

CONFIDENTIAL**MASTER****FILE COPY**

31 October 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Review of Stanford Research Institute (SRI)
Project, Menlo Park, California 14-16 October 1974

1. [REDACTED] ORD/LS and myself reviewed the par-anormal research activities at SRI with the two principal investigators, Dr. H. Puthoff and Mr. R. Targ. During the visit three remote viewing experiments were completed with mixed results. Plans for another visit to SRI with intention of completing a series of experiments with agency personnel in control of target selection were finalized for 4-5 November.

2. It is expected that [REDACTED] will review the progress on the basic research in detail in a separate memorandum. A brief summary follows. The medical and psychological tests for the six subjects are more than one half completed with the remainder scheduled to be completed in 30-60 days. Raw data has been included in progress reports #3 and #4 with more to follow. No significant comparisons and characteristics have yet been noted. Mid-test random neurological data is partially complete. Delays have been encountered because the SRI division originally taking data proved slow and did not have the desired analogue read out. Four physiological functions are now being monitored on in-house equipment. The data on the psychokinetic experiments has been completed. Remote Magnetometer interaction data was taken for subjects 1, 2 and 6. S-1 got statistically positive results, null results for others. The interaction with laser beam experiment has produced positive results one standard deviation above change. In summary, the P.K. experiments are indicative of psychokinetic phenomena only in a modest statistical sense. A review of the screening of the subjects by measuring their performance at three tasks, remote viewing, ESP teaching machine and remote viewing of line drawings indicated little multiplicity of talents among subjects. About half of these screening tests are completed.

3. Remote viewing experiments have continued to maintain first priority attention for the applied research (OTS fraction) of the project. A series of local remote viewing experiments

CONFIDENTIAL

SG1A

SG1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

have now been performed at my request to assess the ability to obtain information within a short distance of the subject (a few feet to a few miles). Claims of good results prompted a review of this data and a request for a demonstration. These results are described below.

4. To avoid redundancy, "successful" remote viewing experiments are summarized in progress report #4 (attached) pp. 1-24 and will not be reviewed in detail here. The purpose of these experiments was to remotely describe objects several rooms or buildings away. The complete raw data for several of these experiments was reviewed while at SRI. The original tape recordings of two of the technology series viewing experiments were reviewed and the targets visited. Copies and photographs of the tapes and targets were made. These supported the claim of best results yet obtained. Unambiguous identification of the target would be unlikely from the data without a prior knowledge of the target but the remotely obtained description has many correspondence with the actual target. Many more correspondences than expected by chance in my judgment. These materials are available for inspection and review. Assuming the integrity of the experimenters and their procedures remain intact, their data is a strong indicator of an, as yet, unexplained information channel.

5. To test the reproducibility of these remote viewing experiments, the investigators were asked to prepare a demonstration of the close range remote viewing. The request was made one week before the visit. The investigators were not able to obtain the services of the "best" subject (H.H.) during this visit but agreed to have her available 4-5 November for a series of experiments under our control. The SRI investigators suggested we attempt the experiment with a more readily available subject (D.E.) who had not been used for these short range remote viewing experiments but had previously performed a successful remote viewing experiment and was also one of the project test subjects. Descriptions of the experiments follows:

6. Remote viewing experiment #1 by D.E.

a. The first demonstration was attempted the afternoon of 16 October. The experimenters included D.E., an SRI analyst and Mr. R. Targ, one of the project principal investigators. These two remained at SRI. Dr. H. Puthoff, the other project principal investigator, Ms. "P.C.", another SRI employee and test subject, ORD/LS and myself were to choose and visit the place to be remotely viewed. At a prearranged time D.E. would describe his impressions of the chosen target. Targ would record the entire description as it was given. Targ was not aware of the target selection

SG1A

SG1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

before we returned. On the way I suggested a site, the Palo Alto City tennis courts. Having played at these courts I felt they were distinctive and simple so we could easily evaluate the description. We went to the courts and parked the car along the fence which surrounds them. We walked towards the end of the courts where bleachers sit and watched the play for the agreed upon length of time. Afterwards we walked to the other end of the court to view the two swimming pools nearby and returned to SRI.

b. Upon arriving back at SRI and being introduced to D.E. the results were casually evaluated. Considerable conversation was recorded and five or six sketches made. The discussion centered on the idea we were in an indoor environment. Strong impressions of a certain children's museum southwest of SRI ran throughout. The sketches showed several different scenes. Several comments are as follows. We were, as D.E. predicted, southwest of SRI. However, the children's museum named was nearby across the city park (one hundred yards away) but we were never in it. Correctly, the first sketches showed us walking across a gravel path towards an embankment or wall (it was a fence) and gives the correct orientation of our circumnavigation of the wall. Another sketch, described as Puthoff and P.C. separated by a waist-high railing could easily be two people separated by a tennis net. Another sketch appears to have little resemblance to anything encountered and is probably an accurate rendition of the inside of the children's museum. A final sketch of a "mechanical" object "interacted with" appears to be a pitch fork or tennis racket like object held in one hand by a person. A round object is suspended in space in front of the "mechanical object." D.E. could not identify this object so he put a question mark on it. When asked, D.E. said he had no impression of violent physical activity or running.

7. A second experiment was performed with [redacted] as the viewer. Mr. Targ and myself left. [redacted] and Dr. Puthoff were situated in a work area. Mr. Targ offered a list of targets to choose from. I rejected them and asked for a second list. I agreed on a visit to the Xerox copier suggested in the second list. We proceeded there and at the appropriate time began to make copies of handy objects which included pocket change, a wrist watch, etc. After 10 minutes,

SG1A
SG1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

the experiment was terminated and results immediately evaluated. The discussion and sketch appear unrelated to the visit with the possible exception of concentration on a scene including a brightly lit box or window.

8. The third experiment used D.E. as the viewer again. Complications arose in the implementation of this experiment. D.E. said he had impressions of the results already prepared before the experiment. He further said he submitted his precognitive results to Puthoff's secretary. Since the secretary had been called to a staff meeting, it was decided to have [redacted] sit in the office to varyify the precognitive results were not altered. Then Mr. Targ and myself left to choose a target. I suggested we repeat the Xerox experiment. Repeating an experiment has never been part of the SRI protocol. This was agreed to an done. After about eight minutes of copying we exhausted things to copy. I suggested we terminate the experiment. Mr. Targ said that was not a good idea because it would inject a breach of faith between ourselves and the experimenter. We discussed this point for several minutes then left the area after the prescribed period of time. D.E. provided conversion and sketches again which contained some elements that could be associated with the visit. Most elements, however, were ambiguous at best. The most interesting result occurred about eight minutes into the experiment when D.E. said he had the strong impression we were terminating the experiment and leaving the area. Dr. Puthoff attempted to keep D.E. describing his impressions, since Dr. Puthoff could not believe the experiment would be terminated before the agreed upon time. The subsequent description by D.E. is not of value. All the above data will be discussed in more detail in the progress reports.

9. The above descriptions are not recorded as proof of paranormal abilities. Rather they are recorded to document the results of our first attempt to demonstrate the remote viewing ability with the available personnel under more fluid conditions and with agency personnel in control of target selection. It is felt that the performance of the subjects under controlled laboratory conditions is an important characteristic but the performance under conditions more closely analogous to field operations is also important.

10. During our visit the SRI paranormal paper was published in "Nature", a prestigious British journal. Puthoff was besieged by many phone calls and it is clear that much attention will be given to the paranormal research activities at SRI. On the short term, it will be important to avoid allowing this attention to effect the performance. A long range assessment

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SG1A

is more positive. The scrutiny and criticism of the total scientific community will be applied to the SRI results. This should result in attempts to replicate the results at other laboratories and attempts to understand the phenomenon by others. This should stimulate and hasten the understanding of the phenomenon at the price of losing exclusive agency control of any potential applications.

11. It is apparent that SRI has more data than can possibly be analyzed and reported during the remaining three months of the contract. It will be the responsibility of myself and to tightly control the generation of new data and assure the highest priority data be analyzed and reported.

12. Tentative arrangement for a full one day project review in Washington were discussed. This review would possibly include the opinions of Dr. J. Ball, a theoretical physicist, currently evaluating theoretical explanations of paranormal abilities. The first or second week in December appears to be an appropriate time.



OTS/CB