Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 13–27, 1988
Pergamon Press plc. Printed in the USA.

0892-3310/88 $3.00+.00

Remote Viewing and Computer Communications—An Experiment

JACQUES VALLEE

1245 Oakmead Parkway, Suite 103, Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Abstract —A series of remote viewing experiments were run with 12 participants who communicated through a computer conferencing network. These participants, who were located in various regions of the United States and Canada, used portable terminals in their homes and offices to provide typed descriptions of 10 mineral samples. These samples were divided into an open series and a double-blind series. A panel of five judges was asked to match the remote viewing descriptions against the mineral samples by a percentage scoring system. The correct target sample was identified in 8 out of 33 cases: this represents more than double the pure chance expectation. Two experienced users provided 20 transcripts for which the probability of achieving the observed distribution of the percentage score by chance was 0.04.

These results confirm earlier reports of successful remote viewing experiments while extending them to cases in which participants were thousands of miles away from each other and in which the targets were mineral samples of potential economic significance, with control of communications provided by a computer network.

Research Questions in Remote Viewing

Among other human parapsychological abilities, the phenomenon of remote viewing has been the subject of intensive study in recent years because it is amenable to standardized experimental protocols and to formal replication. Indeed, the pioneering work of Hal Puthoff and Russell Targ (1976) at the Stanford Research Institute has now been extended and verified by several teams in various parts of the world (Jahn, R. G., 1982).

Examples of early remote viewing research noted by Puthoff and Targ (1976) include experiments performed by members of the Society for Psychical Research in London, reported by Sir Oliver Lodge in the 1922 book *Outline cf Science* (1922). In these experiments one person kept a record of impressions, at a certain time each day, of what the other person actually saw while travelling hundreds of miles away. These researchers reported a striking similarity between the descriptions and the actual sites and they did not find any decrease of accuracy with increasing distance.

According to Russell Targ and Keith Harary (1984), the first researcher to "see the pattern" of remote viewing phenomena was Rene Warcollier whose book *Mind* to *Mind* (1963) contained not only actual experiments but a theory of "secondary elaboration" that described the nature of the "mental noise" interfering with perception of the targets.

In contrast with this earlier work, in many of the SRI experiments no one was actually at the site. The viewer was simply asked to describe "the target" or a location designated by a certain longitude and latitude.

The observation that human subjects, under certain conditions of training and of operational environment, are able to provide accurate descriptions of remote sites that are only designated by an address (such as a set of coordinates) or by an abstract keyword opens up a series of interesting questions.

One would want to know, in particular, whether or not distance from the site is a factor of success; whether sensory deprivation enhances or hampers performance; and whether it is true that group communication amplifies or stimulates remote viewing ability. Similarly, it seems important to establish whether or not telepathy plays a role in remote viewing; that is, all other conditions being the same, are the viewers more successful when another human being has conscious knowledge of the site or target to be viewed?

Over 10 years ago a series of experiments were designed, executed and analyzed in order to explore these questions. Our results have only been published until now in a very terse and summary form (Vallee, 1981; Vallee, Hastings & Askevold, 1976). It may be of interest to members of the Society for Scientific Exploration to review how the sessions were planned and what was learned from them.

Operations of the Computer Network

At the time when the initial SRI remote viewing work was in progress, the present author served as principal investigator for DARPA and NSF in the development of the first teleconferencing system based on a computer network. Hence we had access to advanced software permitting an arbitrary number of remote users to connect themselves under a series of extended electronic meetings where social structure could be controlled by a leader designated as "Organizer," and where access could be secured through keywords.

It was thus possible for the first time to run conferences whose styles ranged from the very formal (with voting and anonymous polling) to the completely open, as in brainstorming sessions. Furthermore, interaction could be simultaneous, in which case any entry made by any user was instantaneously transmitted to all others, or delayed, in which case users could come and go, read the entries that had accumulated, and respond at their convenience. In this system, which has been used for numerous other business and scientific applications, the files of entries are encrypted in storage and cannot be changed once released by the sender.

All communication was typed on terminals equipped with modems and connected to the network by local telephone calls. The system features and human factors have been described in greater detail by the author in the book *Computer Message Systems* (Vallee, 1984).

The availability of this system enabled us not only to conduct the first remote viewing experiments that used computer communications as a medium, but to document the advantages of this form of group interaction. Among these advantages we noted the ability to capture unobtrusively the date, time, duration, and text of every comment, thus greatly facilitating monitoring and analysis; the convenience of having access to the entire conference at any time of day or night; the ability for each viewer to perform experiments while staying in familiar, comfortable surroundings, rather than enduring the frustration of tiring trips to a remote laboratory; and the remarkable feeling of connectedness created by the computer network itself —a feeling that Arthur Hastings has aptly called "an altered state of communications."

Among these factors, the enhanced control and monitoring structure of the medium is perhaps the most important at this stage of remote viewing research: computer conferencing eliminates non-verbal and subliminal cues and places the entire group in conditions where all communications can be documented without the intervention of a human monitor.

Planning of the Experiments

Having agreed on the principle of the experiments we secured private funding and the necessary equipment to enable a group of 12 users to interact over a four-week period, from mid-June to mid-July 1975. The formal remote viewing experiments were scheduled for the period of June 29 to July 3.

Given the pioneering nature of the work, it was not difficult to enlist the participation of an enthusiastic and dedicated group of seasoned researchers. Indeed the team included some of the star performers in the SRI work as well as interested observers located throughout the United States and Canada. All participants donated their personal time to this effort.

The choice of mineral samples as targets for these experiments is another factor that distinguishes this work from other remote viewing efforts that have concentrated on geographic sites. While the result of such work is often striking, the variability and the ambiguity of terrain, complicated by real-time changes in weather, makes judging a very difficult task, open to many criticisms in terms of protocol. It seemed to the author that it would be preferable, given the objectives of this particular experiment, to select targets that were simpler and more easy to standardize than locations on the earth.

Another advantage we saw in the use of rocks as targets was the undeniable economic value of the accurate recognition of minerals by psychic means, if it could be demonstrated and perfected. Accordingly we selected as the targets a set of 11 mineral samples, listed in Table 1 below.

The remote viewers were told only that they would be working with rocks

TABLE 1
Mineral samples used as targets

A =	Rare earth sample of bastnosite and Europium
B =	Not used in experiments
C =	Vein filling of galena (silver ore) and quartz
D =	Precious Opal from Virginia Valley, Nevada
E =	Gold ore contained in a section of quartz vein
F =	Halite (salt crystal) from Nevada
G =	Realgar from Utah, aggregated with orpiment
H =	Barite from Dugway Proving Grounds
I =	Cinnabar from Alaska (mercury mineral)
J =	Magnetite from British Columbia, strongly magnetic
K =	Cobaltite from Alaska (cobalt ore)

from North America. The minerals themselves were selected by the author and by Gerald Askevold, a geologist with the U.S. Geological Survey. They came from the collections of the USGS or from private collections. They were selected for their uniqueness in terms of composition, origin, physical properties, or esthetic appeal. They had not been polished, cut or otherwise altered by man after extraction. For security reasons the samples remained in the custody of Mr. Askevold.

After selection the rocks were sealed in envelopes and the envelopes were labelled from A to K (one sample, labelled as "B was not used). A geologist who was not a member of the experimental group wrote a one or two-page description of each mineral sample, and these descriptions were filed for later reference. Appendix 2 gives an actual example of such a description as it was made available to the judges.

The Computer Conference

From June 14 to June 28 the participants began to interact in a series of discussions about current issues in psychic research. The exchanges were warm and friendly. They enabled the group members to become comfortable with the equipment, the system and with each other.

The formal experiments began on Sunday June 29 and lasted until Thursday July 3, 1975. They were conducted as follows: Five of the envelopes containing samples were pulled out at random, and enclosed in larger blank envelopes. An assistant was then asked to come into the room and, left alone in the room, to randomize these unmarked envelopes. They were then labeled "Sunday" through "Thursday" and constituted the "double-blind pool." The remaining samples were referred to as the "open pool."

The experimental protocol was then conducted as follows: Each day at 7:30 a.m. and 7:30 p.m. (California time) a geologist sitting alone at his home terminal selected any one of the envelopes from the "open pool," extracted the sample and held it in his hand for 30 minutes. At this point he simply announced that the session could begin. Anyone entering the conference during this period could volunteer a remote viewing description which was recorded by the computer with a date and time stamp. The entry was available in hard copy and could not be edited after it was sent. The geologist closed the session by providing a feedback statement about the sample, which was then removed from the pool.

Each morning we also took the envelope bearing the name of that day from the double blind pool. We placed it at a designated office location where it was available for remote viewing for eight hours. At that location the envelope was in full view of the professional and office staff during the entire day, providing additional security. Any participant coming into the computer conference during that day could type in a description of the sample contained inside the double sealed envelope. At the end of the day the envelope was returned to the geologist, who added it to the "open pool" but provided no feedback for these targets.

Remote Viewing Data

Upon completion of the experiments the transcript contained 33 descriptions of the 10 samples from six active remote viewers. Thirteen of these descriptions were under double blind conditions and 20 under open conditions. Four specimens had been run both as double blind and as open targets.

A review of the computer transcript illustrates both the process and the product of the experiments, witness the following description by viewer " B located in Florida:

I was getting something that looked like a big Malaysian penny for a minute, all copper/brass, and there suddenly what to my wondering eyes should appear but a small donut of quartz crystals, like a keyring had fallen into a supersaturated salt solution overnight.

Entry No. 238, the same day at 7:46 p.m. The viewer is "S" in New York City:

I have the impression I could "look" right through it. My analytical overlay is providing lots of alternatives. Damn, wish it would keep still. Crystal, crystal, crystal **ball,** glass, **crystal clear** crystal.

Entry No. 239, two minutes later, the same viewer:

I think I'll settle for a chunk of crystal of some sort, formed by dripping and evaporation. Location by specific state: Northern Nevada?

Indeed, the actual target that inspired these descriptions was a semi-transparent salt crystal. The feedback entry (No. 251), was provided the same day at 8:00 p.m. by geologist Gerald Askevold in Menlo Park, California:

The sample (F) is a beautiful specimen of crystalline halite, which is salt, and in this almost pure form is practically transparent (in fact, looks very much like quartz). It has beautiful cubic cleavage on part of the sample, and I can see through it. This sample was taken in St. Thomas, Nevada. Halite is formed from sedimentary evaporite beds.

In the above exchange, many of the familiar aspects of remote viewing are illustrated. The same is true in the description of the next target sample made by "B" the next day:

Why do I keep getting greens? I see a medium size green wedge. I don't see a pure emerald crystal, much as I would like to. It is flecked, and connected to a coarse rock edging. A non-geologist would say it is not metallic: it looks to me like it was poured, a heavy liquid green plastic (the green becoming blue-green at the edges of the sample), and if fractured it would be in one clean smooth break of glassine purity.

The stone in question was an opal and the independent geological description we had in our files read: "A small and irregularly angular fragment that is roughly pyramidal in shape. Most of the specimen is a pale brown, aphanitic, siliceous rock with a conchoidal fracture. It is transected by thin discontinuous veinlets that are translucent and have a play of delicate colors including deep green blue and milky white. The specimen was selected to represent the material in the veinlets, precious opal."

These few extracts provide a sense of the richness and precision of the descriptions we obtained. They also convey the spirit of the experiments, an attitude of positive team work and an atmosphere of deep trust. The participants commented frequently on this atmosphere, which they subjectively felt was conducive to good performance on their part. The realization that the software effectively bridged time and space was specially stimulating. At times participants from Canada, New York, Florida, and California were making entries into the system simultaneously.

At the end of the conference we were able to retrieve the experimental descriptions and to subject them to a formal judging process.

Statistical Findings

Of all the phases of the remote viewing process, judging is the most complex. It calls for the matching of actual descriptions with a set of known targets. Such matching is to a large extent subjective: how can we be sure that two judges will perceive the same similarities and the same differences when pairing a description with a target?

To alleviate this problem the SRI protocol uses a panel of several judges who are asked to rank the targets for each description. We modified the protocol by asking our five judges to assign a "score" as a probability of match (rather than a rank) to each description. This percentage score reflected the judge's certainty of the "match."

The judges were professionals: a sociologist, a librarian, an editor, an administrative assistant and a physicist. They had not taken part in the experiment and had not read the transcript. They were provided with the geologist's objective description of the ten rocks and with the 33 remote viewing statements that had been retyped eliminating any indication of date, authorship or experimental conditions. They were also provided with the 10 mineral samples.

The task of each of the five judges was to independently assign one or more probability estimates to each description, reflecting the match between that description and every mineral sample. In other words, each judge independently rated each transcript against each of the 10 samples and assigned a numerical value to the goodness of fit in such a way that the sum of all the values equaled 100, possibly assigning a non-zero value to the category "other" if the fit with the given samples was felt to be poor. Appendix 3 shows the actual instructions as they appeared in the introduction to the booklet given to each judge, and Appendix 4 shows an actual transcript rating form as it was filled out by one of the judges.

When the judging process was completed these numbers were added to provide a score of possible matches for every one of the 33 descriptions, resulting in the figures in Table 2, where the top five matches have been listed for every description. In Table 2 the circled entries indicate a correct match and a number in parentheses gives the aggregate score assigned to that mineral sample by the panel.

We see, for instance, that given description #1 the judges felt it was most representative of sample J (with a total score of 134) followed by F and C. The actual target was C. In description #3 the judges overwhelmingly designated F as the best match (score of 212) and F was indeed the target.

To facilitate in-depth analysis of these results, Appendix 5 gives the actual individual figures assigned by each of the independent judges in our panel, and Appendix 6 shows the aggregate figures, obtained when the ratings were summed across the five independent judges.

The actual target was assigned the highest score (that is, it was "correctly identified") in 8 out of 33 cases. This frequency is more than double a pure chance expectation of 3.3. By chance it would occur less than once in 100 trials.

For a more detailed analysis, which accounted for the distribution of percentages among several targets for each description, the percentage scores were computer processed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A one-tailed T-test was used to determine the probability that the assigned percentage scores for correct and incorrect targets were due to chance.

For all 33 transcripts the probability of achieving the observed distribution by chance was 0.08. For the 20 transcripts provided by the two most experienced viewers in the group, the T-test indicated a 0.04 probability score. In fact, the results for the whole group are due entirely to these two "most experienced" viewers.

TABLE 2
Analysis results (Correct matches are circled)

Remote Description			Panel Selection and Scores Among the 10 Possible Targets					
No.	Open/ Blind	Author	Best Match	2nd Match	3rd Match	4th Match	5th Match	Actual Target Was:
1	Open	S	J(134)	F(60)	C(50)	G(44)	D(30)	C
2	Open	H	A(100)	I(60)	F(52)	H(50)	C(45)	C
3	Blind	S	F(212)	G(50)	C(10)	D(10)	H(10)	F
4	Open	S	J(100)	E(76)	F(55)	K(30)	A(10)	G
5	Blind	H	K(70)	H(62)	G(60)			D
6	Blind	B	D(284)	J(10)				D
7	Blind	T	A(205)	I(90)	G(80)			D
8	Blind	S	I(210)	J(40)				D
9	Open	H	H(150)	F(70)	J(50)	C(20)		I
10	Open	S	D(50)	J(50)	K(50)	E(48)	C(30)	I
11	Open	B	I(208)	D(30)	C(20)	H(20)		I
12	Open	H	F(45)	E(20)	D(17)			E
13	Open	B	F(188)					E
14	Blind	B	K(110)	D(56)	J(30)			H
15	Blind	H	A(180)	D(10)	F(10)			H
16	Blind	S	[illegible]					H
17	Open	B	D(100)	F(90)				F
18	Open	S		D(120)	I(20)			F
19	Open	S	G(104)	C(100)	J(84)			J
20	Open	H	F(30)	K(20)	D(6)			J
21	Open	B	J(56)	I(50)	D(30)	A(10)	C(10)	J
22	Blind	B	H(62)					K
23	Blind	H	D(52)	G(10)				K
24	Blind	Ba	C(40)	D(14)	J(10)			K
25	Open	B	D(72)	J(10)				D
26	Open	V	J(80)	D(25)				D
27	Open	H	D(55)	E(5)	F(5)	K(2)		D
28	Open	B	D(126)					H
29	Open	H	D(222)	F(10)				H
30	Open	S	J(58)	C(30)	H(22)	A(10)	I(10)	H
31	Blind	H	H(32)	E(30)	G(10)	I(6)		A
32	Blind	B	C(130)	G(124)				A
33	Open	B	I(60)	D(16)	J(15)	K(6)		A

Lessons Drawn From the Experiment

We were encouraged by the results of this experiment. Accurate and significant remote perception occurred under test conditions that placed the most successful participants 2,500 miles away from the targets. Also of interest is the result that the "double blind" and the "open" conditions provided equally correct descriptions, suggesting that the ability under study also functions on information not known to others. The computer conference system allowed control of the test conditions, with complete recording of all messages among participants.

About two-thirds of the transcripts contained descriptive elements that corresponded with the correct target specimen, but often these were mixed with non-corresponding elements, and it was not possible to reduce the information to a coherent single identification. The characteristics most often identified correctly were the color of the sample, the shape, relative weight, presence of crystals, type of material (for instance, metallic), and geological formation process (for instance, volcanic).

Attempts to specify location were usually in error as were descriptions of the size of the samples and their exact substance. In particular we were disappointed that the sample of europium (A) had been missed by the viewers; this particular target came from a unique mine in Mountain Pass, California, that has the potential of cornering the world's rare earth market. A unique location could therefore have been provided. We were also disap pointed that the magnetic properties of sample J had not come through. We do not know if these patterns are due to the participants or to the nature of the information transfer process, or to insufficient structuring of our experiments. We suggest that further studies should select targets that are easily discriminated (i.e., widely different) along the "most perceived character-istics. In order to stimulate such studies, and to facilitate replication, a formal Protocol is attached here as Appendix 1.

The fact that several of the specimens were composite and contained mixed materials made this an especially complex (though realistic) test situation, perhaps more demanding than the conditions that prevailed in the SRI studies, at least for non-geologists. Our results tend to validate Puthoff and Targ's experiments and strongly indicate that remote viewing techniques are deserving of further scientific attention.

References

Jahn, R. G. (1982). The persistent paradox of psychic phenomena: An engineering perspective. *Proceedings of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers* (IEEE), *70,* 132–170.

Lodge, Sir Oliver. (1922). Psychic science. In J. A. Thomson (Ed.), *Outline of science* (4 vols). New York: Putnam.

Puthoff, H. E., & Targ, R. (1976). A perceptual channel for information transfer over kilometer distances: Historical perspectives and recent research. *Proceedings of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers* (IEEE), *64,* 329–354.

Targ R., & Harary, K. (1984). *The mind race.* New York: Villard.

Vallee, J., Hastings, A., & Askevold, G. (1976). Remote viewing experiments through computer conferencing. *Proceedings of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers* (IEEE), *64*, 1551–1552.
Vallee, J. (1981). Une étude expérimentale de la perception à distance au cours d'une conférence médiatisée. Paris: *Revue de Parapsychologie, 12-13*, 28–36.
Vallee, J. (1984). *Computer message systems*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Warcollier, R. (1963). *Mind to mind*. New York: Collier.

Appendix 1

A 17-Step Protocol for Remote Viewing Experiments

This formal Protocol employs computer-based communications media capable of supporting message exchange either in synchronous (simultaneous) manner or in asynchronous (delayed) manner among a geographically disseminated group of users. The system must capture uniquely and unobtrusively the name of the sender and the date and time of a message, and it must preclude editing once an entry is made.

Step 1. A series of 10 to 12 mineral samples are selected by two principal investigators. They have similar characteristics in terms of bulk, such that they can fit in a standard letter-size mailing envelope. It is advisable to select a few more samples than actually required.

Step 2. An independent geologist writes a one-page statement covering the appearance, density, composition, history and physical properties of the samples. These statements are set aside in a secure place for later use by the judges panel.

Step 3. The principal investigators enclose the samples in sealed envelopes labelled with letters of the alphabet for unique designation. This designation is kept confidential.

Step 4. The samples are divided arbitrarily into an "open pool" and a "double-blind pool," each pool composed of five or six samples. The selection is made by someone who has not seen the samples and only has access to the envelopes, which are of similar bulk and weight.

Step 5. The "double-blind pool" is randomized as follows: the envelopes containing the samples are placed inside larger, unmarked envelopes that are left on a table by the experimenters together with a marker pen. The investigators leave the room. A person who has no knowledge of the experiment and is not intended to be either a subject or a judge is sent into the room under supervision by another independent person, with instructions to move the envelopes around in any order and then to write on them the names of the days of the week.

Step 6. One of the principal investigators takes custody of the "open pool" while the other takes custody of the "double-blind pool."

Step 7. A group of viewers in remote locations has been selected. This group is trained in the use of the computer system and briefed on the following process (steps 8 through 11). They are told that their task is to provide a description of mineral samples that have not been refined or processed. The experiments extend over a specific five-day period.

Step 8. On each day of the experiments, at a designated time (such as 8:00 a.m.) the "open pool" experimenter logs on to the system, makes his or her presence known to the group, opens any envelope at random and takes the sample in hand for 30 minutes, declaring simply the session has begun. Any viewer who chooses to provide a description during this time period is free to do *so*. Descriptions *so* entered are seen by anyone who is logged on. At the end of the 30-minute period the principal investigator types in a "feedback" statement describing the sample in his or her own words.

Step 9. The same procedure is repeated with a new sample at a fixed, predesignated time at the end of the day—for instance at 8:00 p.m.

Step 10. Also on each day of the experiments, the "blind pool" investigator takes the large envelope marked with the name of that particular day and places it in a designated location (such as "on the metal tray next to my terminal"). He or she makes an entry into the system announcing that the "target" is available. Anyone logging in at any time during the day is free to provide a description of the sample contained in the envelope.

No feedback is provided. At the end of the day the envelope is removed and turned over to the second investigator, who extracts the small envelope from the large one and adds it to his "open pool."

Step 11. At the end of the last day of the experiments feedback statements are provided for all "blind pool" targets and the viewer group is disbanded.

Step 12. A panel of judges is assembled. The panel is composed of five persons who have experience, either fiom professional practice or personal background, in using judgment in qualitative decisions. They are open-minded about psychic abilities, without being strongly committed to any particular theory about such abilities. They do not know the viewers personally.

Step 13. All viewer statements are retyped from the computer transcript in a standard format with names and dates removed. These anonymous statements are also randomized and are turned over to the panel of judges who are provided with all mineral samples and the independent geologist's prior descriptions. The judges are not given the "feedback" statements written by the experimenters, which were written after the fact and may therefore be biased.

Step 14. Taking each viewer statement in turn, it is the task of an individual judge to assign to each mineral sample a rating "score" representing its perceived match with respect to that particular statement. The scores for the given statement must add up to 100. For instance, the judge may feel that the statement matches sample "E" perfectly, giving a 100 score to E and zero to all others. Alternatively, the 100 points might be spread among two or more samples and a category called "other." The scores are turned over to the principal investigators.

Step 15. For each viewer statement, the scores are added together and the five best matches are retained to provide a summary table similar to Table 2.

Step 16. Using standard, widely-available computer software such as the SPSS package, one uses a one-tailed T-test to determine the probability that the assigned scores for correct and incorrect targets are due to chance.

Step 17. It is then possible to go back over the set of experiments and examine the results obtained separately for the open and blind pools, for specific targets, distance, or physical characteristics, and for specific viewers, thus providing information to guide future experiments.

Note. The same protocol would naturally apply, with minor adaptation, to any collection of similar objects. It is not restricted to mineral samples.

Appendix 2

Example of Independent Geological Description

Specimen A—Locality: Mountain Pass, California (southern California near Nevada border)

General Appearance

The specimen is a somewhat flat, angular fragment ($8 \times 7 \times 2$ cm.) that is splotchy pale red, moderate pink, and light brownish-gray in color. It is a rock composed of several non-metallic minerals, the most conspicuous forms moderate pink crystals to 2 cm. across scattered through the specimen and in thin veinlets (bastnosite). These crystals are only moderately well-formed and have many irregular boundaries. It is light in density.

Mineralogy

The specimen contains the rare mineral bastnosite—a fluorcarbonate of the rare earth elements and is especially rich in cerium, lanthanum, reodymium, and praseodymium. Europium is a minor constituent.

Occurrence and Use

Europium is used in color televisions.

The specimen comes from a unique mineral occurrence at Mountain Pass, California. Here bastnosite occurs in cartherote-rich veins that are spatially and genetically related to a potash-rich intrusive shankinite-syenite complex. Other minerals commonly associated with it are calcite, dolomite, ankerite, and siderite.

This single mine has the potential to comer the world's rare earth market.

Appendix 3

Actual Instructions to Judges

This booklet contains ten target descriptions, labeled A through K (sample B was not used), printed on yellow sheets and providing a photograph of each sample together with an accurate summary of its properties written by a geologist not associated with the experiments. Read these target descriptions first.

It also contains 33 unlabeled verbal "remote perceptions" of these targets by a team of experimenters (pink sheets numbered 1 to 33). Your task is to match each remote perception of the experimenters against the 10 targets.

We would like you to find what you would consider the best match for each of the descriptions. Your matches will be expressed in terms of probabilities, and for this purpose we have provided a list of the samples, in the margin of each remote perception, in order for you to allocate percentages to possible choices. A category called "other" has been provided and should be used when the remote perception does not match well with any of the samples such that the sum of all percentages allocated to samples A through K adds up to less than one hundred.

Another way to think of this assignment is: If you had to bet the sum of $100 on a given remote perception corresponding to the ten target samples, how much money would you be willing to bet and how much would you place on each letter?

Thank you for helping us in analyzing this experiment.

Appendix 4

Example of Actual Judge's Response For a Given Transcript

Remote Perception No. 6

Black shiny hardness, like a crystal of obsidian projecting from more basic coarse rock. A strong sense of this two-naturedness; two definitely different aspects to the one sample. The polished part looks like a miniature black Washington Monu-

Percentage Allocated to:

A ______

C ______

D ___70___

E ______

F ______

G ______

H ______

Remote Perception No. 6	Percentage Allocated to:	
ment, except six or eight-sided, with a pyramidal point at the end. About 4–5 inches long. Comes from Central New Mexico.	I	
	J	10
	K	
	Other	20
	Total:	100

Appendix 5

Results From Individual Judges

Description No.	Author	Target Sample: Hand Held	Target Sample: Double Blind	Individual Rating of Transcripts: Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 4	Judge 5
1	S	C		24G + 24J	30D + 50J	50C + 50J	10H + 10J	60F + 20G + 201
2	H	C		12F + 40H	40C + 201 + 40J	100A	25E	5C + 40F + 5G + 10H + 401
3	S		SUN (F)	12F	70F + 10H	100F	20F	10C + 10D + 10F + 50G
4	S	G		6E + 40J	10A + 10C + 5F + 60J	30K	20E + MF	10D + 50E + 30F
5	H		MON (D)	2H	50H	70K		60G + 10H
6	B		MON (D)	24D	90D ·	100D		70D + 10J
7	T		MON (D)	MA	701	100A	75A	80G + 201
8	S		MON (D)	301	301	1001		501 + 40J
9	H	I		40H	70F	100H	10H	20C + 50J
10	S	I		28E + 2F	50D + 20F	30C + 20E + 50K		50J
11	B	I		20C + 481	30D	1001		20H + 601
12	H	E		12D		5D + 45F		ME
13	B	E		8F		100F	10F	70F
14	B		TUE (H)	6D	30J	100K	10K	50D
15	H		TUE (H)	20A	60A	100A		10D + 10F
16	S		TUE (H)	6H		100H		60H
17	B	F		30F	60F	100D		
18	S	F		86F	40D + 201 ,	100F	10D + 40F	70D + 20F
19	S	J		24G + 24J	60J	100C		80G
20	H	J		6D		10K	10F	20F + 10K
21	B	J		6J	10A + 10C + 10D + 10I	20D	10J	401 + 40J
22	B		WED (K)	12H				50H
23	H		WED (K)	12D	10D + 10G			30D
24	Ba		WED (K)	4D	10D + 10J			40C
25	B	D		12D	10D		10J	50D
26	V	D		30J		25D		50J
27	H	D		2K	5D + 5E + 5F			50D
28	B	H		36D	40D	10D		40D
29	H	H		52D	40D	100D	20D	10D + 10F
30	S	H		12H + 18J	10A + 10I + 10K	10H	30J	30D + 10J
31	H		THU (A)	12H + 61			20H	30E + 10G
32	B		THU (A)	24G	30C	100C	40G	60G
33	B	A		6D + 6K		10D + 15J		601

Appendix 6

Results for Judges Panel as a Whole

Description No.	Author	Target Sample: Hand Held	Target Sample: Double Blind	Aggregate Panel Results for Specimen: A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	S	C			50	30		60	44	10	20	134	
2	H	C		100	45		25	52	5	50	60	40	
3	S		SUN (F)		10	10		212	50	10			
4	S	G		10	10	10	76	55				100	30
5	H		MON (D)						60	62			70
6	B		MON (D)			284						10	
7	T		MON (D)	205					80		90		
8	S		MON (D)								210	40	
9	H	I			20			70		150		50	
10	S	I			30	50	48	22				50	50
11	B	I			20	30				20	208		
12	H	E				17	20	45					
13	B	E						188					
14	B		TUE (H)			56						30	100
15	H		TIJE (H)	180		10		10					
16	S		TUE (H)							166			
17	B	F			100			90					
18	S	F				120		246			20		
19	S	J			100				104			84	
20	H	J				6		30					20
21	B	J		10	10	30					50	56	
22	B		WED (K)							62			
23	H		WED (K)			52			10				
24	Ba		WED (K)		40	14						10	
25	B	D				72						10	
26	V	D				25						80	
27	H	D				55	5	5					2
28	B	H				126							
29	H	H				222		10					
30	S	H		10	30					22	10	58	10
31	H		THU (A)				30		10	32	6		
32	B		THU (A)		130				124				
33	B	A				16					60	15	6