

16 December 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Visit to Stanford Research Institute, 10-11 December 1974

1. While at SRI, we conducted a series of experiments over a period of two days with interesting results. The first day, Tuesday afternoon, was devoted to another outdoor remote viewing experiment. Hal and his secretary, Jan, drove to the target while I remained in the Lab with Russ. The experiment was delayed fifteen minutes because of problems in acquiring the traveling orders from Bart's safe. During this experiment, the images were not as clear or distinct as in the previous one, and I was forced to "work" harder to extract meaningful data.

2. Much of the key data that I recorded and sketched was correct and the gestalt elements were all present. I correctly located Hal and Jan as being by water, standing on a stony surface. I had him pointing at a winged creature which I incorrectly identified as a seagull (it was a winged insect in the water). The black and white structure to the left of the pool turned out to be a lamp post with a glass globe rather than the light-house-like structure I tried to describe (my drawing is a good likeness to the structure). Again toward the end of the fifteen minute experiment, the results became less accurate. I tried to describe a wooden bridge off to the right that did not exist but there were several wooden balconies on a two-story apartment house that resembled what I called a wooden bridge. Also my drawing of the "cement stantions and cables" resembled the wooden and metal fence surrounding the pool. I did, however, mention the presence of railroad tracks that I could not precisely place. This presented a good time correlation with the passage of a S.P. train on its track about two blocks away; the train caught Jan's attention and Hal explained to her where the tracks were.

3. All in all I feel this was a good correlation experiment although by no means as outstanding as the first experiment. Furthermore, the range to this site was over twelve miles and there were no obvious sources of strong A.C. fields. These facts plus the state-of-agitation of Hal due to the delay in arriving at the target all contribute to the less outstanding results. However, I am getting better at filtering out noise in these experiments.

SG1A

E2 IMPDET CL BY

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>

4. Since the results were encouraging, I agreed to return Wednesday after visiting another contractor. We began with a full protocol technology series experiment with only Hal going to the target site while Russ remained in the Lab with me. I correctly identified the target as being a computer terminal but was unable to specify whether it was a hand copy or CRT terminal (two CRT and one hand copy terminals were in the room). I placed it correctly in the room and identified the PDP-8 computer computer as "at least three 6-foot relay racks of equipment with interconnecting coax cables" - there were five racks! I incorrectly tried to place a yellow gieger counter on a table in the target room, but the counter I described was sitting on a shelf just outside the door of the Lab I was in. I correctly stated in reply to a question by Russ that Hal was talking to the computer operator about what the operator was doing rather than about the experiment Hal was conducting. Again the results of this experiment were very good so we planned to do an additional one after lunch. We also agreed not to use targets that I was familiar with as a result of the briefings.

5. After lunch we conducted a blind remote viewing experiment in which Hal asked Earle Jones to place an object in Bart's conference room. I remained alone in the Lab and attempted to verbally describe the object to a tape recorder. My initial image was of a "heavy grey metal casting." I immediately stated that "if we had not agreed not to use objects that I knew had been used before, I would say that it was the three hole punch again." I continued for about five minutes trying to describe this "grey metal casting" with "engraved or embossed markings" continually stating if it isn't the three hole punch then I can't identify the object. Finally, I gave up after sketching the object and Hal and I went to the conference room to see the object - it was a three hole punch! Earle had chosen it at random and was not aware that it had been used before! I am particularly happy about this experiment and its results.

6. We then ran two more completely unsuccessful experiments in which objects were placed in the conference room by Earle and a person unknown to me. The first object, a pocket watch about two inches in diameter was missed completely. Instead I drew a green IBM typewriter and a tall philodendron-type plant in a dark blue pot. Both of these objects were in the office outside the conference room. Interestingly in this experiment I saw the two objects I described individually depending on the angle from which I tried to observe the table. Looking down I saw the typewriter; looking sideways I saw the plant. In the next experiment, Earle placed a wooden carving of a bird on the table. I incorrectly identified it as a blue rough surfaced notebook with a red sunburst emblem on its cover. Earle had had such a notebook and emblem in the conference room for several hours that day! Hal has an explanation for this smearing in time of the data.

7. Following these two unsuccessful experiments, Hal suggested that I try to separate six S.W. message envelopes from six blank envelopes. While he prepared the experiment by putting the envelopes into brown envelopes, I played with the teaching machine. Out of five runs of 25 trials my worst score was six and my best was twelve.

8. In selecting the SW message envelopes I scored exactly 50%. Of the six envelopes I had selected as SW messages, the last three were while likewise, three of the six that I had selected as blanks were SWs. I then tried to draw the geometric figures that were in the three SW envelopes that I had correctly selected. The match of the drawings is easily rationalized but I don't know how good they are. The results are sketched below:



9. After this last experiment, we sat and talked for awhile but conducted no additional experiments. To be honest, I felt drained and quite tired but I am well satisfied with the pattern of the experiments. There are no "near hits"; either the results are overwhelmingly positive with good accuracy, or, as in the two unsuccessful cases, they bear no resemblance what so ever to the object or scene of the experiment.

10. To date then I have conducted two outdoor remote viewing experiments with good to excellent results, one technology series with good results, and three blind remote viewing experiments, one with excellent results and two in the same room with zero results.

[Redacted]  
OTS/APB

SG1A

## Distribution:

Original - Circulate  
 1 - OTS/CB [Redacted]  
 1 - OTS/APB/Chrono  
 1 - OTS/APB/Contractor File

SG1A