

READING THE ENEMY'S MIND: INSIDE STAR GATE, AMERICA'S PSYCHIC ESPIONAGE PROGRAM by Paul H. Smith. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2005. Pp. 507. \$24.95 (hardback). ISBN 0-312-87515-0.

As with all attempts at historical reporting on such a complex project—running nearly two decades, involving two completely different entities that were intertwined but had separate missions, only one or two common members, and certainly separate histories—this was a difficult task. Paul Smith's effort, while heroic, provides us with some very tantalizing and interesting insights into some profoundly personal viewpoints of his 7-year journey through the United States Army's now-declassified Remote Viewing Collection Program called Star Gate.

*Reading the Enemy's Mind* also offers up original viewpoints held by some of the innovative founders of the program during the critical beginning years prior to Paul's arrival. This is when the influential foundation stones were being laid regarding some of the earliest beliefs and understandings surrounding remote viewing and psychic functioning by such pioneers as Kress, Swann, Puthoff, Targ, and Tart. The book also brings us the views of many others throughout the continuing and historic saga of what *appears* to be an unbiased Star Gate history. But . . . there is a major fault line which runs diagonally through the book. It's unfortunate! I say unfortunate, because there is a lot of extremely good information contained within this book, and, I believe, had the author made a greater effort to let go of many of his personally held convictions, it could have been a book without significant faults.

Paul begins by encouraging the reader to believe that he has aspired to interview in depth as many as possible of the survivors, and to acquire and review as much as possible of the surviving declassified material that is available in his effort to bring us the complete story of the Star Gate program, and that he did this in order to present it to us in an unbiased historical format.

This simply isn't true. There is a self-storage container comprising all of the declassified materials and files from SRI-International and Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) which are available and which, for some reason, he chose not to review. Furthermore, he did not interview Edwin C. May, the man who ran SRI-I from 1985 until the lab terminated there, and who also ran the lab at SAIC from start-up until termination of the program in November of 1995. He also did not interview the undersigned (Joe McMoneagle) for these same periods of employment

at both labs. This failure generated most if not all of the scientific errors in this book. Nor did he interview any of the other full-time personnel who worked in either of the two labs.

However, there are still a lot of basic and amazing facts which have been taken directly from the files that will be of great interest to any reader. It is clear that Paul was able to squirrel away many of the unclassified project files before the program was terminated, or he began his book long before its publication. If he had just been a little less biased in his beliefs or underscored that what he was writing was “his belief at the time,” I feel the book would have been far more accurate.

What would be some examples?

Beginning on page 81 with “Important insights,” these are presented as findings which remain unchanged over time. But these findings have changed. We have found that the responses from multiple viewers do not necessarily improve the quality of the final data. Some viewers see motion at targets, not all viewers improve with practice, and not all people can be taught remote viewing. On page 84 is the question, “Why did the CIA terminate their interest in RV?” Well, to date, no one actually has ever stated why. No one knows. One place that Paul’s real bias peeks through is on page 97, where he begins to differentiate between scientific protocols and methodologies in remote viewing. He goes right to the heart of the matter by stating that, “As the SRI research progressed, it became clear that at least as far as *verifiable targets, consistency, and replicability* were concerned, none of the usual paranormal trappings of crystals, smoked mirrors, tarot cards, and so on were necessary.” True, each of the SRI viewers had a distinctive style. Like major-league baseball pitchers, some even had favorite little rituals. Hella Hammid always wore her lucky socks while viewing, and Pat Price polished his glasses so he could “see” better. Paul goes on further to say; “Bottom line: If what one does is traditionally called something else, it is probably not remote viewing.”

He is referring to the SRI research as it progressed—until he stopped paying attention. This was roughly equivalent to approximately the end of Ingo Swann’s connection to SRI in 1988 and/or Hal Puthoff’s departure from it in 1985 even though there were another 10 years and 18 million dollars worth of research completed, which represented some of the most significant findings made in RV history. The fact that he wasn’t paying attention is clearly established by his continued inability to place “any form of methodology” in the same pile as he earlier so quickly put the smoke and mirrors.

Moving on, in the first paragraph of page 121, Paul implies all personnel at SRI were involved in the development of the CRV training program developed by Swann and Puthoff. This simply isn’t true. The work, although in many way seemingly brilliant, was almost entirely Swann’s. He developed it, after having been given entirely free reign by Puthoff. It wasn’t developed by the SRI staff. In fact, there were some on the SRI staff that were

dead set against it for varied and in some cases good reasons. At the time of its development, there were a few who thought it had some remarkable ideas, but it hadn't been thoroughly tested and it wasn't finished. No one knew if it would work, or if it did, how well. Segments of it had been tested on different people within SRI, some of whom enjoyed the testing, some of whom did not.

On a different note, Paul made a few but common misconceptions about the Monroe Institute and Hemi-Sync®. It's true that Hemi-Sync®, or the introduction of dissimilar frequencies into the left and right ears, is intended to produce an artificially produced beat frequency which the human brain then accepts as real; however, it cannot *cause* altered states of consciousness. What it does cause is a *frequency following response* which the person listening to the Hemi-Sync® can either choose to pay attention to or not. This may or may not promote an altered-state experience, which is purely dependent upon the mood or intention of the person having the experience.

There are a significant number of other technical issues that should be noted, such as: regardless of the cover letter statements, the RAPT program was never designed for screening people for the Star Gate program. The two other sources referenced only by number from 1982 through 1984, with the additional sets of ID numbers given to the undersigned, was to hide the fact that there was only a single viewer during that time period. Only Hal Puthoff and Ingo Swann contributed to the creation of CRV, while everyone else participated as test subjects. When questioned directly, Edwin C. May specifically stated that he did not help in the creation of CRV. In fact, he has stated that clearly, there was some disagreement within the lab (e.g., Hella Hammid, some of the others, and Ingo Swann) over the training method Ingo was developing.

In the 36 years of research into RV, we still do not understand what the carrier of the information happens to be. Therefore, all of the discussion within the book in reference to perception, matrix, signal line, consciousness, aperture, autonomic nervous system, structure, and objectification is purely hypothetical and should be stated as such. However, this isn't the case. It is presented as scientifically proven with the SRI lab, which it was not. Mental noise and analytical overlay was long established as a problem within remote viewing and a solution has yet to be found that positively eradicates this from a remote viewer's lexicon. Few if any remote viewers have been able to demonstrate under laboratory conditions the ability to tell when they are producing valid data versus incorrect data about the target, or to demonstrate when they are positively in connection with the target or not. This problem has rendered all remote viewing systems (methodologies) virtually useless for other than building logic response.

Paul's statement about my last 10 years of service as a Signals Intelligence Analyst and Operator is not correct. I served as Detachment Commander, Border Site A, Schleswig Detachment, Augsburg Field Station

1974–1975; I was the Senior Non-Commissioned Officer in Charge of Physical Security, Office of the S2, Field Station Augsburg, 1975–1977, after which I was assigned to Headquarters, Intelligence, and Security Command, Arlington Hall Station, where I became the CWO, and advisor to Brigadier General Rolya, the commander. I then took control of my Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) world-wide, until recruited by Project Star Gate, from which I retired on September 1, 1984. I worked until that retirement date and did not retire in May of 1984, as stated in the book.

The program didn't stop using geographic coordinates in late 1985. We moved to placing geographic coordinates into envelopes as early as latter 1979, a direct result of CIA complaints. Hypotheses about reading minds and telepathic overlay are interesting but of no scientific validity. They've never been studied in the lab in conjunction with RV, but are opined within the book as a very real part of the RV processes. There are numerous other processes mentioned that, while interesting, cannot be scientifically validated as claimed.

Up until this point my review has been critical and picky. But there are reasons for this. I read the book as it was presented—a historical presentation of what went on inside Star Gate as genuinely scientific. It's not entirely accurate, it certainly is personally slanted, and there is a lot that appears to have been deliberately left out. The question is why?

It is my belief that Paul walked in the door at a bad time. He walked in when there were no old viewers to properly mentor him. He walked in when Ingo was leaving SRI under a large cloud of disappointment and anger. He walked in after having a single and prominent viewpoint handed to him with very little other support, and just prior to having a huge amount of responsibility levied on him. Only a military remote viewer back in those times in that project could ever understand the intense stress and in some cases, duress, Paul was put under when he, like others, volunteered to become a psychic to numerous high-level agencies in our government. As I've said many times before, many days were like a knife fight in a phone booth. Paul, as did all of the others, performed admirably during his time with the unit. It is possible that under such stress he felt that he was less supported than he was tasked most of the time. That's unfortunate, because it hardened him against some of the issues that prevented this from being a better book.

Paul's book is filled with facts, many of which are heavily mixed with Paul's opinions. I have no beef with his opinions regarding training, his sense regarding analytic overlay, transference of mental imagery, how or where information might be stored, the way it's passed between humans, or any other idea that he may have regarding remote viewing. Paul has earned the right to make any comments he would like on the subject, as long as he states those are his opinions and not necessarily facts. The myriad of facts he has gleaned from the project files that he has made available to the public

vis-a-vis his book are a wonderful godsend to the public and I applaud his sincere effort. Where he has provided us with the comments of others and appropriately referenced them in footnotes, he is to be commended. Well done.

However, where the book does fall short is in the numerous errors of omission; whether they are deliberate or simply accidental doesn't matter. His biggest mistake is leaving out virtually any mention of the research effort at SRI from 1986 through 1988, and any mention of the research done at SAIC from 1988 through the project closure in November of 1995. In some cases his errors of omission shortchange some persons or implicate others where they should not. His writing style implies that issues were proven within the well-established rules of science when they were not and that many who worked at the SRI and SAIC laboratories knew more or understood more about remote viewing than they did. In most cases we knew far less than he says we did and sometimes considerably more where he says we didn't. Given the range of impact this would have had on his book and its content, and the number of chapters it would have affected, I'm left with the conclusion that these omissions could only have been deliberate.

So, I guess I'm heavily split on this book. I'd recommend reading *Reading the Enemy's Mind* for a good insider's view about many of the day-to-day activities that went into the Star Gate project, and some of the details regarding the command structure and politics of the unit. But, if you are looking for real knowledge steeped in scientific accuracy, specifically how remote viewing works from a technical standpoint, or what is known or unknown about it, the book doesn't hold up. Paul Smith is a great writer and you probably won't be disappointed reading it. Just remember to take it as only one man's viewpoint of his time in Star Gate.

JOSEPH W. MCMONEAGLE

*P.O. Box 100*  
*Faber, VA, USA*  
*jmceagle@nccwildblue.com*