

No original at  
Star Gate site

Final Report-  
Covering the Period 1 October 1987 to 30 September 1988

December 1988

THE EFFECTS OF HYPNOSIS ON REMOTE VIEWING  
QUALITY (U)

TAB J

SRI International



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>

ABSTRACT (U)

[REDACTED] Two remote viewers participated in an experiment to determine whether the overall quality of remote viewing (RV) would be enhanced by a hypnotic trance. Each viewer participated in 16 RV sessions while in trance. No significant evidence of psychoenergetic functioning was obtained, and comparisons with previous work by the same viewers were therefore rendered moot. Implications of these results for further research are discussed.

III RESULTS (U)

A. (U) Hypnotizability scales

(U) Our experienced viewer (No. 372) produced a score of 10 on the 12-point hypnotizability scales, a 92 centile equivalent. Though he was unable to inhibit hand movement on suggestion, failed to respond to a hallucinated voice item, and experienced conflict during value and meaning alterations, he produced a deep state of relaxation, became absorbed in imagery processes, was able to regress, performed posthypnotic suggestions, and showed amnesia and hypermnesia, trance logic, cognitive and role distortion. Imaginal ability was highly rated with the ability to create, manipulate, and experience imagery in all sensory fields especially when the image was positive and productive.

(U) The novice viewer (No. 137) scored a 7 on the hypnotizability scales, a 71 centile equivalent. She produced a deep state of relaxation, showed ability to regress and to be absorbed in imagery, performed posthypnotic suggestions, and showed amnesia. She showed difficulty altering sensory phenomena, did not demonstrate hypermnesia, trance logic, or the ability for cognitive and role distortion. Again, for this viewer imaginal ability was highly rated with the ability to create, manipulate, and experience imagery in all sensory fields.

B. (U) RV results

The results of the independent judge's rank order for each RV are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

(U) RANK BY SESSION NUMBER FOR 16 TRIALS

Session No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Viewer 372	2	1	1	4	5	3	2	3	2	4	5	2	2	4	5	5
Viewer 137	3	5	3	2	2	4	1	2	5	4	5	4	4	2	5	5

[REDACTED] The sum of ranks for Viewer No. 372 is 50, with an associated p-value of 0.67. For Viewer No. 137, the sum is 56, with a p-value of 0.93. Since neither of these p-values is significant, it appears that there has been no information transfer in this experiment. Comparisons with previous work by these viewer's would be superfluous, since there is no significant evidence of RV.

#### IV DISCUSSION (U)

[REDACTED] RV has been demonstrated to be a weak phenomenon such that success on any given study cannot be expected 100 percent of the time. The following discussion focuses on three other possibilities for failure to achieve positive results in this study.

[REDACTED] The first possibility is that the hypnotic trance was disruptive to the usual RV processes. Since each of the viewers had participated in well over 100 previous RV trials, their particular methods of producing an RV response were relatively habituated. The viewers received no particular training on how to perform under trance, how the RV experience would differ while in trance, or extensive practice with hypnosis RV sessions. It seems reasonable to conclude that the addition of a training period prior to the taking of experimental data may have produced more positive results.

[REDACTED] Conversely it may be that the demands of the RV production process are such that the trance state is not at all conducive to producing high-quality RV. If this is so, then a decrease in performance over time might be expected as the viewers become accomplished at trance induction and deepening. Both viewers showed a tendency in the direction of decreasing performance as the study progressed ( $r = 0.510$  with 15 df for viewer # 372,  $r = 0.348$  with 15 df for viewer # 137). In the pilot work mentioned above the viewer produced his responses while in the waking state using a stimulus word that served as a post-hypnotic suggestion. Further experimentation may show this to be the more efficient protocol, since it dovetails nicely with our standard stimulus-response method of conducting an RV session.

[REDACTED] A second possibility is that the viewers chosen for this study were not the optimal individuals for this work. While ranking relatively high on the scale of hypnotizability, these particular viewers were not hypnotic virtuosos. Demonstration of an effect using hypnosis may require the most highly susceptible subjects, corresponding to a score of 12 on the *Stanford Hypnotizability Scales*.

[REDACTED] A third potential source of interference in the hypnosis task could have been what is known in the parapsychology literature<sup>7</sup> as "displacement." In this instance the term refers to the inability of the viewer to distinguish accurately between elements of the target and elements of its decoys in the target packet. The division of the target pool into 20 packets of five was done arbitrarily for simplicity of judging in another experiment. In prior years a given target

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was randomized with decoys from orthogonal target clusters for judging purposes *after* the RV session was concluded instead of before the session. Displacement into the other targets in the packet may have occurred, such that the viewer was confused about exactly what constituted the target. To check this possibility, a new set of decoys for each target was randomly chosen from orthogonal target clusters and a second judging was performed by a different judge. The second judging produced marked variability in the ranks assigned and a decline in the sum-of-ranks, with a p-value for the difference in means between the two judgments of 0.08. While this result does not achieve significance at the usual 0.05 level and may be due to judging differences, it could also suggest displacement effects.

[REDACTED] In order to address these issues, future experiments should be designed to eliminate these potential difficulties. Specifically, an attempt seems warranted to replicate the results of the successful pilot work mentioned above, where hypnosis was used as a memory aid and targets were randomized with decoys after the viewing.