



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
US ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND  
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755

IAOPS-H-S

1 June 1981

INSCOM GRILL FLAME PROJECT PROTOCOL

1. (S/NOFORN) GENERAL:

This protocol contains the procedure for INSCOM GRILL FLAME Project (IGFP) sponsored remote viewing. It is in effect for the period required to accomplish the scope of work. Remote viewing (RV) is an intellectual process by which an individual perceives characteristics of a designated target remote in space and/or time from that individual. RV does not involve any electronic sensing devices at or focused at the target site, nor does it involve classical photo interpretation of photographs obtained from overhead or oblique means. The individual performing RV (the remote viewer) is provided with a unique identifier to allow him to focus his attention on the designated target. This identifier may be stationary map coordinates, a specific structure, an identifiable vehicle (aircraft tail number) or a specific individual (name, place of birth, age, and/or photograph). The task of the remote viewer is to describe designated aspects of the specified target. The task is achievable 1,2,3,4,5. No drugs or hypnosis will be used in this RV protocol.

2. (S/NOFORN) MILITARY OBJECTIVE:

It is the objective of this protocol to standardize the process of remote viewing so that it may become an established task in the spectrum of intelligence and information gathering functions and for target acquisition applications.

3. (S/NOFORN) MILITARY APPLICATIONS:

Remote viewing can be used to: (1) target on key enemy military individuals from covert agents to key battle commanders; (2) detect the change in state of military units; (3) monitor hostile military LOCs. US Army personnel units, materiel and operations are vulnerable to hostile RV. Countermeasures must be devised to eliminate or reduce this vulnerability.

4. (S/NOFORN) APPROVAL HISTORY:

The Commander, US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command (DARCOM) approved, in principle, the US Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity (AMSAA) involvement in project GRILL FLAME in April 1978. In May 1978, the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (ACSI) accepted lead responsibility for GRILL FLAME applications. Effective 14 January 1981, by approval of Under Secretary of Army, INSCOM became the only active operational GRILL FLAME element in the Army. Program management for GRILL FLAME was transferred to Commander, INSCOM effective 11 February 1981. OACSI, DAMI-ISH remains the Army focal point for policy matters and interface at the national level. Overall DoD responsibility resides with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).

Classified by *Greg Ham*  
Declassify on *05/16/30Z Jul 98*

5. (S/NOFORN) DEFINITIONS:

- a. Remote Viewing (RV): An intellectual process by which a person perceives characteristics of a location remote from that person. It does not involve any electronic sensing devices at or focused at the target nor does it involve classical photo interpretation of photographs obtained from overhead or oblique means.
- b. Remote Viewing Session: A single attempt by a remote viewer to perceive and report characteristics of a designated target.
- c. Remote Viewer: The individual who performs remote viewing.
- d. Interviewer: The individual who interacts with the remote viewer before, during, and after the RV session.
- e. Project Analyst: The individual who interacts with outside agencies.
- f. Project Operations Officer: The individual who controls utilization of RV assets.
- g. Project Training/Concepts Officer: The individual who trains personnel to do RV and develops operational concepts for application by the operations officer.
- h. Project Manager: The individual who coordinates project activities.
- i. Project Officer: The overall, responsible individual for all aspects of the project.
- j. Requestor: A requestor is an Army or non-Army consumer or producer agency who initiates and submits a task (See TAB A for Tasking Flow Chart).
- k. Task: A task is an operational request for information, essential elements of intelligence or target requirement.
- l. Target: Specific task, which may be in the form of a coordinate, picture of an object, or drawing, etc.

6. (S/NOFORN) PROCEDURE:

- a. Training: To provide a framework for standardizing the task of RV, a series of training sessions will be conducted. The elements of a training session are: (1) target selection; (2) remote viewer session preliminaries; (3) remote viewing session, and (4) post-session analysis. The procedure will be described using geographic coordinates as the remote target identifier.

~~SECRET~~

(1) Target Selection: Training targets are developed in response to operational needs. The basic training package includes the use of geographical coordinates as well as the modifications outlined in paragraph 7 below. In the case of geographical coordinates, a target pool is constructed by an individual not involved in interviewing or remote viewing. A target pool consists of a group of similar sealed envelopes which designate a specific target by geographic coordinate. Prior to the beginning of a session, an envelope is randomly selected from this target pool by the interviewer. At this time, only the coordinate is provided the interviewer who then reads the coordinate to the remote viewer at the beginning of the session. Other information available concerning the target is revealed only after the session during the post-session analysis. A specific target is presented only once to the remote viewer.

(2) Remote Viewer Session Preliminaries: Before a first RV session is scheduled, the remote viewer is oriented to the procedure to be followed by the interviewer. The remote viewer needs to understand that he or she should state raw perceptions; experience has shown<sup>1</sup> that specific definitions are quite often wrong while the initial raw perception tends to be correct. Remote viewers are always encouraged to express their feelings and ideas for enhancing all aspects of the RV process.

(3) Remote Viewing Session:

During the 30-60 minutes prior to the agreed-upon start time of a session, the interviewer offers some encouragement to the remote viewer in the manner of a coach giving a pep talk to his team.

During the 15 minutes immediately before the session the remote viewer and interviewer are generally silent. Experience has shown (unpublished data) that this "quiet time" enhances the RV process.

During the 15 minutes the remote viewer and the interviewer function as a team. The interviewer provides encouragement with words of reassurance that the task is, in fact, possible. At no time is the session conducted by the remote viewer in the absence of all other persons.

If the remote viewer does not have any immediate sensory images, the interviewer applies no pressure. Rather, the interviewer reassures the remote viewer that they have all the time in the world. When the remote viewer has an image, experience suggests (unpublished data) that the remote viewer often intellectually transports himself or herself to the remote target site. The interviewer, in conversation with the remote viewer, may then suggest that the remote viewer intellectually move around at the site and describe the site more fully (e.g., buildings, terrain features, people, activities, machinery, etc).

If it appears to the interviewer that the images are in some way contradictory or inconsistent, the interviewer may then attempt clarification by asking questions in order to verify what the remote viewer first described.

~~SECRET~~

The RV session is tape-recorded and pen and paper are available for the remote viewer to sketch his perceptions. Experience has shown<sup>1</sup> that some remote viewers prefer to combine written and oral descriptions, while some prefer to work sequentially.

The average RV session is approximately 30 minutes and never exceeds 60 minutes, not to include drawings, etc.

(4) Post-Session Analysis: After the RV session is over, the remote viewer and interviewer obtain specific information about the target and compare their session results with this data. The remote viewer and the interviewer discuss the session results. The purpose of this post-session analysis is to provide the remote viewer with the satisfaction of knowing how well he or she did.

b. Operations: The elements of an operational remote viewing session, in general, are similar to the elements of the training remote viewing session. The sequence consists of the following: (1) target selection; (2) remote viewing session preliminaries; (3) the remote viewing session; and, (4) post-session analysis and reporting.

(1) Target Selection: Target selection or tasking is initiated by a requestor through USA INSCOM staff where it is subsequently passed to the INSCOM, ADCSOPS-HUMINT, Special Actions (SA) Branch. Within SA, the task is logged by the operations officer and assigned to a project analyst. The project analyst working with the requestor creates the specific task EEI. Subsequently, the project analyst requests the operations officer schedule RV sessions against the task.

(2) Remote Viewing Session Preliminaries: This aspect consists of two phases: (a) project analyst-interviewer preparation; and (b) interviewer-remote viewer preparation.

(a) Project Analyst-Interviewer Preparation: Prior to a session the project analyst and the interviewer discuss the purpose of the session, specific EEI required, line of questioning most appropriate for successful mission accomplishment, and whether the session will be monitored.

(b) Interviewer-Remote Viewer Preparation: This phase of the sequence is similar to that used in a training RV session. The remote viewer is oriented to the procedure to be followed by the interviewer; reminded that he/she should state raw perceptions; and, encouraged to express their feelings and ideas for enhancing all aspects of the remote viewing process.

(3) Remote Viewing Session: This phase of the sequence is nearly identical to the training RV session with the exception of the following:

(a) The project analyst and/or the requestor may monitor the RV session from the control room and provide on-line guidance to the interviewer.

(b) The project analyst and/or the requestor may require drawings of specified descriptions, and may provide post-session debriefing/analytic guidance.

(4) Post-Session Analysis: Upon conclusion of the remote viewing session, the interviewer, in accordance with guidance received from the project analyst, discusses the session results with the remote viewer. The purpose of this discussion is to provide the RVer with feedback in the form of positive reinforcement concerning his/her ability during the session. However, it should be noted that due to the tasking constraints placed upon the interviewer by the project analyst or operations officer there may be no post-session analysis feedback to the RVer.

7. (S/NOFORN) VARIATIONS IN PROCEDURE FOR RV TRAINING:

a. The foregoing has focused on the use of coordinates to obtain from a remote viewer the description of that site. Another approach to the same goal is to use a person in place of a coordinate. For example, the remote viewer is provided some personal information and then proceeds to describe the location of the individual. Thus, the individual serves as a beacon to locate the target by RV. To standardize this approach, the procedure described in paragraph 6 is modified.

b. The elements of this procedure consist of: (1) target selection; (2) remote viewer session preliminaries; (3) activity of person who serves as beacon; (4) remote viewing session; and (5) post-session analysis.

(1) Target Selection: A target pool is selected by an individual not involved in interviewing or remote viewing. The targets chosen will be distinctive, to include more than one example of each. This precludes the remote viewer from eliminating a target because one example was used before. The remote viewer is informed that the target pool consists of similar as well as different types of targets. All other aspects of the target selection element of the procedure remain the same.

(2) Remote Viewer Session Preliminaries: This element is identical to that of the basic RV procedure.

(3) Activity of Person Who Serves as Beacon: At the beginning of the RV session, the remote viewer and interviewer are given one or more items of biographical information or may even meet briefly, for 3-5 minutes, the individual serving as the beacon. If the latter is the case, the beacon individual departs the meeting and obtains the target. This procedure eliminates the possibility of the beacon individual divulging any hint of the target. The beacon individual travels to the target, arriving there at the previously specified time. He or she then interacts with the site for the predetermined length of time of the RV session.

(4) Remote Viewing Session: This element is identical to that of the basic RV procedure.

(5) Post-Session Analysis: This element is identical to that of the basic RV procedure.

8. (S/NOFORN) SCOPE OF TARGETS FOR REMOTE VIEWING: USAINSCOM sponsored RV will exclude US, allied, or neutral nation's citizens as targets except when expressly authorized by appropriate legal authority.

9. (S/NOFORN) PERFORMING ORGANIZATION: USAINSCOM is the performing organization.

10. (S/NOFORN) PROJECTED MAXIMUM NUMBER OF REMOTE VIEWERS AND INTERVIEWERS: (Information classified beyond the scope of this paper.)

11. (S/NOFORN) SELECTION OF REMOTE VIEWERS AND INTERVIEWERS:

a. Historical Perspective: In December 1978 and January 1979 two hundred and fifty-one INSCOM personnel in the greater Baltimore/Washington, D.C. area were considered for participation in the IGFP. These two hundred and fifty-one individuals were experienced in the intelligence disciplines of SIGINT, PHOTINT and HUMINT and represented more than eight units/organizations within INSCOM. Of the two hundred and fifty-one individuals considered, one hundred and seventeen were interviewed by IGFP management personnel under the guise of a "survey" to determine attitudes about the possible use of psychoenergetic phenomena (parapsychology) in the intelligence field. The large difference between number considered and number actually interviewed was due to the following elimination factors applied by IGFP personnel.

- (1) Commander's evaluation.
- (2) Retainability - at least 20 months.
- (3) Health.
- (4) Not readily available (programmed IDY, schools, etc.).

During the selection process, IGFP management personnel were looking for individuals who were open minded, adventurous, above average intelligence, mature and stable, "artistic" in character and personality, successful, well thought of by self and co-workers, articulate, sensitive, and had an ability to "in-flow" data. These characteristics were provided by Stanford Research Institute (SRI) International, Menlo Park, CA. SRI personnel stated essentially that no definite profile has been established, but that their experience has shown that successful subjects (Remote Viewers) normally possess some of these characteristics.

During the interview phase of the selection process consideration was also given to individuals who related their own previous psychoenergetic experiences. Individuals who had objections to the military use of psychoenergetics were not considered for final selection for the IGFP. Additionally, individuals who

displayed an unreasonable enthusiasm for psychoenergetics, occult fanatics and mystical zealots, were not considered for final selection. Of the 117 individuals interviewed, one refused to talk about psychoenergetics at all, three thought that most of what they had heard was nonsense or trickery, three were opposed to the investigation of psychic phenomena on religious grounds, and 110 had favorable opinions towards psychoenergetics and the possible use of psychic phenomena in the military. With 94% of the people interviewed showing favorable attitudes for the IGFP, it was obvious that further screening was necessary to reduce this number to a manageable amount. IGFP screened the interviewees to ensure equal participation across the intelligence fields of SIGINT, PHOTINT and HUMINT, and after an extensive review of the interviews, 15 individuals were selected as prime candidates. However, it was the opinion of IGFP personnel that approximately 30-35 individuals possessed the requisite potentials desired for the IGFP.

b. Current Activities: After over a year of work in IGFP, participants were tested by the INSCOM Command Psychologist in an attempt to determine a suitable profile by which further participants could be identified. The tests administered were:

- (1) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
- (2) Gordon Personal Profile Inventory
- (3) Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B)
- (4) California Psychological Inventory
- (5) Edwards Personal Preference Schedule
- (6) Personal Orientation Inventory

For the most part, the group presented as emotionally stable with no marked trends. There does appear to be an interesting similarity in defensive style, a tending toward artistic, aesthetic, cultural interests, and an introversive style of emotional expression. From these test results the Command Psychologist has constructed a test that may be used as an initial screening tool in the selection of new IGFP participants. Plans are to administer this test to populations such as the MI Officer's Advance Course at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. Individuals who score within parameters specified by the Command Psychologist would then receive personal interview with IGFP management personnel. From these interviews new IGFP participants would be selected.

12. (S/NOFORN) REPLICATION OF THE RV PROCESS: For each participant, the maximum number of RV sessions will be two per day and no more than three per week.

13. (S/NOFORN) JUDGING:

a. Training: Sessions will be judged using the following Target Correlation Chart:

TARGET CORRELATION CHART (TCC)\*

ASSIGNED VALUE	DESCRIPTION	RATING
1	Absolutely no target correlation.	None (0%)
2	Drawings, narrative, and feedback reaction have minimal target correlation.	Low (15%)
3	Increased target correlation, identity of target could not be determined.	Low-Moderate (30%)
4	Many target correlation factors readily recognizable. Target identity possibilities narrowed.	Moderate (50%)
5**	RV data shows unmistakable correlation to the target. Target possibilities can now be typified.	Moderate-High (70%)
6	Little or no extraneous RV data present. Target identity can be readily matched.	High (80%)
7	Correct naming of the target.	Direct Hit (100%)

\* Target Correlation Chart (TCC) was established not to prove or disprove Remote Viewing (RV). Rather, it was designed to measure RV learning trends and to provide Project Management personnel a readily available management tool.

\*\* Current state-of-the-art indicates this level of expertise is the norm for an experienced Remote Viewer.

b. Operations: Sessions will be judged in relation to intelligence usefulness by the requesting agency.

14. (S/NOFORN) CONFIDENTIALITY: Individuals performing as remote viewers and interviewers under the USAINSCOM GRILL FLAME program will not be identified outside of their parent organization without their prior consent, and they will be referred to in project records only by an alpha-numeric designator. Products of remote viewers and interviewers such as tapes, drawings, transcripts, rosters, or other materials which might reveal the identity of the remote viewer will be coded to assure the protection of their identity.

15. (S/NOFORN) PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT: RV sessions will be conducted in an ordinary room at ambient temperature and humidity during the normal waking hours of the participants. The only limitations on these parameters will be security from electronic eavesdropping and elimination of ordinary distracting noises such as a radio and office machinery.