

CRV EVALUATION SHEET

(September 1981)

Name Gary O. Langford
Date 21 September 1981

Responses to the following questions are necessary if we are to begin the evaluation of the CRV methodology currently in testing. The questions are an attempt to cover all aspects of the CRV methodology to date, but if you wish to provide added commentary, please do so. Please read through this questionnaire and respond to the items by circling the appropriate evaluative word, making additional comments if you wish. If you do not wish to respond to this questionnaire or any part of it, it will be valuable to know why; in such case please attach a write-up.

General

1. Did the training monitor provide sufficient lectures and orientation in advance of each beginning of practical exercises so that the specific features to be worked with could be grasped?

Yes Frequently Sometimes Infrequently No

2. Did you ever begin any practical exercises without sufficient understanding of the specific topics to be worked with?

Yes Frequently Sometimes Infrequently No

3. Aside from personal difficulties, was the working time and material support sufficient to provide general comfort for:

Orientation lectures? Yes Usually Sometimes No

Practical exercises? Yes Usually Sometimes No

4. Were schedules provided for study, lecture and practical exercises enough in advance of the work to be undertaken so as to create for you a general sense of predictability?

Yes Usually Sometimes No Never

5. Are the overall conditions at SRI conducive to general study and work in general ESP?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

Waiting 6 months for a paycheck was not helpful.

6. Are the overall conditions at SRI conducive to continuing study and work with the CRV methodologies?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

Let's hope that the funding has been taken care of by now.

Stage One

7. Were you provided sufficient descriptions, lectures and orientation relevant to stage one in advance of practical exercises so as to enable you to grasp the novel fundamentals involved?

Yes Usually Only Sometimes No Never

8. Did you at any time begin practical exercises on any stage one phenomena without understanding what these phenomena were described as?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

9. The prime stage one phenomenon is hypothesized to be "ideograms." Were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered so as to enable you to conceive the nature of ideograms in advance of practical exercises?

Yes No

10. During practical exercises did you encounter ideograms?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

As before

11. If you encountered ideograms, can you give a percentage as to their occurrence, within the framework of the training designed to accommodate them?

100% 75% 50% 25% No

12. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find ideograms easy to produce?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

13. As a result of tutoring ^{and practice} were you able to gain increased command concerning the production of ideograms?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

14. Do you feel that ideograms are relevant to so-called "signals"?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

ABSOLUTELY!

15. Concerning ideograms, do you feel that other individuals, given the opportunity of lectures, orientation and practical exercises similar to yours, can learn to identify, produce, and become competent in attempting to deal with them?

Yes Probably Improbably No

16. Are ideograms easy to produce?

Yes Usually Sometimes Never

17. Is the appearance of ideograms predictable, given the stimulus the coordinate represents?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

18. With reference to types of ideograms, were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered to enable you to identify them?

Yes No

for the range of sites we used.

19. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find the different types of ideograms easy to recognize and deal with?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

20. Did tutoring in these different types of ideograms increase your proficiency in recognizing them?

Yes No

21. Do you feel that ideograms are an important function in attempting to deal with aspects of psychic perceptions of distant sites?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

22. To the best of your knowledge, are you aware of any other psychical research group that has attempted to discover ideograms and work with them in the manner designed within the CRV training effort?

Yes No

23. If your answer to question 22 is "yes," please cite references.

My own work used "ideograms"
from 1974. SRI Report 7-4375
Final Report July 1977

Stage Two

24. The prime stage two phenomenon is hypothesized to be "sensations" perceived by psychical awareness. Were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered so as to enable you to conceive the nature of stage twos in advance of practical exercises?

Yes No

25. During practical exercises did you encounter stage twos?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

26. If you encountered stage twos, can you give a percentage as to their occurrence, within the framework of the training designed to accommodate them?

100% 75% 50% 25% No

27. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find stage twos easy to produce?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

28. As a result of tutoring ^{and practice} were you able to gain increased command concerning the production of stage twos?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

29. Do you feel that stage twos are relevant to so-called "signals"?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

ABSOLUTELY!

30. Concerning stage twos, do you feel that other individuals, given the opportunity of lectures, orientation and practical exercises similar to yours, can learn to identify, produce, and become competent in attempting to deal with them?

Yes Probably Improbably No

31. Are stage twos easy to produce?

Yes Usually Sometimes Never

32. Is the appearance of stage twos predictable, given the stimulus the coordinate represents?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

33. With reference to types of stage twos, were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered to enable you to identify them?

Yes No

34. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find the different types of stage twos easy to recognize and deal with?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

35. Did tutoring in these different types of stage twos increase your proficiency in recognizing them?

Yes No

Practice, also!

36. Do you feel that stage twos are an important function in attempting to deal with aspects of psychic perceptions of distant sites?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

37. To the best of your knowledge, are you aware of any other psychological research group that has attempted to discover stage twos and work with them in the manner designed within the CRV training effort?

Yes No

38. If your answer to question 37 is "yes," please cite references.

please see answer to 23

Aesthetic Impact

39. Aesthetic impact is hypothesized in the CRV training procedure to be a determining factor in allowing the viewer to acquire expanded and in-depth contact with the desired site: Were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered so as to enable you to conceive of the nature of aesthetic impact in advance of practical exercises?

Yes No

40. During practical exercises did you encounter aesthetic impact?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

41. If you encountered aesthetic impact, can you give a percentage as to its occurrence, within the framework of the training designed to accommodate it?

100% 75% 50% 25% No

42. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find aesthetic impact easy to produce?
 Yes Usually Sometimes No
43. As a result of tutoring ^{and practice} were you able to gain increased command concerning the production of aesthetic impact?
 Yes Usually Sometimes No
44. Do you feel that aesthetic impact is relevant to so-called "signals"?
 Yes Usually Sometimes No
45. Concerning aesthetic impact, do you feel that other individuals, given the opportunity of lectures, orientation and practical exercises similar to yours, can learn to identify, produce, and become competent in attempting to deal with them?
 Yes Probably Improbably No
46. Are aesthetic impacts easy to produce?
 Yes Usually Sometimes Never *now.*
47. Is the appearance of aesthetic impact predictable, given the stimulus the coordinates represents?
 Yes Usually Sometimes No *indirectly. IT is more a function of stage two.*
48. With reference to types of aesthetic impact, were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered to enable you to identify them?
 Yes No
49. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find the different types of aesthetic impact easy to recognize and deal with?
 Yes Usually Sometimes No
50. Did tutoring ^{and practice} in these different types of aesthetic impact increase your proficiency in recognizing them?
 Yes No
51. Do you feel that aesthetic impact are an important function in attempting to deal with aspects of psychic perceptions of distant sites?
 Yes Usually Sometimes No

52. To the best of your knowledge, are you aware of any other psychological research group that has attempted to discover aesthetic impacts and work with them in the manner designed within the CRV training effort?

Yes No

53. If your answer to question 52 is "yes," please cite references.

Analytical Overlays

54. Analytical overlays are hypothesized in the CRV training procedures to be determining factors that degrade correct perception and analysis of the content of signals. Were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered so as to enable you to conceive of the nature of analytical overlays, as so far discovered, in advance of practical exercises?

Yes No

55. During practical exercises did you encounter analytical overlays?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

56. If you encountered analytical overlays, can you give a percentage as to their occurrence, within the framework of the training designed to accommodate them?

100% 75% 50% 25% No

beginning of training

close to None in last few w

57. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find analytical overlays easy to produce?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

58. As a result of tutoring, were you able to gain increased command concerning the production of analytical overlays?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

59. Do you feel that analytical overlays are relevant to so-called "signals"?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

They are always relevant, but the is in knowing how at w stay are corr

60. Concerning analytical overlays, do you feel that other individuals, given the opportunity of lectures, orientation and practical exercises similar to yours, can learn to identify, produce, and become competent in attempting to deal with them?

Yes Probably Improbably No

61. Are analytical overlays easy to produce?

Yes Usually Sometime Never

62. Is the appearance of analytical overlays predictable, given the stimulus the coordinate represents?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

63. With reference to types of analytical overlays, were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered to enable you to identify them?

Yes No

64. At the beginning of practical exercises, did you find the different types of analytical overlay easy to recognize and deal with?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

65. Did tutoring ^{and practice} in these different types of analytical overlay increase your proficiency in recognizing them?

Yes No

66. Do you feel that analytical overlay are an important function in attempting to deal with aspects of psychic perceptions of distant sites?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

67. To the best of your knowledge, are you aware of any other psychical research group that has attempted to discover analytical overlay and work with it in the manner designed within the CRV training effort?

Yes No

68. If your answer to question 67 is "yes," please cite references.

A fantastic contribution to the field of remote viewing. - the ability to know accurate data that corresponds to target

On-Line Checks

69. On-line checks represent a system that can be utilized to determine the quality, on a daily basis, of a viewer's response to and control of signals versus noise. Were sufficient lectures and orientation delivered so as to enable you to conceive of the purpose of and methods for utilizing on-line checks?

Yes No



70. During the overall course of training, did you use on-line checks?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

71. Did you find that it was important to use on-line checks for the precision purpose for which they were designed?

Yes No

72. If you can establish the relative importance of on-line checks, would you say they are:

Extremely Important Important Not So Important
Important Only Sometimes Not Important

73. To the best of your knowledge, are you aware of any other psychical research group that uses a methodology similar to on-line checks?

Yes No

74. If your answer to question 73 is "yes," please cite references.

all my 'class A' type work since 1976.

Training Course Conditions

75. Considering all the conditions surrounding the experimental CRV training course, do you feel that general progress has been made on the problem of developing a methodology that can cope with some of the well-known difficulties of psychic perceptions?

Yes No

76. It is hypothesized in the CRV training procedure that the different aspects of the CRV training methodologies can bring about a novel and precise control of signal versus noise. Does this appear at this stage to be the case?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

77. Do you feel that you responded with ease to the training information delivered to you?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

78. Did you encounter any difficulties that were not resolved?

Yes No

79. If you answered "yes" to question 78, please specify the difficulty(s).



80. Reviewing the general actions of the training monitor:

(a) Was he ready with the materials so that confusions were reduced and daily progress was profitable?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(b) When necessary, did the training monitor slow down the course to make sure no misunderstandings were present?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(c) Was the training monitor prompt with regard to schedule-keeping?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(d) When upsets occurred, did the training monitor make attempts to resolve the upset?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(e) Were upsets frequent?

Yes No

Not from my perspective

(f) If you answered "yes" above, please specify the general situations that led to the frequent upsets.

81. Reviewing the general actions of yourself as a student:

(a) Were you usually prompt with regard to class times?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(b) Did you find it hard to be a student within the context of the training program as it was designed?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(c) Did you ever refuse co-operation?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

(d) Did you participate and share in the following aspects of the training course?

- (1) House-keeping duties? Yes No
- (2) Site selection & preparation? Yes No
- (3) Course lectures? Yes No
- (4) Practical exercises? Yes No
- (5) Material support requirements? Yes No
- (6) Record keeping and analysis? Yes No
- (7) Report preparation? Yes No

(e) Did you volunteer your help and assistance in the above?

Frequently Often Sometimes Infrequently Never

82. It is important to know about your relationships to other students: were these generally

Excellent Good Fair Poor

83. Concerning the training monitor, what would you say are:

(a) The worst points? **Unwillingness to listen to ideas on how to better present course material.**

(b) The best points? **Persistence, insight.**

84. Concerning yourself as a student, what would you say are:

(a) The worst points?

I do not consider myself a student, rather someone who can participate on an equal basis and contribute valuable information

(b) The best points?

I listen.

85. Concerning the overall training program, as it is designed, what changes do you think should be implemented and why?

1. See attached memo. Go to team approach
2. Have discussion sessions to gather viewpoint from all people involved.

Future Participation

86. Do you wish to continue in the experimental CRV training program?

Yes No

87. If you answered "yes" above, please state why.

I want to learn whatever you have to offer, so I can put out a better product on Class A's.

88. If you answered "no" above, please state why.

89. Do you feel that the training program will be successful overall?

Yes Probably Perhaps No

90. Do you wish to continue with the training program? Please check those categories you would be willing to work within?

Full time 9-4:30 _____

Part time 1/2 day _____

Only for training exercises and Class A's.

Record filing _____

Site preparation _____

Site evaluation _____

Site analysis _____

Housekeeping _____

Map selection _____

Map filing _____

As a course instructor for new trainees _____

As a site monitor _____

As a training monitor _____

As a tech training researcher _____

Secretarial duties _____

Report preparation _____

Labor for materials support _____

91. Would you rather just "do your psychic thing" and leave the present project commitment to investigate the CRV training procedure to someone else?

Yes No

Further Investigations

92. Do you think that ~~Further Investigations~~ should continue relevant to:

- (a) Tech training Yes No
- (b) Stage four Yes No
- (c) Stage five Yes No
- (d) AOLs yes No

This is not R+D!

Whatever gets me to work on Class A's. That's the reason I do this.

93. Would you rather work in general experimental ESP studies, rather than engage in the specific and controlled methodologies implied by the CRV training course?

Yes Usually Sometimes No

94. Do you feel that your natural gifts at psi are being interfered with in any way by participation in the CRV training program?

Yes No

95. Do you feel that any part of the CRV methodology is harmful to you in any way?

Yes No

96. If you answered "yes" to question 94 or 95 please specify.



97. What specific aspects of the CRV methodology do you think should be changed?

more attention needs to be put on controlled experiments. evaluation criteria needs to be established.

98. What specific aspects of the CRV methodology do you think should not be changed?

The breaking down into stages.

99. If you have comments that are not handled by the foregoing categories, please state them below.

See memo

That's why we get paid. The final product is Class A's CLASS A's are very important
G.O.F.

4 Sep 81

God

TO: Hal Puthoff
FROM: Gary O. Langford

In response to the request by you to assess the remote viewing procedures and the training techniques used by Ingo Swann, I am providing a few brief comments in such a form so as to more fully evaluate these phenomena at a later time. Any attempt to evaluate fully the merits of Ingo's procedures and techniques would be undermined by not having an adequate evaluation procedure. I confess to not having developed one. Consequently, my comments are to be taken as tentative remarks, bearing only on the most cursory review of each issue. They should not be construed as definitive remarks, taken with propriety nor as authoritative remarks, as they are only now being committed to writing after some passage of months from actual events. It is only under these guidelines that I attempt to respond to your request. The most propitious time to gather comments on new and untried training procedures and techniques is during the training period, not afterwards.

We are working together as individuals towards a stated objective, to provide an accurate source of data. We would achieve this objective in less time with less frustration if we worked together as a team. Thus far, we have not had a team effort and little has been done to foster that feeling. Guidance for a team concept could come from you. The fundamental dichotomy between those fostering the individual performance (Ingo) and those purporting the team performance (Gary, Hella, Blue) has in fact been one of the major issues that continues to thwart progress. For example, we do not cross correlate results and submit our best combined estimate to the clients. Therefore, each viewer is given feedback (sometimes in the spirit of competition) as a measure of their performance. Since all of the viewers have backgrounds differing in education, experience, and environment, there is most certainly a difference in the viewings. My technical background assists me in accurate renditions of technology sites, whereas the other viewers are more proficient in sociological aspects. Together, many more aspects of the viewings can be provided than by that of any one viewer. However, as individual performance is measured now, I am judged equally on aspects of the viewings for which I have no interest or background. The same is equally true for the other viewers. We do not evaluate the group performance, rather we qualify individual performance with rewards or punishment. Rewards such as verbal praise of an individual in group meetings (also taken as punishment of those not so praised) are common. It is not so much as what is said, as it is how it is said. Ingo must take great care in this regard, as teachers must at all times be sensitive to this potential interpretation by the individuals being trained. A teacher's most efficient way of teaching has always been to present himself as an equal, with knowledge to be shared. Both teacher and trainees should learn equally from the experience of the interaction. When this learning occurs, the teacher can be sure that he has been successful in learning what the trainees know. That is not the same as saying what the teacher has taught the trainees.

I suggest that we consider more closely the attributes of the team approach.

Ingo's method has all of the qualities of becoming a method that meets our expectations of reliable, accurate, and repeatable results. The procedures that Ingo has established do produce the results that he has predicted. However, it is inappropriate to qualify the results of this past year's work in terms of such nebulous and relative terms as poor or excellent. Rather, the results of Ingo's training stand alone with some of the other techniques that have been tried successfully. In particular, my viewings under the guidance of Ingo, have shown marked improvement from the beginning of his training sessions. It is difficult to separate the viewings into categories, wherein one group shows the merits of Ingo's methods and the other shows the merits of any number of other methods that I have tried. Nor should this be the purpose of any evaluation. After all we are after a product. The way we get there is not that important. Ingo's method works to provide accurate, repeatable results. That helps us to reach our objective. As long as Ingo's method continues to provide me a way to reach the objective I will support it. If something better comes along, then it should be looked at also, and I expect that Ingo would be most interested, too.

How for a pointed evaluation of Ingo's ideas, methods, and approach:

The concept of ideograms is fundamental to the structure and process of Ingo's ideas. Ideograms form the basis of all the remote viewing that has been performed at SRI. Ingo expanded on this concept and used the nature of the ideograms to form other images. This also has been exploited by others. What is new you might ask? Even more basic than ideograms, is Ingo's method of targeting on the site. Ingo proposed the use of Earth coordinates as the manner in which a remote viewing session could begin. This use of coordinates has been a major breakthrough in the study of remote viewing. Coordinates have reduced the time to do a remote viewing from several hours to just a few minutes. This savings in time has resulted in a significant increase in the number of experiments and therefore more information. It is this single event--that of using coordinates--that has resulted in the great strides that have been made by Ingo in his quest for the perfect remote viewing. I commend Ingo for his inventiveness and insight.

On ideograms, Ingo has created a thought process that uses ideas and concepts that have been known and used before, but he has formulated these ideas into a sequence that is natural to the thinking process. His formulation is rigid in structure and unbending in design and uncompromising in training. Perhaps he has excluded other ideas that may in fact enhance his own ideas. That is what rigidity usually implies. Yet, I can not criticize Ingo's methods or his intentions, since I know him to be a sincere individual. He has his moments, however, so do I. Ingo's insistence has led to difficulties amongst some of the members of the project. I too have been frustrated in my attempts to share my experiences and thereby help Ingo discover knowledge that he shows no awareness of in his dealings with the viewing. I always feel a loss when I am unable to communicate an idea that I know will help someone over a difficult spot. This memo is not the time to discuss these other ideas. The instructions in your memo were quite specific and I will confine my remarks to those.

Aesthetic Impact: A wonderful sensation, filled with accurate information about the site. The benefits of this concept are well worth the learning. How it can be further applied and enhanced has not been investigated enough. Much more should and can be done with it.

Taking Breaks: A radical departure from some of the old style sit there until you are finished and keep working. The use of breaks permits the viewer to rest the mind and to subconsciously put together diverse parts of the complex puzzle. It also gives the viewer permission to go ahead at a pace that is commensurate with the viewers feelings. Nothing is foretold or forced. The emphasis throughout the entire session is that of obtaining accurate results, not the idea that you are proving whether psychic functioning exists or not.

One overriding comment that must be made. Ingo should confide in someone and discuss the concepts he is proposing to use in the training sessions. They have to be discussed prior to their use so that any pitfalls can be uncovered. I suggest that you provide the sounding board for Ingo's ideas.

Please forgive the length--I did not have the time to write a more concise response. And as always, over look the spelling. In my haste...

I would like to ensure that this response is forwarded to Ingo for his review. And I am available to discuss the contents and my reasons for these comments.

Let us make sure that we do not lose sight of the objective of the project. The important aspect is: IT IS NOT WHO DOES THE TRAINING OR THE VIEWING, BUT RATHER THAT THE CLIENT GETS A PRODUCT THAT CAN BE USED TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEMS.