

# TKR TRANSCRIPT: GARY LANGFORD IN CONFERENCE

02 July 2009 at [www.dojopsi.com/chat/](http://www.dojopsi.com/chat/)

Ten Thousand Roads Remote Viewing and Dowsing Project ("TKR")

Project Home: <http://www.tenthousandroads.com>

Discussion Forum: <http://www.dojopsi.info/forum/>

Viewer Studios & RV Galleries: <http://www.dojopsi.com/tkr/>

Email: "Remote-Viewing" at Yahoo and Google groups

## Introduction to the chat guest:

A web page made to feature Mr. Langford, this transcript, and other information about or from him now or in the future is location here: <http://www.dojopsi.com/rvexpo/Gary/>

**TKR on Gary's invitation to chat:** *Very seldom seen in public, we are honored to host Gary Langford for some Q&A. Gary provided remote viewing for science research from the 1970s until the 1990s, and was a key participant in projects now collectively known as STAR GATE.*

**About Gary:** *Marketing hound; Sales jockey; Physicist; NASA Fellow; worked at Lockheed, SRI International, Geodynamics Corporation, and consulted to SAIC; CEO of five corporations (one NASDAQ); taught graduate studies in Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Stanford University; currently developing a theoretical basis for Psi.*

This transcript was obtained from a live chat held in the TKR chat room at the Dojo Psi. Copyright © 2009 to Gary Langford, and Palyne "PJ" Gaenir ([www.palyne.com](http://www.palyne.com)) on behalf of TKR and the Dojo Psi. (Transcript integrity notes: typos corrected, topical Q&A put more cohesively together, room traffic ignored. Items in square parenthesis were added by Mr. Langford later during review to make a few sentences more clear.) Chat moderator: PJ Gaenir.

## Mr. Gary Langford in Conference at TKR

[moderated session July 2, 2009 at 09:59pm Eastern Daylight Time at [www.dojopsi.com/chat/](http://www.dojopsi.com/chat/)]

*We are Ten Thousand Roads Remote Viewing and Dowsing Project aka "TKR." The rules are simple: Relax, have fun, be cordial, no politics or religion. Remote Viewing rocks!*

**PJ:** TKR would like to welcome Mr. Gary Langford to a 90 minute text chat conference. This is July 2, 2009 at 7:00 PM Pacific Time. A transcript of this chat will be offered at <http://www.dojopsi.com/rvexpo/Gary/> within a few days after this chat for those coming in late or who miss it. Gary it's great to see you!

**Gary:** Thank You.

**PJ:** Thanks for joining us. We have questions coming in already. :- ) Are you ready?

**Gary:** Yes, the visuals are great [text only].

**PJ:** Can you tell us what you are doing lately? With your profession, your spare time, and your psi?

**Gary:** I sold my last company (health-care) in 2005, then took a position as a professor [teaching] engineering and physics. For the past 4 years I have been doing research on evolution and scalability of social structures, specifically functional paradigms. The implications of this research is to narrow down the mechanisms for various levels of performance and functionality. Further, the application to thought processes is foremost.

**PJ:** Wow, that sounds pretty complicated to me.

**Gary:** The essence of the theory is to combine a structure of value, performance, and loss to build a framework from which to evaluate decisions and thoughts. The simple notion that Value = Performance divided by some measure of investment is fundamental to the theory. Given a Value that one ascribes to performing a function, the person will be willing to experience a loss and live with a certain expectation of performance. For RV that means one can improve performance by either increasing the investment or by decreasing the losses.

**PJ:** That sounds great in theory. As part of your research are you coming up with concrete ways to do those latter things for RV?

**Gary:** Improving performance is where most people spend their time. But there is much to gain by decreasing the losses associated with achieving a given level of performance. The theory is only an annoyance that sometimes suggests refinements for RV. The practical uses of the theory are many-fold, which I will write down in the next several minutes.

**PJ:** Alrighty. Great.

**Gary:** First, practice does not always make perfect. If one practices an ineffective method, no gain, only loss. So what should be practiced? To practice the transition from your no-thoughts to your first thought is the first important step. Most of the data is lost at that transition.

**PJ:** Can you describe what a typical RV session is like for you?

**Gary:** A typical session: Yes. I regularly must stop thinking about all else. That means, a concerted effort to eliminate all distractions. Ingo Swann worked in a very quiet room. That in itself can be distracting, unless you are OK with absolute solitude. Rather than

practice in such an environment, I opted to go for more noise and develop the capability to eliminate distractions mentally. The capability to eliminate distractions is a learned action. Actions are measurable and as such have inputs, performance measures, losses, and outputs. Learning to deal with distractions is the first step. Distractions are defined as anything that interrupts your ability to think of nothing. I spent years working on dealing with distractions, mentally. Try RV in a noisy environment (like a bar), in a car, at the races, in a crowd, at the beach (with that annoying water noise stuff) just kidding, but when you are OK with [certain types of] noise, at the beach can be very distracting. Once you have begun to deal with distractions, your ability to not think of anything improves. The simple experiment applies photos of scenes (like National Geographic). They are OK, but there are better targets. Does not really matter, the issue is not one of getting high performance, but merely one of dealing with distractions. You know you are making progress when you have done something regardless of the background distractions. Not thinking of anything is important because that indicates you have no distractions. The period that you can think of nothing will both be more at your command in regards to when you can demand it and the length of time in which you are able to be undistracted. Probably not a word, but undistracted fits.

**PJ:** Glad to see you say that. (Joe McM talks about that as well.) Can you tell me how this ties into the "evolution and scalability of social structures, specifically functional paradigms." -- is it that this is a specific way of narrowing down 'performance and functionality' -- namely, reducing 'loss' during RV?

**Gary:** [Hi Joe] Evolution of your ability is tied directly to your improvement. One evolves from having to do mechanical things such as say a word to begin, or write down a note on paper, or record your thoughts to keeping all that information ordered in your mind. Scalability is the ability to discern the size of target. Early days of RV tried to focus on those targets of a particular size, make that known to the participants and voila, get the results. Learning scalability eliminates the need for target grandness of a certain scale (or size).

**PJ:** So... this would allow you to be more proficient with a much wider target pool bandwidth than normal, yes?

**Gary:** More performance, nearly unlimited range of targets, and little loss. Ergo, the purpose for the theory to help guide the work.

**PJ:** Does this imply that in your current viewing, you keep most of this inside your mind (vs. step by step on paper)?

**Gary:** Yes, all of the information is kept in my head. I am paperless. Save the trees and [all] that. But, let's work with those who have specific "blocks" that inhibit their work.

What are the problems you face?

**PJ:** Visitors: feel welcome to submit suggestions for blocks at left right now.

**Gary:** I can list my blocks in the meantime.

**PJ:** OK great.

**Gary:** First block was the notion that I could do RV, but when I thought much about it, I did poorly. To get over that block took much work to become more accustomed to doing RV. In a week, I would do several hundred RV sessions. Sessions might last 2 minutes. I did not care about performance, just the notion that repetition was healthy. Of course I learned some very bad habits in the process, which I corrected (with the help of many other people). Those corrections were good for me, as it showed me more about the RV process, that eventually led to the theory. I now do at least 5 RV sessions every day. But they are not the type you might think. I am not trying to discern something about an unknown target. I have, for the most part, stopped doing targets. Rather, it is the task to fill in the blank.

**PJ:** Can you elaborate on 'the blank'? Is that a mental model, such as that whatever the proper answer for the question is, is what's in the blank?

**Gary:** A blank might be to describe the missing thought that goes into building something that you have not built before. I'll write about a few other types of blanks. Say you have gone fishing. Knowing where the fish are [located] is important. Knowing if you will catch a fish is important. So the first blank is in selecting the right place to go fishing. Now that you have selected the right place, knowing what to use as bait, knowing where to place the bait, knowing at what time, are all interesting tasks. The list of such tasks is great, so the issue of 5 per day is very easy. Of course, when it comes time to describe something or someone, find something or someone, or just make the right decision, those tasks become much easier. Another blank: struggling with how to improve performance. Performance is measurable and several people have work very diligently to make those measures. Performance is one of the outputs of the viewing. (I hesitate to refer to this as RV, when in fact V is a very small part of it. So forgive the reference to RV, as it is not meant to be restrictive, but only indicative of a broad range of functions that can be done.) Performance: Performance has the same units of measure as the input that initiates the RV mechanism(s). The measures for a "come find me task" is "found me where, when". But there are other measures equally interesting. I like the "how" measure. No one measure is best for a task (regardless of the interests of stakeholders). All measures must be combined in a utility function to really understand performance.

**PJ:** Can you tie this interesting stuff back into where we began: with a typical session for

you? I mean the internal process, since you do this internally?

**Gary:** Yes. I eliminate (avoid) distractions. I'm aware that I have no thoughts about anything. A pose a question of which I want an answer. During the period of no distractions, I become aware of the answer to the question AND all the other related questions that I did not think to ask at the beginning. Now the operative issue is how do I become aware.

**PJ:** Yes, there's the \$64,000 question.

**Gary:** Becoming aware of the answer has three steps that I can discern. The first step is to relate the question to the very atomic thoughts that are associated with the nothingness. Those atomic thoughts, by themselves are not correlated, but only related. Correlation is the third step. The process of correlating requires a pattern. This is not in the sense of pattern matching. If that were the case, then one could not view anything that one did not understand. Pattern acquisition is the free-form comparison with your experiences. Your experiences will cloud the atomic elements, but no matter, they will be removed later. So first, gather the atomic "facts" or notions; second, arrange them in a recognizable pattern, correlate them to the question. Arranging the atomic facts into a recognizable pattern couples your experiences and musing into your response. That is OK (especially since you know that it has happened). To remove your internal thinking, you then correlate your experiences with your experiences.

**PJ:** When you are in the period of 'no-distraction' and you 'become aware of the answer and all the other related questions [etc]' and so you are gathering these atomic facts -- does this translate (in my much more simplistic world) to 'data' -- to 'impressions' ?

**Gary:** Yes, you are making the process simple as you go along. Each RV mechanism is designed to be simple and not progress beyond the next mechanism without eliminating all that you have attached to it. These are conscious steps, the mechanisms are not probabilistic. They are deterministic.

**PJ:** How do you eliminate what you've attached? Such as learning to 'deal with' noisy environs, learning to do it in your head instead of on paper, etc.? Is that an example of doing such a thing?

**Noise:** Noise is self-correlated with your own thoughts. Self-correlation is easy to learn. An example: If one were to want to know what the housing market trend would be - say when would the bottom of a local market occur. Since the real estate news is pervasive in all media, you will have accommodated to the "world view" or the like. Now consider that you have taken this market trend as your task. What would you RV? The newspaper at a sequence of dates in the future? The exact date, correlated to some event that you would

recognize? Not an easy problem to lay out. But... Take a look at the real issue with a market bottom. What does that mean? How does that manifest itself. The RV task may be different than simply RV of an event. Rather, consider that the market bottom is an unrecognized opportunity. No one will actually record the event in real time. In fact, it will be a lagging event - a historical recognition of the fact some months later. You could RV a particular point in time. But that would run the risk of you picking just exactly the wrong time, or the wrong pundit. So this is not an easy RV task, but rather one that requires strong correlation with your experience. I took that task on 4 years ago when I wanted to sell a house, then purchase another one. The market was rising and I missed out, followed the market down and then sold at the worst time, bought a house and then realized that it was exactly the right sequence, timing, and worked out well.

**PJ:** So you RV \_\_\_\_ instead of a point in time. What is the \_\_\_\_ ?

**Gary:** [Filling in] your blanks: Time is the problem. Talking about the notion of time for a while. Time is artificially made up to facilitate our lives. It is not natural in the sense that there is no ethereal time marker from which the world operates. So when we skew our RV with time, we force a juncture of an uncertainty principle (to borrow freely from physics). Instead of trying to "time the market bottom", better to realize that market bottoms occur only because there are two market tops. Between is a "bottom" and if that is the object of the task, then it is easier to peg the market tops.

**PJ:** So the target is defined as much by what it is not, as what it is. If not more-so sometimes.

**Gary:** Yes. I could go on for days on this subject. It is the heart of RV. The processes are different than [we used] before, the mechanisms are well defined, performance is measurable, and the object is to minimize loss.

**PJ:** This stuff is fascinating. But complex, and as a result, we have a ton of waiting questions, each of which I suspect would take another hour to even begin to address. But this is your chat, and I want you to be able to finish a thought before changing subjects. Do you think I could throw out some questions for relatively simple answers (I realize this requires vastly oversimplifying everything!) so some of our guests can have a chance to hear your off-the-top thoughts on a few things?

**Gary:** Yes, let's go for another question.

**PJ:** Are you intending to publish this theory(s)?

**Gary:** Yes, it will be published online, with portions submitted to academic journals.

**PJ:** Wonderful. I hope you will let me know when so I can publicize it in the layman's RV world.

**Gary:** Of course.

**PJ:** Can you tell me, do you "feel" a sense of "target contact" when viewing? And if so, do you have a sense of when or if that is ever lost? Or does that question apply to how you model this?

**Gary:** Yes, I do have a strong sense of the target when I describe it. ('It' refers to any type of target). The sense is one of knowing what makes the target interesting to different stakeholders. One stakeholder might be the "owner" or user or interested party. Each [stakeholder] will have a different perspective about the target, each with their view of correctness. The model (framework in my language) is unique to each of the stakeholders.

**PJ:** Briefly: When you were with us on the TKR forum for a short time, you spoke about building "mental tools" to filter truths about the target. Can you elaborate on the process of that? A bit simply?

**Gary:** The mental tools are the mechanisms of RV. They are sometimes enacted through a method, but also can be linked processes. Various mechanism can be swapped in/out as the target type and the needs of the question require. I have developed 32 mechanisms and their respective performance measures. Some have greater losses than others. All losses are acceptable [so far].

**PJ:** Will these 32 be in your publication on the theory? Or somewhere layman viewers like me can read it?

**Gary:** The short answer is I had not thought about putting the mechanism[s] out with the general theory. But it might be a good idea, so yes, I will provide them. The general theory was meant to be about systems (in general). It builds on the General Systems Theory of the 1960s and has extensions into physics, biology, sociology, economics, and management. The Psi angle was only meant to help me. But yes, it would be a good idea to get more people thinking about it.

**PJ:** Great. Next: When you are doing a session 'in your head', do you simply remember it all? Do you have a mnemonic process or visualization of some sort for doing that? And, how long is your average session (say on an applications target)?

**Gary:** The angle of time is particularly fascinating to me. I have researched causality and now can describe a causal function (as applied to Psi). The other fields mentioned above were much easier to deal with that Psi. Fortunately, there were three experiments at SRI

that gave me all the data necessary.

**PJ:** I would love to have you again someday specifically just to talk about 'time'. Vs. many questions.

**Gary:** Causality when constrained by a temporal event, is locally non-deterministic. However, causality when unconstrained, is deterministic and RV-able. Again, not a word, but it seems to fit.

**PJ:** When you are in 'no-mind' (so to speak), do you have a method for learning to extend this period? If data does not come promptly, how do you 'start' the data flow without invoking unrelated imagery?

**Gary:** Think of time as an artifact. As an artifact, what would replace it. Events, sequenced, would do just fine. In fact, physics can be completely described (non-locally) without time, and only with events. My contribution to physics will have to wait for about 8 years. Several other important tasks take preference. Another question (from right field)

**PJ:** This was missed: When you are doing a session 'in your head', do you simply remember it all? Do you have a mnemonic process or visualization of some sort for doing that? And, how long is your average session (say on an applications target)?

**Gary:** Yes. There is very little to remember. I only remember the differences between the actual data and my internal experiences. It is much simpler as it limits the amount of material that must be thought about. The average session is about 2 minutes. The 'no mind' period can be extended from the initial fraction of a second, to as long as 2 minutes. It takes 2 minutes to plow through the mechanisms (one-by-one).

**PJ:** The other that got missed is: When you are in 'no-mind' (so to speak), do you have a method for learning to extend this period? If data does not come promptly, how do you 'start' the data flow without invoking unrelated imagery?

**Gary:** Learning to stay in the 'no mind' period is just the consequence of doing 1000's of RVs. Each one adds a nominally small amount to the 'no mind' period.

**PJ:** I'm fascinated. Thank you, I felt reasonably intelligent until tonight, when I feel like I can almost but not quite wrap my brain around some of this. I suspect I am missing some core meaning-map variables needed! Next question: In 1986 you were commissioned to develop a psi methodology. That wasn't taken up apparently. How come?

**Gary:** In 1986 I did develop a psi methodology. It is in use today by a small group of people.



**PJ:** Do you use any brain-tech assistance such as audio (tones in various brainwave bands, noise, etc.)?

**Gary:** Tried many, found them all too annoying.

**PJ:** Thanks. Do you see a relationship between gravity and psi, given they both exhibit action at a distance and both are instantaneous (faster than light) in their effects?

**Gary:** Now that is an interesting questions that brings in entanglement. Psi, seems to have interesting correlations - reference Ed May and Spottiswoode. An interesting correlation that I think about but as yet have not really done much with.

**PJ:** You once said that "The essential feature of a target is its interface with other things." Does this tie into what you were saying about the market downs being defined as between the two ups? At the time you said it I was thinking of 'interface' like in art (the white-space outside the object helping define it).

**Gary:** Exactly. Functions are enabled at interfaces. They are the boundary conditions.

**PJ:** Is the idea that, the shorter the session (2 minutes instead of 30 minutes) the easier to be "noise-free" (minimum losses due to noise, stray thoughts, etc.) ? So in your 2 minute sessions -- do you do multiple of these for a given final report?

**Gary:** Yes. 30-minutes is too long for me. Most people I have observed are exhausted. But 2-minutes sustained, is a breeze, noiseless, and useful. The 2-minute RV is complete - start to finish. It is one no distraction zone. A lot can be done, when there are no distractions.

**PJ:** Do you have to do work on 'fleshing it out' or anything like that, later?

**Gary:** Meaning?

**PJ:** I mean if a client asked you for information, you'd say, "Give me 2 minutes?" or, you'd spend two minutes in some deep "atomic thoughts" :-)) and then work on how that all related to each other and so on and finally provide a report?

**Gary:** The 2 minute session is all inclusive thought time, if that is what you mean. Recently, I spent two months writing the report from the 2 minute session. I had more to write, but could not afford to spend more time. One might think I'm a slow writer. But the report was over 500 pages including figures, equations, and text.

**PJ:** How can you tell the difference between 2 minutes + report, vs. 2 minutes + two

months in reporting which is another form of psi itself in fleshing it out? In other words, it seems like the fleshing it out for report process, is an extended model of the RV itself. No?

**Gary:** Depends on the customer. Some want just the "answer" from their perspective. That is fairly simple, and if I can avoid a report and go verbally, I will do it. With the questions and answers, the typical conversation lasts about two hours. If I am doing it for myself (such as with the real estate market), then I will spend about 6 hours writing it up. But if the customer wants a full report they can share with others (policy makers, decision makers, partners, etc), then I take the time to produce a highly professional report.

**PJ:** Last Question as we are out of time: Are there any points you would like to emphasize to the developing viewer (most of us here)?

**Gary:** I have seen so many techniques and have found very few worth while. Worth while means they will do less harm than good and your performance will actually improve. I will post my simple steps. Practice will help you uncover your way.

**PJ:** Gary I'd like to thank you for taking some valuable time to be with us this evening. It's very rare for us to have this opportunity, and I know the transcript of this will be a big hit as well. I hope someday we can do this again! I look forward to anything you'll share with me and I'll make it available however you wish online.

**Gary:** I will prepare an update method. And dig up the 25-year old manuscript.

**PJ:** That would be wonderful! Thank you so much.

**Gary:** Thank you for inviting me.

[end chat, July 2, 2009 at 11:34pm Eastern Daylight Time]

This interview is a part of the **REMOTE VIEWING EXPO JULY 2009** held by **TKR**, the **Ten Thousand Roads Remote Viewing and Dowsing Project**. Expo: <http://www.dojopsi.com/rvexpo/>. The page for Mr. Langford's materials/info is <http://www.dojopsi.com/rvexpo/Gary/>. To talk more about this conference or its ideas, and to see some other things Gary has shared over time, visit the TKR Remote Viewing Forum at <http://www.dojopsi.info/forum/>. To try some hands-on remote viewing yourself, visit Viewer Studios and RV Galleries at TKR at the Dojo Psi, at <http://www.dojopsi.com/tkr/>. To casual chat with other viewers, visit us Monday nights 8:30-10:30pm Eastern at <http://www.dojopsi.com/chat/>.