling of "rough-cut stone." It feels like a church but it is not a church." He made a drawing of a small arched building which is at the site. "Very peaceful and relaxed," he said. A recurring theme was some kind of stone overhang, which was not at the site, and was the cause of the judge to interchange this otherwise coherent transcript with the Art Museum. Rating = 4.

Target 4: Jungle Gym. The viewer described a large box with curved edges, made of wire-like bent coat hangers. He also had a metal surface rippling and shining in the sun like a child's slide. (A slide was next to the jungle gym target.) He made schematic drawings of both the circular jungle gym, and the slide. He went on to say that the target is more like a sculpture than a building, and indeed the playground elements are in the form of metal sculptures (horse, car, etc.). Rating = 5.

Target 5: Salt Pile. This target is a salt refinery on the San Francisco Bay. Its prominent feature is a gleaming white pile of salt about 100 ft high, and 200 ft long. The viewer did not see the salt pile. He described an outdoor site with birds and wind, which was correct. He also saw some machinery. The item that allowed the judge to correctly match the transcript to the target was his drawing of a large, orange, pillow-shaped structure. This was easily matched to a large rusted quonset hut at the site. He also spoke extensively of a sharp pointed object that the outbound person was especially interested in. (In fact, RT had picked up a very large salt crystal, and brought it back to SRI.) Although we

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

considered the transcript somewhat nonspecific, the judge was able to match it correctly. Rating = 3.

Target 6: Brickyard. There are initial descriptions of square objects, and the first drawing looks like a drawing of a brick. The transcript also had discussions of being inside a building, and of views of towers, which are incorrect. He later sees things lined up that look like books on a shelf. Again and again he has "very precise geometric patterns," as "the most important aspect of the place." The drawing package has six pages of curved objects and forms that do not apply, however. Rating = 3.

The sum of ratings for this viewer is 24, the highest in the group. The blind judging with transcript analysis resulted in correct match to the appropriate targets for four of the six transcripts, and an interchange of the remaining two. This gives four first places and two second places in the final judging matrix. Using the exact count-of-permutations analysis described above, the probability of obtaining by chance a result equal to or better than the one obtained is  $p = 2/6! = 0.0027$ . That is, the odds of obtaining a result of this significance by chance is approximately 1 in 300.

The viewer's significant performance was repeated in his second training period at SRI, when he took part in carefully controlled trials which again produced highly significant results.

4. Viewer No. 468

Target 1: Merry-Go-Round. The target was a child's merry-go-round in a playground sand pile. About 25 ft away is a spiral slide. The viewer's main descriptions were of a large multistory building in a courtyard. Inside this building he has a "free-floating staircase that is kind

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

of suspended. It turns this way, and then there is a chute," a description that resembled somewhat the spiral slide. However, there was nothing in the drawings or transcript that pertained to the merry-go-round, so that a judge would not be able to identify the target from that data. We therefore assigned it a rating = 0, in spite of the suggestive correspondences to a nearby feature.

Target 2: Windmill. This target is a white-vaaned windmill on a country road and has been well described by two previous viewers in past years. This viewer described curving stairs (incorrect) and a circular building like a water tank (correct). Our assessment rating = 3.

Target 3: Stanford Art Museum. The item of main interest at this site is a 5 ft cube sculpture standing on its corner in front of a columned portico of a Greek-style building. The viewer described a dark rectangular solid sticking out of the front of the building, and drew a careful sketch of pillars that support the front of the entry just behind the cube. His transcript also had bridges, office buildings and cyclone fencing, which do not appear at the site. Our rating = 3, based on the two good drawings of the projecting rectangular solid and the columns.

Target 4: Methodist Church. For this target he described a building with a "sloping roof with windows set into it." He then drew a large sketch of a building with a pointed roof supported from the outside by sloping roof beams. These features accurately represent the main features of the large stone church that was the target. The viewer also correctly described that the target team went inside the building, and then looked out through windows toward the end of the trial. Our rating = 5.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

We should note that the viewer seemed quite tense to the interviewer during the first three trials. On Thursday, just before trial 4, his friend, who is our contract monitor, arrived at SRI to observe the protocol, and particularly the randomization procedure used in target selection. He also observed this trial by joining the outbound target team, at which time we noticed a dramatic change in the viewer's performance.

Target 5: Four Seasons Arch. "I get the feeling of their walking through an opening in a low wall." That is just what a target team does at this omega-shaped arch in front of a restaurant. The viewer had several arch shapes, together with a carefully drawn wall comprising 300 degrees of a circle, and correctly labeled as being white (although lying on the ground, which is incorrect). The transcript is all arches and walls for the first four pages, and then drifts into buildings and wooden structures which are not at the site. Our rating = 5.

Target 6: Mount Alverno Conference Center. This target consists of an assembly building with glass doors, and an overhanging shallow-pitched roof which resembles in many details the drawing made by the viewer. He also correctly described the approach to the site over a little bridge with hand rails. He also said that the building is locked, so that the target team could not go inside (correct). Further he described a bridge "that goes nowhere," in striking agreement with a stairway that rises up a hill, and appears to go nowhere, since all one sees at the top of the stairway is the sky. The viewer did not describe a tall stone tower surmounted by a gold cross next to the assembly building, which is considered part of the target site. Our assessment = 5, because of the good drawing of the main building, and an accurate description of the place as being "quite like a church but not exactly a church itself."

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Sum of ratings = 21. We note that this viewer's ability to make clear drawings of his mental images (he is a professional illustrator) is a great asset both to himself in describing his remote viewing experiences, and to those trying to evaluate his descriptions.

5. Viewer No. 518

Target 1: Stanford Shopping Center. The target is the central courtyard of the Stanford Shopping Center. This is a great rotunda surrounded by high arches and is paved with tiles in a circular pattern. The pedestrian avenues leading away from this hub have fountains and large planters with flowers. The viewer drew and described a round fountain with a spray, located close to a rectangular box with something dark in it (foliage perhaps). This transcript did not contain a description of the central focus of the target, although many elements could be found in the nearby pedestrian avenues. Rating = 3.

Target 2: Bowling Alley. The viewer described an outdoor scene with a large building with overhang (correct) with many curves and oaken doors (incorrect). Inside he had a complex structure like a throne. We found little resemblance to the target. Rating = 1.

Target 3: Alta Mesa Cemetery. The viewer described and drew several small buildings. "A place to walk and stroll. A place of fun and recreation." He had a recurring bicycle throughout the transcript which could not be matched. Our rating = 1.

Target 4: Hoover Tower. The viewer had the feeling that he was "abnormally high." He also saw the semicircular ends of a dark tunnel in which he was standing. The target team was on the observation deck of Hoover Tower. The deck is surmounted with a domed ceiling (that the viewer

~~SECRET~~

described) and each of the four sides is a large floor-to-ceiling arch, making the view outside much brighter than the space inside the observation deck. The viewer clearly had the idea of shade, coolness, arches, and height. Our rating = 4.

Target 5: Swimming Pool Complex. The viewer described "a two-dimensional rectangle that is not a structure," in a plaza surrounded by walls. His images finally resolved into a three-tiered fountain of lazy-susan construction. At the site the target team was standing between a large rectangular pool and a circular wading pool 100 ft across. The target team members discussed at the site the fact that if the viewer described the wading pool as three concentric circles in a plaza, that would probably indicate target acquisition. (The circular pool has three depth graduations, each marked by a dark circular band.) The viewer's final drawing is of three nested circles in the middle of a plaza, surrounded by a wall, with trellises and foliage on the sides (correct). However, this very apropos drawing was preceded by others less descriptive of or applicable to the target. Our rating = 4.

Target 6: Miniature Golf Course. The target team concentrated their attention on a red A-frame schoolhouse on a miniature golf course. The viewer several times described teepee-shaped structures, but the main portion of his description pertained to the inside of a hall with much confusion, and a row of what looked like display cases. (Actually the hall contained rows of pinball machines.) Our rating = 2.

The sum of ranks for this viewer was 15, which is the lowest of the six participants. However, since these trials this viewer has returned to SRI for an additional two weeks of work. During that time he appeared to perform quite well on the remote viewing of slides, hidden objects, and distant coordinates. These additional trials are discussed later.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~6. Viewer No. 690

Target 1: Alta Mesa Cemetery. The viewer, on this first trial, had a very diffuse transcript; mainly outdoors, grass, reeds, and trees, in a natural, not man-made environment. The viewer had low cliffs nearby. The drawings were relatively nonspecific. Because of the outdoor naturalistic description, the rating = 2.

Target 2: Four Seasons Restaurant Arch. The target is a large white omega-shaped stone arch set into a wall in front of a restaurant. The subject described "a white dome supported by pillars," and also a fence. Throughout the brief two-page transcript there was only the "gazebo" like structure that you can see through, and the fence. Rating = 4.

Target 3: Sheilded Room. The target is a small rectangular screen-room, about 4 by 8 by 7 ft high. The principle feeling of this target is one of confinement. The viewer said, "he seems inside a square something, looking out through a square. It's dark inside. It is not terribly high, 6 ft maybe." The drawing shows a rectangular structure marked "6 ft wide." The screen-room is as close as we can get to sending an outbound team "nowhere." Our assessment of the viewer's description = 5.

Target 4: Automobile Showroom. The target is a hexagonal glass building with a conical roof. The viewer's first impression was of "a glass bottle with a thin neck." "I keep getting the impression of glass, lots of glass objects." "It is some kind of store." The subject felt "bad vibes" from the place; it seemed threatening. It turned out that HP, the outbound person, was sent to an automobile showroom and was pretending to be interested in a new car, attracting the salesmen in the showroom. He came back reporting that it was one of the most unpleasant outbound

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

experiences he has had. The drawings were diffuse, but because of the essentially correct, though exaggerated emotional perceptions, it received a rating = 4.

Target 5: Palo Alto Library. The outbound team stood between the shelves in the library stacks. The viewer did not describe anything about the library, and the rating = 0.

There was an interesting facet in connection with this trial, however. The viewer described a cornfield with rows of corn ready for picking, etc. When we heard the tape for this trial we could think of no such place in the city of Palo Alto. But in accordance with our usual protocol, we took the viewer back to the target site. As we were parking the car in the same spot as we had initially, the viewer looked out the left window of the car and exclaimed, "that's my corn field." Immediately adjacent to the public library, there is a community garden, which this year is devoted entirely to corn. So, one may speculate that the viewer accessed this adjacent area while attempting to describe where the beacon was located.

Target 6: Methodist Church. All the images in this transcript pertain to a one story building with "an inverted V roof." The main feature of the target is just such a roof. The viewer also correctly identified the target as being a building in downtown Palo Alto. Since there were no identifying characteristics given, our rating = 4.

The sum ratings for the six trials is 19, which is the third highest in the group. One of the main features that contribute to this viewer's relatively high rating is that these transcripts are relatively free of incorrect material; the viewer does not have a lot to say, but what is said is largely correct. We consider this to be a very desirable characteristic.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

The formal judging for this series correlated well with our subjective assessments. The separate verbal and pictorial ratings each gave four first place matches out of six, and the combined averages gave five first place matches. All three matrices turn out to possess the highest assignable score out of all possible permutations in the direct-count-of permutations method, and the probability of obtaining such a result by chance is only  $p = 1/6! = 0.0013$ .

C. Comparison of Blind Judging and Subjective Assessment

We have described in some detail how a judge arrives at a numerical ranking of the trials in a formal evaluation of a series, by use of concept analysis of the transcripts.

In order to arrive quickly at a trial-by-trial assessment, we occasionally make use also of a simple post hoc rating technique of a type devised by the client. In this approach one rates as "perfect" (e.g., 7 on a 0-7 scale) a transcript in which the target is unequivocally identified. If there is no apparent relationship between the transcript and the intended target on the other hand, the transcript is rated 0. For intermediate results, an intermediate rating is assigned, as indicated in Table 2.

In the four series that have been formally judged at SRI, two were found to differ significantly from chance expectation, and two were found to be at chance. Before this formal judging, all transcripts were numerically rated using the 0-7 scale, in the presence of the contract monitor. We are now in a position to compare mathematically our subjective impressions of the transcripts (post hoc evaluation scale) with the formal ratings of the same transcripts by a blind judge.

Since the judge rates transcripts on a 1 to 6 (best to worst) scale, and the subjective rating is on a 0 to 7 (worst to best) scale, to make

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Table 2

0-7 POINT EVALUATION SCALE FOR TARGET/TRANSCRIPT CORRESPONDENCE

- |  |
|--|
| 7 = Excellent correspondence, including good analytical detail (e.g., naming the site by name).                                      |
| 6 = Good correspondence with good analytical information (e.g., naming the function), and with essentially no incorrect information. |
| 5* = Good correspondence with unambiguous unique matchable elements and little incorrect information.                                |
| 4 = Good correspondence with several matchable elements, but some incorrect information.   |
| 3 = Mixture of correct and incorrect elements, but enough of the former to indicate viewer has made contact with the site.           |
| 2 = Some correct elements, but not sufficient to suggest results beyond chance expectation.  |
| 1 = Little correspondence.   |
| 0 = No correspondence.   |

\*In blind judging transcripts rated 5 or above are typically first-place matched without difficulty.


a comparison it is necessary to normalize the two scales. Since (with the exception of one entry) our highest subjective ratings were fives, we have done this by subtracting the subjective rating from six in every case, giving a range 1-6, best to worst match, which can be compared directly to the objective formal evaluation scale. (In the one case where a 6 was given in the 0-7 scale, we conservatively count it as a 5 so that it would fit this renormalizing scheme.)

We have numerically calculated the correlation coefficient between these two sets of ratings for the twenty-four transcripts/target pairs so far evaluated by both procedures. For the 24 pairs, the correlation coefficient,

~~SECRET~~

$r = 0.68$  (see following graph). The numerical probability of this correlation this high or higher occurring by chance between "uncorrelated" data over the same range of values, is less than one in ten thousand ( $p = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ ).

This important result shows that the rating technique used extensively by the client organization to evaluate transcripts and viewer performance is very well correlated with objective blind matching normally used in psychology to evaluate free response data.



UNCLASSIFIED

COMPARISON OF BLIND JUDGING AND SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENTS (U)

~~SECRET~~

The data are given below:

Viewer No. 155

| <u>Target</u> | <u>Blind<br/>Judging</u> | <u>Normalized<br/>Subjective<br/>Rating</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|---|
| Valombrosa    | 6                        | 4   |
| Logo          | 6                        | 6   |
| Museum        | 4                        | 3   |
| Plaza         | 1                        | 1   |
| Fire Circle   | 5                        | 3   |
| Overpass      | 4                        | 3   |

Viewer No. 292

| <u>Target</u> | <u>Blind<br/>Judging</u> | <u>Normalized<br/>Subjective<br/>Rating</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|---|
| Motel         | 6                        | 6   |
| Wallbangers   | 4                        | 2   |
| Courtyard     | 3                        | 3   |
| Shielded Room | 5                        | 6   |
| Airport       | 1                        | 0   |
| Theatre       | 2                        | 1   |

Viewer No. 372

| <u>Target</u> | <u>Blind<br/>Judging</u> | <u>Normalized<br/>Subjective<br/>Rating</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|---|
| Museum        | 2                        | 2   |
| Baylands      | 1                        | 1   |
| Cemetery      | 2                        | 2   |
| Jungle Gym    | 1                        | 1   |
| Salt Pile     | 1                        | 3   |
| Brickyard     | 1                        | 3   |

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~Viewer No. 690

| <u>Target</u> | <u>Blind<br/>Judging</u> | <u>Normalized<br/>Subjective<br/>Rating</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|---|
| Arch          | 1                        | 2   |
| Shielded Room | 1                        | 1   |
| Cemetery      | 1                        | 4   |
| Library       | 5                        | 6   |
| Auto Showroom | 1                        | 2   |
| Church        | 1                        | 2   |

D. Remote Viewing of 35mm Slides

The purpose of this series of trials was to determine whether a remote viewer could describe the contents of a 35mm slide of a target site with the same accuracy as he describes an actual target site.

The protocol was as follows. The remote viewer was located alone in the third floor laboratory of the Radio Physics Building, and asked to describe the contents of slides projected within an office trailer in a parking lot 300 ft away. The target slides for these trials were photographs of the 60 San Francisco Bay Area sites used in our ordinary remote viewing trials. The use of this particular target pool allows us to compare the quality of the descriptions that are elicited in trials with the slides as compared with those involving the actual outdoor targets.

A trial series consists of six slides, and the viewer is given feedback after each individual trial, before the start of the next. (This is done to avoid displacement, known to occur in parapsychological experiments where trial-by-trial-feedback is not provided, in which a viewer might tend to describe a target slide from elsewhere in the series, rather than the one just projected.)

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

The viewer is monitored via a one-way open intercom connected to the room in the trailer in which the slide is being shown to the series monitor.\* The session is tape recorded at the latter end of the link. To begin, the monitor selected by random number generator, a slide after the viewer announces that he is ready. No feedback is provided to the viewer until the viewer has indicated that he is finished and the monitor has gone to the room in which the viewer has been working and collects his drawings. A session typically lasts about fifteen minutes.

1. Viewer No. 372

The first series of six trials was carried out by Viewer 372 during his second two-week period at SRI. The six target slides were of the following targets:

- (1) Alta Mesa Cemetery
- (2) Ultra-modern Dome House
- (3) Pedestrian Overpass
- (4) Mount Alverno Conference Center
- (5) Redwood City Cross
- (6) Stanford Shopping Center Pavillion.

Our subjective post hoc impression was that four of the six descriptions were good matches to the target slides.

The results were formally evaluated by a blind judge using the concept analysis techniques being applied to the outdoor target series. As per standard procedure the transcript/drawing response packages and target material (slides) were turned over to the judge, each in a separate random order different from the order of target usage. Again, the transcripts

---

\* A second intercom to the subject can be activated by the monitor by a punch-to-talk switch in the trailer.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

were edited only to the point of deleting information which could provide artifactual cues to the judge, such as references to other targets or temporal order. (Only five of the target/transcript pairs were submitted for judging, since the judge had been exposed to one of the results [target 4] presented at a briefing as an example of excellent slide viewing.)

The judge was asked to blind rank order, on a scale 1 to 5, best to worst match, each of the transcripts against each of the targets, generating a  $5 \times 5$  matrix of the five target/transcript pairings, three were directly matched, one was matched second place, one third. The direct-count-of-permutations analysis of the matrix yielded a result significant at  $p = 2/120 = 0.017$ .

Three of the drawings and slide targets for this viewer are shown here as Figures 1 through 3. We conclude from these results that viewers can describe target slides, and from the content of the transcripts it appears that they are describing the slides as projected, not the overall target location.

2. Viewer No. 518



A similar series of six trials was conducted with Viewer 518. His six target slides were:

- (1) Laundromat interior
- (2) Varsity Theatre arcade
- (3) White victorian house
- (4) Sylvania dome building
- (5) Glass Slipper Motel
- (6) A locomotive slide in a playground.

The viewer made what we consider to be three excellent sets of drawings to correspond with the Victorian, the Motel, and the Theatre targets.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED





UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 1 STANFORD SHOPPING CENTER--TARGET, AND VIEWER 372 DRAWING (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**





UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 2. MOUNT ALVERNO CONFERENCE CENTER, AND VIEWER 372 DRAWING (U)

**UNCLASSIFIED**

UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 3 ULTRA MODERN DOME HOUSE--TARGET, AND VIEWER 372 DRAWING (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

These three drawing/target pairs are shown here in Figures 4 through 6. The correspondences for the remaining three were of lesser quality, although still containing many correct elements. Our final evaluation will have to await formal judging. We note in passing that this viewer produced more coherent transcripts and drawings in this series than he did for the outdoor targets.

It appears from the data thus far that remote viewers can perceive the contents of projected slides. Furthermore, they appear to describe the slides themselves, rather than the geographical locations corresponding to the slides. Finally, it appears that because of the more limited focus of content presented by the slide, a viewer has an easier time providing data that is associated with what is defined to be the target.

E. Remote Viewing of Alphabet Letters



The purpose of this study was to determine whether an isolated remote viewer could learn to discriminate between and identify alphabet letters. The percipient, Viewer 372, was located in the third floor laboratory of the Radio Physics Building at SRI, while the experimenters and the target materials were in an office trailer in a nearby parking lot (as in the slide series).

The protocol in all twelve trials in this series was for the viewer to identify a randomly chosen three-letter word exposed to view in the target room. The targets used in this series were red block letters eight inches high, cemented to white cardboard. The three letters making up each word were placed on the chalk tray of the target room blackboard

Twelve trials were carried out. A satisfactory protocol was developed only by the third trial, so the first two must be considered exploratory. In trial 1, the target word was randomly chosen from a group of ten

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED




UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 4 VARSITY THEATRE ARCADE--TARGET, AND VIEWER 518 DRAWING (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**



UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 5 VICTORIAN HOUSE--TARGET, AND VIEWER 518 DRAWING (U)

**UNCLASSIFIED**

UNCLASSIFIED




9/19/79 expert 3

①



②



UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 6 GLASS SLIPPER MOTEL--TARGET, AND VIEWER 518 DRAWING (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

previously prepared words placed in opaque envelopes. In all other trials the target word was chosen by random entry into a 1700 page college dictionary (selecting the first three-letter word on the page) using a Texas Instruments SR-51 random number generator. In trials 1 and 2, the viewer was given feedback after each letter. In both of these trials he failed to name the first letter, but after being told the first letter G for GUN and V for VAT, he was able to confidently and correctly name the following two letters in quick succession. In trials 3 through 12 feedback was given only after all three letters were named, to counter-measure analysis strategies.

The letters were displayed one at a time, and the viewer would give his impressions of each in turn. After each description, that letter would be removed, and the viewer would be informed that the next letter was in place. Except for trial 5, the letters were always presented in their order of occurrence in the word. (In trial 5 it had been decided in advance to display the letters in random order, to discourage end-word guessing. This turned out to be unsatisfactory, however, apparently producing confusion for the viewer, who named all three letters correctly, but had them in the wrong order. He then couldn't think of a word, and changed two of the letters.)

Of the nine 3-letter words presented in a consistent manner (3, 4, 6-12), the viewer was correct in 6 of his letter assignments (i.e., of the 27 letters presented, 6 were identified, a significant departure from chance expectation.

F. Extended Remote Viewing (ERV)

1. Background

One of the program remote viewers (518) stated that over the past few years he had on occasion experienced spontaneous extended remote

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

viewing (ERV),\* usually associated with rest or sleep periods. Subjectively, these ERV experiences appeared to be of unusual intensity and clarity; however, the situation and/or content of these experiences did not lend themselves to independent objective verification. Therefore, Remote Viewer 518 requested that some time be devoted to investigating the phenomenon, with the goal of determining whether the content of such ERV experiences was verifiable and, further, of superior quality to that obtained in the ordinary RV protocol.

## 2. Pilot Effort

An initial single-trial pilot effort in ERV was carried out during Remote Viewer 518's first stay at SRI. In this trial there was some evidence that information obtained in the ERV state was veridical. Therefore, it was decided that upon his return a formal series of trials would be undertaken.

## 3. Formal Series (Six Trials)

The formal series of trials consisted of six targeting periods of approximately three hours each. During each of these trials the remote viewer was closeted in a third-floor laboratory of the Radio Physics Laboratory in the SRI complex and asked to render drawings and describe into a tape recorder his impressions of a target object. Each session was terminated either by the monitor who indicated that the (approximate three-hour period was up, or by the remote viewer himself at a somewhat earlier time. The remote viewer was then taken to the target location for feedback.

---

\* ERV (extended remote viewing) is here defined as an exercise in remote viewing for an extended period of time, generally lasting for more than an hour. Furthermore, an effort is made to maximize the subjective sense of awareness of the target site while minimizing the subjective sense of awareness of the remote viewer's physical surroundings.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

For the first four trials the targets were chosen by the SSO of an SRI SI/SAO facility, and placed on display on a conference room table in that facility. (The SSO is not otherwise associated with the SRI psychoenergetics program.) For the first trial the remote viewer was asked to describe the facility as well as the target object; for the remaining three trials just the target object.

Before the fifth trial, it was decided by the remote viewer and monitor that the target location for the remaining two trials should be changed so as to avoid analytical overlay problems associated with target-site familiarity. The site chosen by the monitor was the roof of the Radio Physics Laboratory building, directly above the ceiling of the room in which the remote viewer was located.

a. Trial One

The target object for Trial One was a copper ewer (pitcher) placed on a dark brown wood-grained table (see Figure 7). The remote viewer sketched an object which evolved into a table-lamp base, finally topped by a lampshade.



The description of the facility rendered by the remote viewer had many matching elements, especially if one considers that the remote viewer combined the two primary rooms into one; because of this, however, the description is ambiguous and can't be taken as evidential.

b. Trial Two

The target object for Trial Two was a metal food mill with red handle shown in Figure 8. In response the remote viewer sketched a silver-grey object with a handle on it that looked first like a fireplace scoop (most correct), and then evolved into a bellows.

~~SECRET~~

**UNCLASSIFIED**



UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 7 COPPER PITCHER AND VIEWER NO. 518 ERV RESPONSE (U)

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**




FIGURE 8 FOOD MILL TARGET AND VIEWER NO. 518 ERV RESPONSE (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**

~~SECRET~~c. Trial Three

The target for Trial Three was a straw hat with curled up brim and dimpled top (Figure 9). The remote viewer's response is shown in the same figure.

d. Trial Four

Target four was a photographic tripod (Figure 10). The remote viewer's response, shown in the same figure, consisted essentially of a silver teapot-like object sitting on a tripod.

e. Trial Five

Following the first four trials, the monitor and remote viewer agreed that the target location for the remaining two trials should be elsewhere than the now-familiar SI/SAO facility. Several alternative locations were discussed, with the final decision to be made by the monitor. The monitor chose the roof of the Radio Physics Laboratory. Due to an error in timing, the remote viewer began the fifth session without having met with the monitor to be informed as to which of the discussed alternative locations was to be used. In the absence of this communication there was no overtly agreed-upon target location. Nonetheless, we observe post hoc that the remote viewer experienced an outside brightly-lit gravel-based area, and provided a response which resembled the intended target area (see Figure 11). Because of the ambiguity of target location, however, this result was not included in the package of results to be blind judged.

f. Trial Six

The target chosen for the final trial was a world globe (Figure 12). In response the remote viewer drew a sphere mounted on a stand, but did not cognize the map aspect.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED




FIGURE 9 TRIPOD TARGET AND VIEWER NO. 518 ERV RESPONSE (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED







FIGURE 10 STRAW HAT TARGET AND VIEWER NO. 518 ERV RESPONSE (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED

FIGURE 11 ANTENNA AND VIEWER NO. 518 ERV RESPONSE (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**





FIGURE 12 GLOBE TARGET AND VIEWER NO. 518 ERV RESPONSE (U)



UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**

~~SECRET~~4. Discussion

For an assessment as to the quality of remote viewing obtained in the ERV series, the results were submitted to two independent analysts for blind judging. The judging packet submitted to the analysts consisted of the remote viewer drawings, and target photographs, each in their own random order different from the order of target usage. The analysts were instructed to blind rank order, on a scale 1-5 (best to worst match), each of the five drawing packets against each of the five target photographs.

One analyst obtained three direct matches, one second-place, and one fourth place match; the other: one direct match, three second-place, and one fourth place match. The difference between the two was a pair of responses that were essentially indistinguishable with regard to a particular pair of targets (food mill and hat). The matrices were analyzed using the direct-count-of-permutations method discussed earlier. One of the two judges results reached statistical significance at the  $p = 0.05$  level.

With regard to a comparison between ERV and the ordinary RV process, the data obtained is roughly of the same quality as that of ordinary RV.\* There was therefore, no apparent advantage in committing the greater time period for the ERV process. By report of the RVer, however, the subjectively more intense ERV state was never fully achieved in this series, and therefore no definitive comparison between RV and ERV is possible at this point. We therefore recommend further effort along this line to ascertain the full potential of the ERV process.

---

\* See, e.g., the technology series in H. Puthoff and R. Targ, "A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer Over Kilometer Distances," Proc. IEEE 64, pp. 329-354 (March 1976).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~G. Coordinate Remote Viewing (CRV) with Immediate Feedback

Of special interest for operational applications is a particular form of RV known as coordinate remote viewing (CRV). CRV is a procedure whereby the RVer accesses the target location on the basis of an abstract locator such as geographical coordinates. As inexplicable as such a phenomenon might seem, we appeal simply to pragmatism in that it appears to work.

It has been shown that good results can be obtained even with the use of special arbitrarily-constructed coordinate systems;\* the CRV phenomenon thus appears to provide yet another example of "goal orientation" in psychoenergetic phenomena, rather than being particularly related to coordinate systems per se.

An orientation program for CRV has been designed at SRI, and is being applied with success with RVerS inexperienced in CRV. The details are as follows.

A target pool of more than 100 geographical sites from around the globe has been prepared and is being continually expanded. The locations are chosen to embody some particular well-defined characteristic (e.g., mountains, oceans, deserts, lakes, cities, islands, rivers). The coordinates of these locations, obtained from standard reference atlases,<sup>†</sup> are each written on one side of a 3" x 5" file card, on the other side of which is a descriptor (e.g., Mt. Hekla volcano, Iceland) along with an atlas reference. The cards are then placed in envelopes, coordinates facing the back, and randomized.

---

\* R. Targ, H. Puthoff, B. Humphrey, and C. Tart, "Investigations of Target Acquisition," Research in Parapsychology 1979, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, N.J. (In press).

<sup>†</sup> The Times Atlas of the World, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1971. People's Republic of China Atlas, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1971.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

The CRV orientation procedure is as follows.

- (1) RVer and facilitator seat themselves at opposite ends of a table in a quiet environment, the former with a supply of paper and a pen, the latter with target envelopes (contents unknown) and the reference atlases.
- (2) The CRVer is instructed that the facilitator will begin the CRV process by selecting an envelope and reading aloud the target coordinates. The CRVer is to note down on paper any immediate impressions (which he may also express aloud) and then, rather than embellishing on his first impressions, to ask for the coordinates to be read aloud again so that the original process may be repeated, etc., until a coherent picture of the site emerges.
- (3) Following these instructions, the facilitator selects an envelope at random, opens it from the rear so as to be exposed to the coordinates only, and then begins the process described above.
- (4) After one or more repetitions of the coordinates (each followed by a CRV response) leads to a recognizable target characteristic, the card is turned over by the facilitator, and the atlas consulted (if necessary) in order to give feedback. A line is drawn on the CRVer's data sheet to separate the data generated thus from further data, since up to this point the data were generated in a double-blind protocol and can be objectively evaluated later as a test of target acquisition.
- (5) Having terminated the target acquisition "test" phase, feedback can now be given and/or further data solicited. The feedback given at this point is nonnegative, ranging from "that's the target" through "near the target" to "you are at another target" (giving the CRVer the benefit of the doubt). The facilitator then has the option of terminating the viewing, asking for more detail ("there's something ten miles north that should be visible") or restarting the process when the viewer's original description did not correspond to the target site. In the latter case the facilitator can, of course, guide or cue the CRVer into a correct response, but (a) this is acceptable in the nontest part of the sequence, (b) this can be checked for by asking for detail in the surrounding region, and

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

(c) provides an opportunity to investigate whether such cueing procedures can be useful in operationally-oriented applications (e.g., guiding the CRVer onto the target site with cues "a," "b," ... "f," and then asking for "g").

RVer 518 was exposed to this protocol, a few targets per session, over a several-day period, resulting in a data pool of 26 CRV target viewings. They were: Salt Lake Desert, Utah; Lake Erie; Chicago; Mono Lake; Aruba Island; Lake Okeechobee; Yount's Peak, Wyoming; Pitcairn Island; Pike's Peak; Los Angeles; Atlantic Ocean; Rio de Janeiro; Kansas plains, St. Peter and Paul Islands; Randall Dam, South Dakota; Lake Titicaca; Cape May; Niagara Falls; Munich; Amazon River; Midwestern plains; Venezuelan Peninsula; Sierra Blanca Mountain; Oregon Desert; Panama Canal; Puerto Rico.

Following the first pilot session of five, in which essentially immediate feedback was given, the remaining twenty-one were carried out with delayed feedback and thus provided material which could be assessed objectively. Categorizing the targets into five groups (mountains, flats, water, cities, islands/peninsulas, the target/response matrix (before feedback) is as shown in Table 3. The probability of such an alignment occurring by chance alone can be calculated by the direct-count-of-permutations method discussed earlier and leads to  $p = 0.0083$ . The distribution of responses is therefore statistically significant. Furthermore, beyond simple statistics, certain individual responses were exceptionally accurate during the acquisition "test" phase, e.g., a good drawing of an island (the target was Puerto Rico) and indication that coordinates given were at the southeast shoreline (correct).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF TARGET/RESPONSE MATCHINGS

| Targets            | Transcripts |       |       |        |                        |
|--------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------------|
|                    | Mountains   | Flats | Water | Cities | Islands/<br>Peninsulas |
| Mountains          | 3           | 0     | 0     | 0      | 0                      |
| Flats              | 0           | 1     | 1     | 1      | 0                      |
| Water              | 0           | 0     | 6     | 0      | 0                      |
| Cities             | 0           | 0     | 0     | 2      | 1                      |
| Islands/Peninsulas | 1           | 0     | 0     | 0      | 5                      |

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

## IV CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The principle observations deriving from our experience thus far with client remote viewers is that, first, there is considerable evidence for successful remote viewing, there is less variability in overall performance among the viewers as a group, than there is from trial to trial with a given viewer. These observations are exemplified by viewer 518. Some of the highest quality remote viewing we have seen came from the series with Viewer 518 describing remote slides; whereas, this particular viewer was the least successful, four weeks earlier, in a series involving the description of remote geographical locations.

Our findings that a viewer may be able to describe and identify alphabet letters is a most encouraging development. Previously we have obtained only very nonanalytic descriptions of letters, with the viewer failing when he was asked to identify the letter. We consider this new result deserving of further work, and we plan to pursue it during the remaining months of this program. Extension of the RV process to include reading would constitute a significant breakthrough for operational applications.

The data indicating that a viewer can describe an individual slide as it is shown on a screen answers an important question; namely, whether the viewer is able to focus his attention on a particular slide of interest, or whether his viewing would become generalized to the actual location associated with the slide. This observed degree of specificity indicates that contamination of specific targets may not be as great a problem as one might hypothesize.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Further, in the trials with extended remote viewing (ERV), it appears that the viewer was able to identify significant elements of a hidden object in each of the trials. These trials were carried out under conditions of tight security, and the results indicate a level of reliability that suggests that the more leisurely pace of these trials might be beneficial to a viewer in his efforts to avoid premature analysis or labeling, and to rid his mind of material from the day's activities which might otherwise overlay his perceptions of the target. Further work is required, however, before a definitive comparison of RV and ERV can be made.

The procedures developed for yielding success on coordinate remote viewing (CRV) also appear to be fruitful, and will be employed with the remaining client personnel during their second orientation period at SRI.

In the coming months we will complete the judging of all trials and work with the remaining four viewers whom we expect for two-week periods of work at SRI.

With regard to further work, it appears extremely desirable to establish and determine some measures, physiological and/or psychological, to determine when a viewer is providing accurate as opposed to inaccurate data.

One approach involves training the viewer to develop the ability to discriminate, himself; that is, to label each of his data bits as correct, analytical overlay, and so forth. As this report goes to press, we have evidence that a procedure we have developed to do this is producing success in this area.

As a complementary approach, several reports in the literature during the past decade indicate that galvanic skin response (GSR), electromyograph (EMG), and measurements of blood volume with a plethysmograph may

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

serve as indicative and noninvasive measures of so-called psi-conductive states, and therefore could potentially be used to "gate" the information content of RV sessions. To this list we would add voice stress analysis techniques as a possibility. We therefore suggest that these approaches be given some consideration as candidates for future investigation.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

NOT RELEASABLE TO  
FOREIGN NATIONALS