Subject: Evaluation and Critique of SRI project "Geophyscial Effects Study (U)

1. (U) Project goals which were met: The Geophysical Effects Study, completed in December, 1984, accomplished the following tasked goals:

A. An analysis was performed to determine whether correlations exist between RV performance in historical data (data from SRI's previous experiments) and factors in the ambient geophysical environment. Data from previous controlled RV studies were analyzed against:

1) Geomagnetic indices.

2) Solar electromagnetic emissions.

3) Sunspot number.

4) Ionospheric conditions.

5) Solar magnetic field.

B. A program of real-time ELF monitoring was implemented. One station was set up in a high-ELF environment (at SRI) and another at a lower-ELF environment (at TRI). Comparisons were made to detect common changes which might correlate to changes in demonstrated RV performance.

2. (U) Project goals which were not met:

A. Although the bibliography shows that a survey of existing literature on the subject was made, no summary of the findings was provided in either the interim or final reports.

B. Data from previous controlled experiments were not analyzed against:

1) Weather (temperature, relative humidity, barometric pressure, etc.).

2) Lunar cycles.

These two features were listed as tasked comparisions to be made, but the Statement of Work said only that they would be made "when possible". The affects of these two very real sets of factors on RV performance should not have been left out, since their biological effects have been shown to be large. It does not seem that an accounting of the smaller variations on biological performance can be taken into account without consideration of their larger effects. No statement was made in the report as to why these larger influences were not considered.

C. No "rough index" of expected RV performance was provided, using given prevailing geophyscial factors. In fact, no study

of "given prevailing geophysical factors" dealing with the Ft. Meade area, where we conduct our operations, was ever made.

3. (U) Project goals which were not properly addressed by the tasking:

A. Whether or not the findings are applicable to our situation is questionable. The main reasons for this are incorporated into the original tasking. The Statement of Work allowed SRI and TRI to conduct a purely "academic" study, rather than a study which would be pertainent to our situation. As a result, we have a final product which, although very specialized, is little more than another textbook on the subject of remote viewing. Examples of how this report vary from our specific needs are:

1) Even though ELF measurements were carried out both at SRI and TRI, (places of high and low ELF radiation), the RV sessions were only carried out at SRI, where the ELF radiation is highest (and where transient ELF effects would cause the lowest percentage of change). No attempt was made to find out whether RV results would have been consistantly different when carried out at the two locations; one with consistantly high, and the other with consistantly low ELF environments. Such an experiment would have provided us with the ability to select the best locale for our work. Whether or not solar activity affects us on a monthly or yearly basis is not nearly as important as whether the location of our worksite, in proximity to manmade constant-ELF emitters would affect us on a consistant, day-to-day basis. This question was not answered, or even addressed by the study.

2) The overall results of ELF effects were, naturally, statistical averages. The report states that many individuals did not conform to, or even showed tendancies to be in opposition to the averages. Since the SRI contract dealt only with the RV performances of their core personnel and "off the street" volunteers, the report does not provide us with any information which can be used to predict the individual reactions of our personnel to our ELF enviroment. Had the SRI project worked with our personnel, we would have gained a wealth of information, dealing strictly with our personnel and aimed at our operational goals. In this respect, the original tasking for the project should have been more stringent.

4. Conclusion: Because of the above factors, the study done by SRI and TRI is shown to only answer questions about generalized trends, dealing with the effects of solar-generated ELF on RV personnel located in the constantly high ELF environment of the San Francisco Bay area. It does not, however, answer specific questions about the effects of ELF on each of our RV personnel, in our working

environment. In fact, the ELF environment in the Ft. Meade area, where we work, is not even considered in the report. In short, the findings of the report have little to do with our operations, and do not effectively answer the questions we were asking when the project began.

5. Recommendations for subsequent actions: In view of the findings of the SRI study, certain actions on our part are now appropriate for our optimum functioning:

A. Since a relationship has been established between sunspot cycles and RV performance, we should now access open source information about sunspot cycles, to predict optimum operational times.

B. Since individual performance has been shown to vary, in spite of ELF intensity variations, we should now conduct a study of our personnel to determine who will have optimum performance times, and when.

C. Since the tasking did not require the ambient environment of our worksite to be established, it should now be done, and compared to the findings of the SRI study.

D. Continuing data bases should be kept on our RV performance and our ELF environment. Now that the SRI study has shown the most efficient method of analysis for such data, we should continue it on our own, for prediction of optimum operational conditions.

6. Recommendations for future contractual studies: Future contracts for studies related to our field of operations should, without fail, contain the following requirements:

A. Studies done for us concerning RV personnel should use our personnel. This is the only way in which the individual tendencies of our personnel, and the resulting effects on our operational capabilities can be measured, studied, and predicted.

B. Studies done for us concerning environmental aspects should include our environment. This is the only way we will be able to predict the effects our present environment will have on us, and is the only way we can predict what changes will occur with any projected change in environment.

C. Any studies done for us concerning operational aspects of remote viewing, either for intelligence or counterintelligence purposes should be conducted in our operational environment. This is the only way a planned study can meet the unpredictable obstacles and tasks provided by our real-time work environment. A removed study will produce a textbook for us to read. An involved, hands-on study will produce an operating manual for us to use in our daily operations.