UNCLASSIFIED

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS ASSIGNED TO SUBJECT RESPONSE PACKETS
ASSOCIATED WITH EACH TARGET

Matrix

Transcript Letter	Can Number				
	3	4	7	8	9
A	(1)	5	4	4	5
B	5	4	3	3	(1)
C	3	3	(1)	1	2
D	4	(1)	5	5	4
E	2	2	2	(2)	3

Analysis

Experiment	Can	Target	Rank of Assoc. Packet
1	4	Spool and pin	1
2	7	Leaf	1
3	3	Key ring	1
4	8	Sand	2
5	9	Quill	1
Total sum of ranks			6
			$p < 0.005$

UNCLASSIFIED

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**

"The five film cans with randomly numbered tops which
contain objects constituted targets in five successive 'remote
viewing' experiments. The subject's five response packets
containing tape transcripts and associated drawings, one
packet for each experiment, are to be matched to the film can
contents. The response packets are unnumbered and presented
in random order, so the matching is of the blind type; that is,
no indication is being given as to which packet was generated
in response to which target.

In carrying out the matching process, the judge must
realize that the subject is instructed simply to give descrip-
tive impressions as to the characteristics of a target, as
opposed to trying to interpret or identify or name the target.
This is based on the known fact that in psychoenergetic
functioning, as in other subliminal perception processes, first
impressions as to form, color and texture tend to be correct,
but further efforts to analyze and interpret tend to lead to
incorrect "analytical overlay." As an aid in judging with
regard to this particular concept, we ask that as part of the
judging exercise the judge should, before reading any subject
transcript, examine all the targets, and write down for his
own use a list of target descriptors (rather than names) for
each item.

The details of the judging procedure, which involve
filling in the accompanying matrix (see Table 1), are as
follows. Select the lowest numbered can (Can No. 3) and
examine its contents. Then read through the packets with the
goal of determining best to worst description of this par-
ticular target. When the rank ordering is complete for this
target, enter the rank order numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, best to
worst match, beside the appropriate transcript letter in the
first column. Then examine the contents of Can No. 4, again
ranking the packets best to worst match, and likewise enter
the rank order numbers, 1-5, best to worst match, beside the
appropriate transcript letter in the second column, and so on.
The rank ordering for each target is to be done independently
of the previous rank orderings, so that, for example, a given
packet may be chosen first place match for more than one target
if that provides the best ordering of descriptions. When the
task is complete, the entire matrix should be filled in, at
which time the packets are to be returned."

The objects in the first group of five consisted
respectively of: a spool of thread with pin; a leaf; a small leather-
belt key ring with the letter "L" attached; sand; and a black and white
quill (without feathers). The subject responses, briefly, were,
respectively, a spool and pin, a rolled up something (spring?), a small
leather belt with letter "L" or "F" attached, a beige-colored cylinder
with rough edges, and a black and white pointed piece of plastic-like
organic material. The judge's blind rank-order assessment, shown in
Table 1, resulted in four 1st place and one 2nd place assignments, a

4