Remote Viewing the Nina Reiser Case

This is a story about the disappearance of the mother of two young children, in Oakland, California, a city of 420,000 people, across the Bay from San Francisco. Oakland is known for many things – sharing the Bay Area with San Francisco, its exceptionally sunny weather, its vibrant multi-ethnic mix, its professional sports teams - the Raiders and the A’s - and for its very high murder rate. It is not known for the disappearance of mothers in the Oakland hills.

This is also about something called remote viewing. You may or may not have heard about it, although it is becoming increasingly known on the Internet and even in the movies. *Suspect Zero* starring Ben Kingsley is a film about remote viewing, although it presented a heavily fictionalized version. The film makes it seem that remote viewers have a cinema-like image of a place or event in their mind, but this is almost never the case. Remote viewing could be termed a psychic craft. It is real – and our tax dollars supported a 20-year remote viewing program conducted by agencies of the US government. The program would never have been funded year after year if it had not been producing some bona fide results. The US government spent over $20 million on the program before abandoning it in 1996. We will say more about what remove viewing is as this article unfolds.

The main thrust of this report is to follow the history of the disappearance of this young woman named Nina Reiser, including the efforts to find her, both conventional and with remote viewing, the trial that resulted, and the surprising aftermath.

We will present the story as it developed. You will see the deployment of remote viewing by a professional team and get a good sense of how a remote viewing project unfolds. Both verbal and graphic data from remote viewing sessions will be included. We will present the large amount of relevant data that a team can produce while not consciously knowing what the objective (or target) is. We will also show some of the challenges such a project faces and difficulties that arise as the remote viewing data is received by the project manager. We will include the considerable amount we got right, and an important facet that we got wrong.

This piece is written both for those with no knowledge of remote viewing as well as for those versed in the field. Remote viewing deserves to be better known and we believe this effort will convince readers with an open mind that there is indeed something – indeed a great deal -- to this phenomenon. Remote viewing has been scientifically demonstrated to exist – but public awareness lags. We believe those familiar with the field will also find this
piece of considerable interest. You can scour the Internet or the 30+ books about the subject, and find much discussion about its history, and many claims, but few actual remote viewing sessions, much less a remote viewing project from start to finish. (As an aid to looking more into remote viewing, we have appended a list of resources.) There has been quite a bit of teaching done, often offered at a high cost, by viewers who were part of the military program after it became public, but on the whole very little display of actual remote viewing sessions. This is most unfortunate. We offer this account in the hope that it will begin to fill the large gap between the claims that have been prevalent in the field and the expectations that have been created.

As we present the main features of this unfortunate saga, we will interpolate additional information about remote viewing.

**The Disappearance of Nina Reiser**

Let's begin with what happened on Sunday, September 3, 2006 in the hills above Oakland, California. On that day, Nina Reiser, age 31, a recent Russian immigrant, was dropping off her two kids at the house where her estranged husband, Hans Reiser, lived. The house was owned by Hans Reiser’s mother; Beverly Palmer.

Hans Reiser was famous in the Linux software community as the inventor of the widely used Reiser FS file system. He had founded a company called Namesys and had hired programmers in Russia to further develop the software. While in Russia himself, he had met Nina Sharanova and the two had fallen in love, had been married in 1999 and had had two children, Rory and Niorline. However, for a few years now they had been in the midst of a divorce which had become very contentious. Hans Reiser was living at his mother’s house in the Montclair District of Oakland at 6979 Exeter Drive. His mother, Beverly Palmer, was
away that weekend at the counter-cultural Burning Man Festival in Nevada. Reiser would have the house to himself, along with the two children, after Nina dropped them off.

After leaving the kids at Beverly Palmer's house around 2:20 p.m. on September 3, 2006, Nina Reiser disappeared.

Her long-time friend Ellen Doren was the first person to be aware that something was amiss, since Nina was scheduled to have dinner with her that evening at about 5:30. When Nina did not show up, Doren became alarmed and phoned Nina's cell phone several times. There was no answer. Doren informed Nina's boyfriend, Anthony Zografos. Alarmed, he too called Nina's cell phone several times but got only the message on the answering machine.

Following the Memorial Day holiday on Monday, Ellen Doren notified the Oakland police on September 6, 2006 that Nina Reiser was missing. The police began to investigate and soon focused on the estranged husband, Hans Reiser. Some of the circumstantial evidence that led them to do this will be mentioned later on. (For extensive detail about the history of this case, please consult the web sites listed at the end of this report.)

Good friends of Nina Reiser, including teachers at the local school where the Reiser kids went for daycare, formed a committee to help search for her. They set up a web site with pictures of Nina and offered a reward which eventually totaled $25,000. The public was urged to submit to the police any information they had that bore on the case and a police phone number was given for that purpose.

Next, before discussing the work of our remote viewing team on this case, let's look a bit more at what remote viewing is as well as some of its history.

**What Is Remote Viewing?**

In the early 1970's the US intelligence community was worried about long-time rival superpower, the USSR. In particular they were worried that the Russians might have made significant progress in the use of psychics or clairvoyants, in what the Russians called psychotronics. After all, Bulgaria had had a government-paid psychic (Vanga Dimitrova) and some Eastern European countries had utilized clairvoyants for military purposes during World War II. A book by Sheila Ostrander and Lynn Schroeder, *Psychic Discoveries Behind the Iron Curtain*, had been published and had made an impression on US intelligence with its accounts of supposed psychic spying and other 'paranormal' feats. Could it be that the Russians had developed secret psychic weapons – could they read someone's mind, could they injure or kill at a distance? If so, from the point of view of US intelligence, the "psi gap" needed to be narrowed.

As it turned out, two laser physicists, Russell Targ and Hal Puthoff had been investigating what came to be called remote viewing at the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in California. Puthoff brought a natural psychic named Ingo Swann from New York City to the West Coast,
and SRI was testing his and others' remote sensing abilities. In one such series, an "outbounnder" would open a sealed envelope he had been given and drive 20 minutes or so away from the lab to the location specified. He would then stay at the site for a few minutes and later report back what he saw. The remote viewer back in the lab would describe what was at the scene where the outbound person was – and often do so successfully -- and this could be done even if the viewing were done before the outbounder got to the destination. In remote viewing, time was not what it seemed. Nor was space: remote viewers could view locations at any distance, including the planets.

The CIA verified to its satisfaction that there was a genuine phenomenon and entered into a contract with Stanford Research Institute to develop a method that worked and to train remote viewers. Swann took the lead in this effort. Over many months he evolved a set of procedures which was termed Coordinate Remote Viewing (CRV). This is a detailed methodology using pen and paper which the remote viewer follows to produce impressions of the target; i.e., what is at the location or place.

The military itself later became directly involved and ran its own programs, using Swann's method, in the main. The program went by many names over the 20 years of its existence – e.g., Grill Flame, Sun Streak, Center Lane and the most famous one, Star Gate. (This is distinct from the TV series of the same name.) During that time hundreds if not thousands of remote viewing sessions were done. The data from those sessions was submitted as part of the intelligence mix – one form of human intelligence to go with Signal Intelligence and other intelligence "products". It was found that remote viewing was useful but by no means flawless. Accurate data was nearly always mixed with inaccurate data. Nonetheless the program survived uncertain round after round of funding over the years and continued to produce information utilized by US military and intelligence agencies.

In 1996 the CIA decided to unburden itself of the program and sponsored a report that said, in effect, even though the technique had been used and was funded and refunded for 20 years, Really, there is nothing to it. Their claim was that remote viewing had not demonstrated its usefulness to the intelligence community. This was a misstatement, to say the least.

After the program was (ostensibly) disbanded in 1996, several remote viewers who had been in military intelligence began teaching remote viewing to the public and some launched remote viewing companies. These included Sergeant First Class Lyn Buchanan, Major Paul Smith, Captain David Morehouse and Major Ed Dames. F. Holmes "Skip" Atwater joined the Monroe Institute in Virginia to explore the possibilities. Joe McMoneagle, viewer 001, undertook extensive work in laboratories as well as client work. McMoneagle, virtually alone among the group, has repeatedly demonstrated his exceptional abilities on television, including many times on Japanese television and is widely considered the world's foremost remote viewer. Ingo Swann continued his work in the laboratory and wrote copiously on the subject. In the succeeding years, many civilians were trained in remote viewing and entered
the scene, mainly teaching RV, but also forming businesses. These included Angela Thompson Smith, Courtney Brown, Prudence Calabrese, Wayne Carr, and Simeon Hein. Most of these individuals have written books about remote viewing. In addition there had been a long-existing separate civilian stream of remote viewing which had done extensive practical and scientific work. Stephan Schwartz is a leading such viewer and practitioner.

So, what is this remarkable thing called remote viewing? How does it work? It is easy to describe it, but not yet possible to say how it works. No one knows. That is, no one knows the underlying scientific principles behind remote viewing. Remote viewing contradicts the known laws of physics. However, we know the kinds of things remote viewers can do to get data and improve its quality over time – although opinions vary about methods and protocols.

First, to become proficient, a viewer needs to believe it is possible to do it. Or better yet, as Joe McMoneagle put it – To go from believing you can to knowing you can is perhaps the most significant step you can take.

Skepticism can diminish remote viewing results, although some skeptics visiting Stanford Research Institute were put to the test on the spot and to their amazement found it did work after all.

Next, a cool-down may help – such as a short period of relaxation or meditation. Some viewers use CD’s specially designed to foster certain brain rhythms, particularly theta rhythms. No drugs are used, nor hypnosis. The viewer is awake and usually has his/her eyes open.

There are two broad approaches to practical remote viewing (as opposed to viewing in the lab). The first is advocated by Russell Targ and Joe McMoneagle. In this method, to greatly simplify, you ask for the target to be presented and then wait for the information, visual information in the main, to appear in your mind’s eye. You draw and write as you receive the impressions. This is the informal method or approach.

The other approach uses one of several highly structured methods. The predominant method was that developed by the Stanford Research Institute and Ingo Swann and is called Coordinate Remote Viewing (CRV). A later branch was termed Controlled Remote Viewing, and there are other variants as well. Others methods include SRV (Scientific Remote Viewing) and TDS style/Knosomatics.

All these methods involve a viewer or viewing team, and a tasker, the person who assigns an arbitrary number or alphanumeric (set of numbers plus letters), conventionally 8, to the target. This is generally the only information the viewer is given. The viewer undertakes the session knowing nothing (or little) about the target or objective, which could theoretically be anything in the universe.
In practice, there are various factors which may lead a viewer’s conscious mind to surmise something about the objective. A tasker may be known or suspected to select certain kinds of objectives, for example. But the goal is to keep the viewer "blind" to the target. If the viewer knows anything specific about the objective, he is said to be "frontloaded". This is not desirable because accurate remote viewing data does not come from the conscious mind but from somewhere else -- referred to variously as the subconscious, unconscious, Jung’s Collective Unconscious, the Matrix, the Akashic records, and the like.

The tasker may also be blind to the target or he/she may have some knowledge of the target. For example, the tasker may know who the client is and what the client is likely to be interested in. Or a client may simply tell the tasker what is being sought, say, a missing child, where a valuable object, how to solve a certain problem. In any case, the tasker does not communicate this information to the viewers.

There may be a separate analyst who analyzes the data, or the tasker may do so himself. There may or may not be a separate Project Manager. There is debate in the field and varying practices about setting up and doing remote viewing, whether for clients or for practice. There is in fact difference of opinion about virtually every aspect of remote viewing and how it is carried out. (We will not enter into that debate here, but will set forward our practice of remote viewing in this case as we proceed.)

Using the more structured methodology, the viewer thus has only the 8-digit alphanumeric to go on. After cooling down, the viewer usually reads the tag (as it is called) aloud, and makes a quick small "scribble" on the page. This is usually one of a pre-defined set of graphic marks called the ideogram. One set of ideograms uses basic lines for water, mountain, land, structure, subject, etc. Water or liquid is a wavy line, drawn very quickly. A mountain or/peaked shape is the obvious ^ shape. Land or a flat surface is a straight horizontal line. These ideograms are thought to contain some or possibly all information about the objective, in miniature or embryo, as it were. However, remote viewing may be practiced – successfully – without ideograms - as done by Joe McMoneagle and Gary Langford (the latter an early coworker at Stanford Research Institute). The tag may be repeated during the session, getting a new impression of the site each time. The viewer then uses other techniques which are beyond the scope of this piece to produce graphic and verbal data relevant to the objective. It is not an easy process and takes considerable training. Some, like Lyn Buchanan, refer to it as a mental martial art.

As mentioned, this data is virtually never 100% accurate. Some use a scoring method and claim accuracy rates from 60% to 80% or above. However, others do not use a scoring method, for a variety of reasons. For example, some data is symbolic or metaphorical and such data is very hard to score objectively.
The viewer will then do her session, generally taking between 15 minutes and 2 hours, depending on the method, type of objective, importance of the objective, viewer's stamina, or other factors.

Once done, the session is then sent to the analyst or project manager. Remote viewing works best with a team of viewers and the analyst may retask several times and receive several sessions from each viewer, depending on the scope and progress of the project.

The analyst then scrutinizes the data using skills and methods developed in that school of remote viewing. The viewers may be tasked again to learn more about a specific objective. If so, they are given new tags for each re-tasking. They then may be told to utilize specific techniques or undertake certain maneuvers, such as "View the objective from 100 feet overhead" or "Move to one hour earlier." This may help the viewer focus in on what the client needs to know without telling the viewer anything specific about the objective. In the military and elsewhere, an additional person, a monitor, has been used to facilitate the process of exploring the viewer’s responses.

This in brief is how remote viewing works, on practical projects. In the laboratory, different and tighter standards and methods are of course applied.

**An Abandoned Van Is Found**

Let us now return to the Reiser case.

On September 9, 2006, nearly a week after Nina Reiser’s disappearance, her Honda Odyssey minivan was found in the Thornhill district of the Oakland hills. She had been shopping with her two kids on Sunday, September 3 at the Berkeley Bowl in the nearby city of Berkeley and the groceries, now rotting, were still in the van. Her purse was also still there as was her cell phone. The batteries from the cell phone had been disconnected.

Nina’s van was found 3 miles from Beverly Palmer’s house, the house where she had dropped off her kids and where she had last been seen. The question was, Where was Nina? Had she abandoned her van and disappeared to escape from her her ex-husband and the nasty situation, or had there been foul play?

**The Aurora Remote Viewing Group Begins Viewing**

The Aurora RVG is a group of dedicated remote viewers with members on three continents (UK, USA and Australia). One of the members, Ken Gardner, happens to live in Oakland. In the fall of 2006 he heard about the Reiser case and decided to task the group with Nina Reiser’s disappearance. (Aurora viewers rotate in tasking the team. In this instance viewers knew that Ken was the tasker. Aurora now uses a blind tasking mechanism so viewers do not know who the tasker is.)
There were several reasons to do undertake this objective. A woman had disappeared and the police were seeking assistance from the public. A couple of large searches had been undertaken without turning up a clue. The Aurora group had been formed in 2004 with the goal of doing useful and productive work, e.g. help find missing people, help solve historical or current problems or puzzles, and the like. Since Ken lives in Oakland, he would have the advantage of being able to follow the case up close. This is not generally possible since remote viewers most often view an objective which is far from where they live, and/or remote in time. They may never get close to the location or be able to find sufficiently specific information about the objective, online or otherwise. In addition, many cases do not get the kind of media coverage the Reiser case was likely to get and if remote viewing could prove useful in the case, that would be a very good thing.

October and November 2006 went by and Nina Reiser was still missing. Searches by hundreds of policemen, fireman and volunteers had turned up nothing. On October 10, 2006, Hans Reiser was arrested for the murder of his wife. He proclaimed his innocence.

In December 2006 the first tasking on the case was given to the Aurora team. The first objective was "The person or persons who left Nina Reiser of Oakland, California's minivan in Oakland's Thornhill neighborhood in September 2006. Viewer will describe the person or persons in detail."

A tasking should contain a main focus (person or persons in this case), a place (Thornhill neighborhood) and a date/time (September 2006). That allows the viewer's subconscious (or whatever the source of the information is) to focus on a specific place and what went on there at a specific time. If the date/time period is not specified, the viewer may view the location at another time and thus miss the desired information.

Again, recall that this is what the tasker has in mind, but the viewer receives only an alphanumeric. In this case Ken chose the made-up word "Nordor" as the tag. The tag could have been, say 8332-BRRB, or any other alphanumeric. The tag is an arbitrary alphanumeric with no meaning other than to serve as a bookkeeping tool.

So, to repeat, the viewer is given the tag and asked to produce a session. They have no idea what the objective is. It could be a naval vessel off the Ross Ice Shelf in Antarctica on July 30, 1922, the first performance of Beethoven's Ninth, a person under investigation by the US Senate on August 8, 1991, Yankee Stadium at 12 midnight July 15, 2008. It could be anything. The Aurora RVG, as presumably all remote viewing groups, wish to limit the temptation to guess what an objective may be. So taskers are asked to produce varied and unpredictable objectives.

A team of viewers was utilized for this project, with some doing more sessions than others. The Aurora Group is made up of trained and experienced viewers, including some who have
done professional (paid and unpaid) work for clients on their own or as part of a previously existing organization. Aurora is a group still in development.

Unlike most other groups in the field, Aurora consists of viewers from several schools or methods, e.g. CRV, TDS and SRV. It has been a challenge to work together given the different methods and approaches, but over about four years we have developed a modus operandi and have worked together with successful results on a variety of in-house and a few outside projects.

The group is not infallible nor is its data even 95 percent accurate, nor is any RV group or individual, despite the hyper-inflated claims of a few in the field.

As mentioned above, we present this report on our work as a contribution to the field, and hopefully to help bring further awareness of RV to the public. Some aspects of this project were successful and one was not. We will present both facets of the work and lay out the project in detail so that newcomers and those within the field can follow the ins and outs of a specific project as it developed. As mentioned, this kind of work is largely unpublished and unobtainable. We think the positive and accurate data we have obtained shows what remote viewing is capable of. At the same time we do not shy away from indicating where and how we fell short in a key area.

First Tasking: Nordor

Tag: Nordor:

"The person or persons who left Nina Reiser of Oakland, California’s minivan in Oakland’s Thornhill neighborhood in September 2006. Viewer will describe the person or persons in detail."

Let us look at the first session done by a viewer who goes by the code name Athena. (Some viewers prefer to use a code name to protect their privacy). She uses a variant of the TDS method, which was taught by a group that no longer exists (TransDimensional Systems). In this method the viewer starts by producing three "scans" – three pages of organized data about the objective following a certain format. In each of her scans for this target, Athena gets a "subject" (a subject being a person, animal, or other living creature.)

In scan 2 she describes the subject in the following way, alongside a cartoon sketch of a person:

Fragmented, unyielding, manic, artificially happy, precise, clinical, masculine, cheerful, smiling, light-skinned, thin, short hair, youngish (looking), non-military bearing, civilian, outside, lots of clothes on. She says she doesn't take him very seriously. He 'reminds me of a guy from a '30s or '40s movie with hat and trench coat – happy-go-lucky.
Again, recall that the viewer knows nothing at all about the objective. It might be an object, a place, an event, or it could be a person. She immediately is drawn to a person, and a male – which on the face of it is entirely relevant to this objective.

She goes on in scan 3 to give further details about this man:

*Chain-smoker, thin, masculine, something 'made up' or artificial about this subject, not a well-developed body, teasing personality, charmer, thin, carefree demeanor, nonchalant with his posture, laugh lines around his eyes. Doesn't seem like a 'modern' guy...some kind of 'throwback' to another era. She adds, Young guy who's feeling his way in life and is naïve or inexperienced.*

Athena sums up the subject:

*Thin, average build, tall-ish (5‘10’), younger looking than he is, 30’s, blondish hair, round face, no facial hair, face has an 'open look' to it, likeable, amiable, doesn't say much about himself, just 'one of the group', drab-colored clothing (tan), wears a hat, looks like a guy in spy movie in the 30s or 40s, smarter than he looks, cultivates the happy-go-lucky persona, level-headed, laughs easily, smokes a lot, good eyesight, unattached, heterosexual, makes friends easily.*

She concludes: *Subject knows a lot, discreet, acts innocent but he knows what's going on, not keeping secrets from anyone, but keeps most of his thoughts to himself, at his physical (peak).*

When Ken saw this session, his immediate impression was that Athena may have been describing Nina Reiser's husband, as the person who caused Nina's minivan to be left in the Oakland hills. Since the police had already arrested Hans Reiser, it was logical to see if the data matched this suspect.

Here are some pictures of Hans Reiser:

Do attributes in Athena's description match Hans Reiser? Quite a few do, yet some don't.

Reiser is of course a male. He is about 5'9" and weighs an estimated 190-200 (based on his appearance in 2008). He was a young-looking 41 years in 2006. Some might say he has an open-looking face – this is a subjective judgment. He had little facial hair at the time of viewing (2006). He is a civilian, he is heterosexual. These and other aspects match with the
exception of thin and blondish hair. Reiser is not thin. He is heavily muscled in his lower body and legs and has strength in his upper body – as came out later, he practices yoga. His hair is dark brown/black. Not much was known at the time about Reiser’s personality and some of those attributes could not be matched.

Especially interesting is the assertion that he knows a lot, discreet, acts innocent but he knows what’s going on. The implication is that Reiser may know a lot about the disappearance (he certainly knows a lot about Linux and file systems). He acts innocent. Then Athena asserts that he is not keeping secrets from anyone, which counters the previous impression that Reiser may have been involved in the disappearance.

It is hard to say whether Reiser is a throwback. This is a particular impression by the viewer based on how she perceives his personality. Athena asserts that Reiser smokes, is a chain smoker. Nothing about this had been published in the media at the time so this was unknown.

Reflecting on what Athena has arrived at, totally blind to the objective -- she has produced data suggesting that the person responsible for leaving the minivan on Thornhill Drive was a male with some distinct resemblances to Hans Reiser, already arrested in connection with the disappearance of his wife.

Next, let’s look at the data of another member of the team, Daryl (Daz) Smith. Daz uses a variant of the CRV method. As noted, this is the predominant method at this time. Also, it should be noted that as viewers become experienced, they tend to modify the details of the method to suit their own viewing style and preferences, which Daz has done. Like Athena, Daz is a highly experienced, professional viewer.

Daz’s session is less focused on a single person or persons. This sometimes happens -- the team may produce data as if there were a division of labor behind the scenes. It also happens that viewers may be "off" on a given day and do not get much about the objective. In this session Daz produces a number of databits suggestive of the general situation that is being targeted, yet not focusing as Athena does on the person who may have been responsible for leaving the van.

One might argue – Wait a minute - he is off target. He didn’t focus on one person (or several). Well, let's take a look at the data and see if you agree that there are parts of it that do indeed relate to this case.

The CRV method builds slowly, going through six stages in which limited bits and pieces of the scene (target) are first produced, and then later more fully formed impressions are rendered.

Early on, Daz’s ideogram indicates there is a structure. On page 2 he writes structure, land, life. He gets an impression as well of missing. This is listed as an AOL (which means "Analytic
Overlay" and refers to the possible imposition by the conscious mind of its usually flawed or erroneous impression). On page 3, Daz writes distress along with feminine. On page 4 he asserts that life is the key element and structure is secondary focus.

On page 5 Daz moves to Stage 2 of the CRV method and writes AOL's of urban (correct), injury (as we later learn, correct), and missing/lost (correct). On page 6 he relates what is called an "Aesthetic Impression" (AI) of feel lonely/dark/cold. Page 7 contains line drawings of some structures. On page 10 he has impressions of small, compacted, hidden. Also, female, small, not old. Confused thought. Heady. Dehydrated – illness – head problem.

Later Daz offers structure, abandoned, alone, broken, gray, urban. Missing, stop, gone. And an AI of a feeling of lost/gone – a lost runaway?

Further on: Anger, fear, regret. AI: an argument over money? And an AOL: search for a missing girl -- which hits the nail on the head.

Daz concludes this session with the following drawing and the caption: a road sign with tall trees behind curving to the right – into the dark.

Once again, it is important to remember that this objective could be anything at all in the world or universe. Nor was it the case that Aurora had been doing a lot of missing persons
cases (although we, and Daz in particular, have done a lot more since this case). Quite a variety of objectives had been given to the viewers.

The wording of the tasking – and the wording is important and must be carefully crafted – was "The person or persons who left Nina Reiser of Oakland, California's minivan...". Describing either Hans or Nina Reiser is consistent with this wording, if both were in the van. As it turns out, and will be evident later on in the report, it is unlikely that Nina Reiser was in the van when it was left in the Thornhill area. It is remotely possible, but not likely. However, it happens that viewers do in fact ascertain aspects of an objective that may not be spelled out in the tasking.

We submit that the data from Daz's session is very suggestive indeed and clearly relates to this case. He has a missing "girl" (Nina was a young-looking 31). He notes an injury to the head (later confirmed). Anger, fear. An argument (reported by the boy, Rory). As became evident later as the case developed, Daz's drawing of the curving road, pines and an entrance area was spot on.

There was also a session by another very experienced Auroran who goes by the name of Mrs. Bun. She also uses a variant of the TDS method. One drawing from that session is especially noteworthy:
Compare the above with the following Google Earth image looking down from the Oakland hills westward toward the high rises in downtown Oakland, out to the San Francisco Bay, with many winding streets leading up toward the Oakland hills (and 6979 Exeter Drive).
Although the viewer indicated that the winding areas and curved lines in her drawing were below ground level, the overview of a city on the horizon, the curving lines, along with the cars drawn, suggested to Ken that perhaps the viewer was depicting the general location of the hills of Oakland. Sometimes a viewer will have accurate or suggestive graphic data, but the accompanying words or labels may be inaccurate. Remote viewing, although it encompasses all of the senses, is a highly visual process, and verbal data, especially data that attempts to name as opposed to describe the objective, may be off base. On the other hand, sometimes – rarely -- the viewer actually names the objective. (In Daz's data above, his AOL conveys the specific situation (missing female) but, as is understandable, not her name.)

**The second tasking: Lincash**

At about the same time, in early December 2006, the viewers were tasked with another objective: The tag was "Lincash" (another made-up word) and the accompanying wording was: "The present location of Nina Reiser of Oakland, California, or her remains". For this objective Ken wanted to focus on the location and so the viewers were asked to delineate salient features within a 10-mile distance of the objective. This is a mild form of frontloading and is sometimes used in a project to help orient the viewer. In any case, virtually every objective is associated with some location, whether it be a person, event, object or just the location itself.
Five viewers undertook this tasking. Since Athena appeared to be "on" with the first tasking, let us see what she came up with for this second tasking. She did her viewing on December 6, 2006 and produced this sketch of the location:

![Sketch of location](image)

The drawing consists of a scene with mountains or high hills, trees, and a road or path leading to a square structure apparently made of bricks or stone. It is not clear if the wavy lines are liquid or vegetation or something else.

Athena uses the following words to describe the setting: shadowy, darkened, evening, earthy smells, not well lit, moist, cool, closed-in. Later, dark surroundings, low luminance, on uneven ground, gravel, rural area. She also depicts an older male, who doesn't have good posture.

Further about the location: peaceful, outdoors, dusk or nighttime, cool, clear air, higher elevation, not many subjects (people) around, windy, isolated. She sums up: an isolated area with few people but abundant in natural resources.

The structure she sees is tucked away or protected by a large natural landmark, like a mountain. There is lots of greenery which suggests rainfall, but there's significant dryness. Evening is the most potent time. The area has a national park feel to it – natural, not abused,
appreciated but not well-known. The subject may not be associated with the structure – he is just typical of the subjects who live close by.

Next there was a session from another accomplished, professional viewer, Lapis. Lapis also uses a variant of the TDS method.

His session also refers to an outdoor setting, dirt, gravel, scenic (?) – hill overlooking water. He writes that it may be the Bay Area (California). Lapis has immediately zoomed in on the area where the case is taking place.

Lapis also gets a significant structure, but it is quite different from Athena's. He refers to a large structure, which many people enter. He suggests it is an intellectual place; higher learning is relevant. But as with Athena's data, it is in a scenic location.

Here is his summary:

This appears to center/focus on a place/location that is surrounded by nature, more than highly urban. It may be on hilly or elevated terrain, and near the coast.

There’s a large structure with a few descriptive elements. The structure (one of them) is rather large and complex. It’s accessed by a fairly large number of people. There's much concrete and metal here. The structure has internal spaces for people to go into. The feel of the place was that of 'intellectual', white collar. There's at least one large curving metal structure. The location seems to have a concrete set of stairs that leads down or into (it). There seems to be glass, much glass built into the exterior architecture here. There's a rather long (tall?) metal vertical post with a coil around it, and a rather industrial red glowing light there. There may be a component of music and reference to a female.

He then notes, Palomar – why?

Mt. Palomar is the site of an astronomical observatory located in Southern California, where Lapis lives. It is 29 miles from the Pacific coast. Lapis had said the structure he viewed is "near the coast". Is there an equivalent observatory in the Bay Area, since Lapis has referred to the Bay Area as the possible location of this objective? There are two main ones: The Lick Observatory on Mt. Hamilton in San Jose (South Bay) and the Chabot Space and Science Center in – the Oakland hills. Not only is the Chabot Center in Oakland, the above data fit it well.
Here are three pictures of the Chabot Center

The Center is situated in a large park on a crest of the hills above the city.

Chabot contains large amounts of metal and glass, and many people visit it for 'intellectual' pursuits – astronomy.

Above are two "large curving metal structure(s)".
In addition, The Chabot Center is less than one mile from the house where Nina Reiser was last seen. It is the only major manmade structure within a one-mile radius. Is it coincidence that Lapis has referred to an astronomy observatory and that one exists within one mile of the Reiser home? Ken did not think so. Just as in ordinary vision the eyes are drawn to objects that 'pop out' in the field of vision, so remote viewers gravitate to salient targets. It is well known, for example that it is easier to view striking or well-known objectives such as the Eiffel Tower or Grand Canyon than more mundane ones. In this instance, Lapis accessed the most significant large structure close to where Nina Reiser was last seen – within a mile. This suggested that perhaps Nina Reiser or her body was in fact still close by.

Lapis and another viewer had data about a pole- or tower-like object with a red light or flame on top. Note the tower in the distance with the red light on top in the following picture taken at night from the Chabot Center. This turns out to be a transmission tower with a warning light on top. Ken surmised that this might be the light that viewers were depicting, although it is not at the Chabot site.

The Chabot setting is compatible with Athena’s drawing as well. The Chabot Space and Science Center lies within a very large wooded park, on the ridge of some high hills, with further hills and valleys beyond.

Whether Oakland is close to the coast depends on what Lapis meant by close. It is about 21 miles to the beach in San Francisco on the Pacific Ocean. Oakland borders the Bay and from the Chabot Space and Science Center it is 8 miles to the beach in the town of Alameda, the closest part of the Bay.

We next turn to viewer Daz's session for this objective. He writes: I get the impression that the 'land' place is key/important – as if it tells a story! He also gets darkness, land, dark and writes an AOL of hole!

This session also contains the AOL: abduction! and on the next page: Feels dark or at night. Life around – moving – but shapes not clear to me. Doing something – carrying/fetching. A process or processing. Something internal. A need to finalize.
Also: remote, isolated, lonely, expanse. And AOL of Road.


Here we have a number of elements that clearly pertain to the objective. Abduction — Nina Reiser is missing, in suspicious circumstances. As with other sessions, the impression given is that something important occurred at night. The need to finalize is ominous, although if Nina had run away, it could refer to finalizing her divorce or separation from Hans Reiser. Expense, problems, a mess, and the like are also accurate. It became known that Nina and Hans had quarreled about large sums of money. His company Namesys was in serious financial straits. He accused Nina of not spending wisely and also embezzling from the company.

Slashing movement and trickle suggests a knife may have been used.

Thus after only two sessions, viewer data suggests:

A male with a description applicable to Hans Reiser was the person who left the minivan in the Thornhill neighborhood. One assumption behind the tasking was that whoever left the van in that location was either responsible for Nina Reiser's disappearance or was an accomplice to same. If the description had matched Nina Reiser, and other data fit, then it would have suggested she had disappeared on her own. Unfortunately, from the data, that was not the scenario that was shaping up.

Second, as to the location of Nina Reiser or her remains as of December 2006, three months after she disappeared, the viewers had suggested:

An elevated hilly place, park-like, outdoors. The Bay Area is the only geographical area mentioned. The Chabot Space and Science Center appears to be relevant as the location itself or close to it, from Palomar and other data. There may be a smaller structure which she is inside, alive or dead, but from the thrust of the data, dead.

From this point on, the analyst focused on Hans Reiser as the person most likely to be responsible for her disappearance and on the Oakland hills as the prime locale to look for her or her remains.

The police had had this opinion for some time. Hans Reiser remained in jail while searches were conducted for Nina Reiser in the large parks atop the Oakland hills and beyond. Oakland in fact has one of the most extensive park systems of any large urban city in the country. These parks have deep canyons and the parks stretch at least 10 miles north to south. It is quite a large area and one very hard to search, given the size, steepness and thick forest cover. As mentioned, Beverly Palmer's house, where Nina was last seen, is on the outskirts of Oakland, close to where the Redwood Regional and connecting parks begin.
The following image from Google Earth conveys the size of these parks.

(Google Earth and similar imaging software constitute magnificent new tools, in particular for remote viewing work. In many urban areas not only are there customizable overhead views but also a "street view" with 360 degree photos taken by ground level cameras on a high percentage of the streets.)

As winter passed, the Oakland Police continued their investigation. Nina’s last boyfriend, Anthony Zografos was among those who had been questioned early on as a possible suspect. He had been instrumental in setting up the Find Nina Reiser web site and had been energetic in placing ads and taking part in searches for Nina. He reported that he had reached out to Hans Reiser following the disappearance, but Reiser had not responded.
In contrast, Hans Reiser had acted suspiciously from the outset. He had not taken part in any searches. He had immediately consulted a lawyer after the disappearance, saying he might become a suspect. He did not initially cooperate with the police. His small CRX car was missing and he drove his mother’s car until after she returned from Burning Man. He tried to avoid police surveillance, driving so as to try to shake them. When his CRX was found, the right front passenger seat was missing and the floorboard of the car was wet. Also found in the vehicle: socket set used to remove the front seat, roll of trash bags, masking tape, siphon pump, absorbent towels, traces of blood, and two books: "Homicide: A Year on the Killing Streets" and "Masterpieces of Murder." The former is about the Baltimore homicide squad and the latter is about notorious murder cases.

Reiser had also been observed by a neighbor washing down his driveway while wearing heavy clothes on a warm night shortly after Nina Reiser disappeared.

When police searched the Exeter house, they found spots of blood on a pillar, blood which matched both Nina and Hans Reiser.

In short, there was abundant circumstantial evidence that Hans Reiser was responsible for Nina’s disappearance, and on this basis the Oakland police had arrested him on October 10, 2006.
In late December 2006, Ken attempted to get more specific information about the geographical location. He drew up a blank grid and laid it over a map of Northern California. The viewers did not know the scale nor the area of the grid. They were shown only the blank grid. Three viewers produced locations on the grid. These locations ranged from between 50 to 100 miles from where the Exeter Dive address. Since Hans Reiser had traveled as far as Reno after the disappearance, it was possible that Nina’s remains were located somewhere in this huge region, and not in the Oakland hills. Or if she had vanished on her own, she could be far from Oakland. The attorney Reiser had engaged opined that Nina Reiser might have gone back to her native Russia.

Another experienced viewer, River, was given a grid of just the Bay Area and produced two locations, one across the Bay, south of San Francisco and another about 10 miles north of Oakland. All of these locations were among the places where Nina or her remains could conceivably be found.

As February 2007 came around, with Hans Reiser slowly headed toward a trial, Ken tasked the team once again, focusing on another aspect of Nina’s disappearance. The team remained blind to the objective – they did not know it was about the disappearance of a woman, about her husband, where or when this took place, etc.

**Third Tasking: Jornoba**

Tag: Jornoba. "Viewer will describe what happened to Nina Reiser of Oakland on September 3, 2006 after she dropped off her kids at her estranged husband’s house in Oakland, CA. Subcue: Viewer will describe the route she/her body traveled on September 3 and any travel she/it did in the following week."

Four viewers viewed this objective. There was a mix of data, which is always the case. Some of the session material did not seem relevant to the objective and some did.

One viewer, Dom, had *hidden pathway* on page one. Also on the same page *dark, ridged, piney*. The themes of dark/darkness, night, pines, a ridge (or hill) were appearing in many of the sessions.

Dom also has: *feverish, worried, blame, love, care and nearby: horrendous and autopsy. As well as: annoyed, anxious, trail – hide!*

*Autopsy* - It was becoming increasingly likely from the data that Nina Reiser was no longer alive.

Viewer Daz summed up his session this way:

*Land: Hard, solid, regular, rough, compact. Linear, stacked, grey.*
Life: Felt feminine. A life form plus something/doing something. The life form and motion seem to be one. Life – in, under, surrounded! The life is strong, confident, moving with the flow of movement against her.

Lines and linear markings are important to this target. "Follow the lines" came up time after time. The overall environment feels warm/hot even, very sunny and lots of nature/feel close but also structures. (Here is one example of the lines Daz drew)

Stacked, compressed, linear, surfaces feel important – here I had strong AOL’s of layers of soil, and something buried. I feel the target is something hidden/missing and the quest to find it.

A tall, strong linear manmade structure is the nearest thing over 150 feet to the target area – I felt this was 5 miles away (linear) moving south/southeast.

The target place felt American, and the colour/heat felt like California – but this is feelings more than direct knowledge. Overall, I feel that form above a configuration of lines/linear components would lead to the target.

The motion seems to be fluid – but I find it hard to say like water as it didn’t feel like liquid. It felt and moved slower but still in a wave-like motion – like sand/marsh or something?

Conclusion: I would say the target is a life, lost probably buried and the life is buffered/moved by the natural environment. In a remote but close to structures location where linear components clearly lead to the target area – (seen from above).

This session further supported the main thrust of the information that had come before. Here, still quite blind to the objective, a viewer was asserting that the feminine life form was dead and buried. From 6000 miles away in the UK, Daz said it felt American and like California in particular.

He further indicated that there are lines, as seen from overhead, which will lead one to the objective. These could be roads or other lines on the ground. There are many twisting roads in the Oakland Hills (recall page 16 above), and a particularly twisting road which descends sharply into a canyon not far from the Palmer/Reiser house. This is Pinehurst Road.
The following image shows Pinehurst Road (the sharply curving road bottom left, unlabeled) in Google Earth with the "Roads" feature turned on. This brings out the street patterns when seen from above.

In fact, the ravine below Pinehurst Road, which is extremely steep, was searched early on, but the search teams could not cover more than a small fraction of the hillsides and had to limit themselves to areas within between 50 and 200 feet from the road. Also, there are no parking places at all on this extremely narrow road as it sharply descends and twists. Hence it was very unlikely someone would try to park by the side of the road and then transport a body into the surrounding thickets and hillsides.

But there are plenty of other areas in the adjacent parks which are less steep, are accessible by road, and where one could park.

Ken then turned to Google Earth for further views of the region from the air. He spent over 20 hours scrutinizing many sites in the Bay Area, particularly those near water, since there was quite a bit of data about water, rivers and the like in the sessions. Water or a river was said to be very near the site. The Bay Area is quite large, has a long internal coastline, and is fed by one major river. Also there are small lakes, ponds and reservoirs spaced across the dry California landscape. Some of the references were likely to the Bay itself, but was that all there was to the water data?

With the large amount of session data already gathered (not all of which has been presented here), many locations in the Bay Area – and outside it -- remained possibilities.
Since Ken lived in the Bay Area he was able to visit a few of the more likely ones, looking particularly at lines on the ground visible from the air. He also kept in mind that there would likely be woods/trees in the vicinity, hills, and water. At least two kinds of structure had been mentioned (Palomar/Chabot and a smaller structure) so he kept an eye out for these as well.

One databit of note was that Daz had indicated the closest manmade structure over 150 feet tall and within 5 miles was a tall square tower. The Sather Tower, more often called "the Campanile," is such a structure. It is on the Berkeley campus of the University of California, just 5 miles from the Palmer/Reiser house on Exeter Drive.

Here is Daz’s drawing of this structure, with the caption:  
*Sketch target location and nearest manmade structure over 150’ high in relation and slightly below ground level*

This was a very clear match and provided RV evidence that Nina Reiser or her remains were likely to be found within 5 miles of the Campanile. Given the other session data, it was less likely the site would be due west or due south of the Campanile. East, SE and NE were better possibilities. The Palmer/Reiser house is slightly southeast of the Campanile.

The question then became, Can we pinpoint the specific location? The authorities had been unable to do so, although several searches had been conducted with scores of volunteers and dozens of policemen and firemen. The area to search was huge, just in the Oakland Hills.

In addition, as the Oakland police released information on Reiser, it became known that in the weeks before he was arrested, he had driven out to the Delta northeast of the Bay Area,
and had gone as far as Truckee near Lake Tahoe, and then on up to Reno, Nevada, 180 miles away. He had also been stopped by a policeman for a traffic violation in the west bay, in the opposite direction, on the San Francisco side. The policeman remembered that Reiser seemed nervous but nothing (otherwise) suspicious. By traveling to all these areas, Reiser had considerably widened the scope of any search for Nina Reiser, at least any in which he was the prime suspect.

Using remote viewing to find a specific geographical location is quite difficult. Finding what is at the scene or place is one thing. Finding the exact location on a map is something else. It has reportedly been done by remote viewers at times, although published evidence is scanty. Aurora had also not attempted to develop this particular skill, due to its inherent difficulty and other priorities we had.

**Fourth Tasking: Kromach**

In March 2007, with no substantive evidentiary developments in the case, Ken decided to attempt to obtain more information about the location by tasking viewers as follows. An explicit instruction was given regarding the location.

Tag: Kromach

"Instruction: Do detailed drawings from 500 feet above and 100 feet above the objective as well as at ground level, water level or other surface level within 500 feet and 50 feet of the objective and looking directly toward where the objective is. That is, kindly do 4 drawings, 2 from above, 2 from in front."

The objective was the current (March 2007) location of Nina Reiser or her remains. Since it was possible Nina was alive and had traveled or that she was dead and her remains had been moved, it was important to specify the date.

Three viewers did sessions on this target. There was again a considerable mix of data, with water being prominent or mentioned in all three.

Daz mentioned that an *L-shaped structure is close or important to your target. This I feel is close to a road.* In ongoing Google searches, Ken looked for L-shaped structures close to a road, along with lines on the ground that would lead to the location.

Ken again used Google Earth and other imaging software to inspect the many sites in the Bay Area that might fit the data. However, after extensive searching, no single location emerged as a likely candidate.

At this point, Ken decided to see if another methodology – dowsing – could be of assistance. Dowsing (using rods or pendulums to find water and other materials or objects) has a long and venerable history – it has been used effectively over the centuries to find water, for example. Ken was especially impressed by Stephan Schwartz's *The Secret Vaults of Time,*
which detailed the use of dowsing and other psi modalities to explore archeological sites. You dig where the dowser says, and it is either there or it isn’t. Often, it was.

Ken got in touch with members of the dowsing community in the Bay Area and one particular dowser in the Northwest was highly recommended. In April, 2007 Ken got in touch with this gentleman and hired him to find Nina Reiser’s location.

Unlike the situation in remote viewing, the dowser preferred to know all about the case. After being informed about what was known to that point, the dowser pinpointed specific geographical coordinates with his dowsing rods, then refined that to two sites close by each other – he felt her body was in two locations. The location was Antioch, about 23 miles from Exeter Drive in Oakland. Antioch is a small city in the Delta region northeast of the Bay Area. As it turns out, Hans Reiser had in fact been out that way to Manteca, 50 miles east of Oakland, where he had looked into renting storage space. Antioch is also along a route he might have taken to drive to Truckee and Reno. Antioch is 32 miles from Manteca, where Reiser was known to have been, and was thus a reasonable candidate for the location of Nina Reiser.

The sites the dowser chose were places where one could easily bury a body. One was a small fenced-off government wetlands, with only a low gate at its entrance. A sign indicated the wetlands were off limits to the public, but it would be easy to park in the small gravel area in front of the gate, climb over the 3-foot barrier and carry or otherwise transport a body into the wetlands. (Nina weighed only 114 pounds.) There were no homes in the area and it was not well-lit. There were two large industrial plants adjacent to the wetlands, and some of the RV data fit quite nicely with these plants and with the idea of a burial site near within a watery area. There was brush and some trees, but very low hills, and those were in the distance.

**A Bizarre Development**

In April 2007 those following the case were stunned by what a man named Sean Sturgeon had to say. He was a long-time friend of Hans Reiser and had in fact been best man at Hans and Nina’s wedding. He was unusual even for Berkeley – as best man he had come to the wedding in drag. After Hans Reiser and Nina separated, and Hans was spending a lot of time in Russia, Sean Sturgeon and Nina had an affair. They broke up after a while, allegedly in part because Nina wasn’t into S&M as Sean was. They had remained friends, however. Then, shocking everyone, Sturgeon announced that he was a serial killer, and had in fact killed 8 people – but, he said, *not Nina Reiser!* *Never!* This seemed like very good news for Hans Reiser’s defense. But Sean said that with regard to this case, he, Sean Sturgeon, was just a "red herring". That got a laugh in this otherwise grim affair. The District Attorney’s office, which was now handling the case, was unimpressed with Surgeon’s confession and little was ever said about it. The authorities kept their focus on Hans Reiser. (To this day, Sean Sturgeon has not been charged with any murder.)
Offering Our Data to the Authorities

As noted earlier, the Oakland police, through the Find Nina Reiser Committee, had sought tips and information from the public that might help with their investigation. Having conducted several remote viewing sessions and obtained considerable data indicating Nina Reiser was likely dead and that Hans Reiser was the likely murderer, and with a good possible location of the body, it was time to see if the authorities would be interested in receiving information from such an unorthodox source. Some police departments are known to work with remote viewers, while others will not.

How to approach the District Attorney’s office and present the information, then? Ken had an acquaintance who leads a team which has extensive experience providing police with information about missing persons. In fact, some members of the team are retired policemen. The acquaintance noted that it is best if the authorities contact you. This is true and easy to say if you have achieved a position where the police know of your work and seek you out. Next best, the acquaintance suggested, was to find someone who had the ear of the D.A. and would vouch for you.

With that in mind, Ken approached two prominent members of the Committee to Find Nina Reiser and asked if they would be willing to read the report that had been written and, if they found it worthwhile, suggest to the D.A.’s office that they take a look at it. The two Committee members were initially quite cool about the idea and did not seem interested in this suggestion. Over time, however, as the weeks went by these members and others on the Committee began to feel more needed to be done. No further searches had been made. There was very little publicity about the case to bring in additional information from the public. The case seemed stalled. With that background, the committee members began to take a different attitude toward our work.

It was during this time that Ken called the Detective in charge of the case and asked if he would be willing to look at the report that had been prepared. His response was: "Make me a believer." With this encouragement, the report was passed on to the Detective.

Meanwhile in the summer of 2007 one further large-scale search of the Oakland Hills and "other areas" was in fact undertaken. It was described as "exhaustive". But no trace of Nina Reiser was found. It was not made public whether areas as far away as Antioch were searched.

Meanwhile Hans Reiser remained incarcerated, as the wooden wheels of the law lumbered slowly toward a trial date.

In August 2007, the Find Nina Reiser Committee members were contacted by a local TV station with a request to do an interview on Nina’s disappearance. The Committee members did not want publicity for themselves, only about the case, and so they got in touch with Ken and asked if Aurora would be willing to do the interview. Ken contacted others in the
Aurora group and we discussed the situation. On the positive side, we were being asked to help in the serious matter of a missing person; it could be an opportunity for remote viewing to be presented to a broad audience; we felt we had some very good data and a good possible location. On the negative side, we hadn't worked with the dowser before and were not sure whether the location in Antioch was the correct one. Also, the Oakland authorities would likely not take kindly to such media publicity. On balance, though, it was decided to do the interview, given the overall circumstances and the request by the Committee. Lapis, one of the main viewers on this project, flew up from Southern California and on August 29, the local CBS affiliate sent a reporter and cameraman to Ken’s house in Oakland for the interview.

Ken and Lapis thought the reporter might stay 15 to 20 minutes. Ken had placed about 20 books on remote viewing on the dining room table and the reporter found these of great interest. He seemed genuinely curious about the topic and stayed for an hour and a half as we discussed the case. So as not to interfere with the police investigation, we did not reveal the specific location the dowser had arrived at and which some of our data supported. It would not do to have the media and the public going out and trampling on a possible crime scene. (For the same reason we did not go out and dig ourselves, as several friends had suggested!) We did mention that our suspect location was not in the Oakland hills, but 35 minutes away by car, in Antioch. The reporter was disappointed we wouldn’t give the exact location but said he understood. He informed us we would hear when and if the interview would be broadcast. It was up to the producer.

The rest of the summer went by, and then September and October as well. We heard nothing from the Detective about our report, despite a couple of inquiries Ken made, nor did we hear whether CBS was going to broadcast the interview. We did learn that CBS’ 48 Hours crew was working on a documentary on the Reiser case. The local interview was never broadcast as far as we know. An hour-long documentary on the case was broadcast by CBS in 2008.

The Trial of Hans Reiser and the Surprising Aftermath

Finally, on November 6, 2007, a jury of 12 jurors and 4 alternates had been selected and the trial of Hans Reiser began, with lengthy opening statements by Alameda County District Attorney Paul Hora and Defense Counsel William Dubois. The trial lasted five and one-half months – grueling for the 12 jurors and alternates -- and was well-attended by the public and covered in detail by the media. With no body, Prosecutor Paul Hora wanted to take his time, make the case as convincing as he could, cross every T and dot every i. And he did. (For detailed accounts please see the resource list at the end of this piece.)

On April 7, 2008. Reiser concluded 10 days of testimony on the stand. He had insisted on testifying in his own defense, against the wishes of his attorney, and by all accounts he had done himself no good. It was rumored the jury came to dislike him -- some seemed to laugh
covertly or smile at his meandering comments and far-fetched explanations -- for example, Why had he removed the front seat of his CRX? To be able to sleep better in the car, he asserted. When sleeping, he needed to have his feet elevated due to an ankle injury, want to see the scars? All the while, too, Reiser had sparred with Judge Goodman, D.A. Hora, and his own attorney. Defense Attorney Dubois seemed to despair of his own client – his lack of any social skills including in the courtroom, his lengthy often unresponsive answers, his refusal to abide by customary courtroom demeanor and behavior such as constantly whispering into Dubois' ear while Dubois was trying to follow the remarks of a witness or the prosecutor. Goodman warned Reiser several times that the Court was not going to tolerate any more of his behavior. Reiser was reported to have a photographic memory but his answers did not bear this out. During the course of the trial Reiser went from being described as a "genius" who had invented an admired and widely used Linux file system, Linux to being considered mentally incompetent by his own attorney.

Perhaps desperate, toward the end of the trial, Defense Attorney Dubois offered the "explanation" that Hans Reiser is indeed odd -- very odd, really – but, it doesn't mean he killed his wife. Dubois said he is like a platypus, an odd mammal that lays eggs, has a duckbill and a beaver tail, and was thought to be a bogus creature when first described. Reiser too is odd, but harmless, really, Dubois intoned.

Ever-sharp D.A. Hora had a comeback for that one. He informed the jury that the platypus, far from being benign, is one of the very few poisonous mammals. It has a spur on its hindfoot which can deliver venom to its adversary.

On April 28, 2008 after three days of deliberation, the jury convicted Hans Reiser of murder in the first degree, based only on the (considerable) circumstantial evidence. There was still no body and Reiser had maintained his innocence throughout. It is unusual but not unprecedented in California for a person to be tried for murder in the absence of a body, an eyewitness or other certainty the alleged victim was no longer alive. In the United States, the jury must be unanimous for conviction. Even with no body, the vote was 12-0.

As the verdict was read, Reiser mumbled only: "I've been the best father I know how." Prosecutor Hora took that lame response as a clear indication the jury had been right to convict -- and of course that the District Attorney's office had been right to prosecute.

That is where the case stood for a couple of months while a date for sentencing was set. During this time, a rumor circulated that the District Attorney's office was negotiating a deal with Reiser and his attorneys: if Reiser would produce Nina Reiser's body, he would get a lesser sentence.

In fact, to the consternation of some, that is what happened when on July 7, 2008 Hans Reiser, handcuffed to his attorney, led authorities down a steep ravine to the hole where he
had buried the body. In a few hours TV helicopters circled overhead as the crime scene was forensically examined.

At a press conference, the prosecution told the public it had agreed to the deal because that would bring much needed closure to the family and friends and would end all speculation about whether Reiser had in fact done it. It would mean, among other things, there would be no false sightings of Nina in Russia (where the defense had repeatedly alleged that she had fled).

As of this writing (late July 2008), the deal has not been finalized and sentencing has not occurred. Judge Goodman expressed doubt that Reiser would fully live up to his part of the deal, which includes telling authorities in detail how he committed the murder and giving up the right to appeal his conviction.

D.A. Hora said that the deal includes reduction of the first degree murder conviction to that of second degree murder. The difference is 25 years to life (first degree) vs. 15 years to life (second degree). Some in the blogosphere were upset by this deal, including at least one member of the jury. However, D.A. Hora pointed out that convicted murderers rarely are released under either the 25 or 15 year conviction and that the family (Nina's mother and relatives in Russia) fully supported the deal.

**Where in fact had Nina Reiser been buried?**

After the authorities had finished their forensic examination of the site and surroundings, public access was once again possible and Ken was able to hike along the trail and down the ravine and take pictures. First, a Google image of the entire region:
Below is a Google Earth close up of the nearby roads, the trail, and a marker where the hole/grave is located beneath the foliage, just above Pinehurst Road (which was mentioned earlier).

Note the woods (which include pine trees), the hilly terrain, the nearby roads (Pinehurst is the one on the extreme left), the "park-like setting", and "lines on the ground" (recall the data cited on pages 17 and 26).
It turns out Nina Reiser had been buried less than one-half mile from the house where she was last seen. Her body was not in Antioch but in the Oakland Hills, which is where most of the searches had been conducted.

In retrospect, we had considerable accurate data, as has been detailed above: about the location and about its surroundings – within 5 miles of the Campanile, within 1 mile of the Chabot Center, on the edge of a city, a hilly area, park-like place, woods, pine trees, nearby curving road, near a path or trail, buried in a hole, etc. We also had some other data, especially about industrial plants and nearby water, which seemed to corroborate the dowser’s location in Antioch; however, this proved not to be the case.

Here are some additional photos of the location. Below is the spot on the 8200 block of Skyline Blvd. where Reiser most likely parked his CRX before transporting Nina Reiser’s body into the park. (Compare Daz’s sketch on page 13 of a curving road, and tall trees.)
Another photo (taken by Ken) of the same entrance to the park. There are no houses opposite this point on Skyline Blvd, so Reiser could have entered the park undetected here.

After walking 200 feet or so, you come to the hill below. The path part-way up the hill goes off to the left to a narrow dirt trail.
The 50-foot descent from the trail. The path has been cleared and is much steeper than it appears in this photo.

Police said they would never have found the actual spot if Reiser had not led them to it. Even when they were very close, Reiser had to direct their attention to the pit. Searchers had not come near the site because it was about 50 feet off the trail, hidden on the side of a steep hill with lots of underbrush, and there was a lot of poison oak in the vicinity (recall Reiser’s heavy clothes when washing down his driveway). It would have taken several searchers walking in parallel along the steep slope through the underbrush and covering several miles of such terrain, to have had a chance to discover the spot.

Below is a photo of the hole where Nina Reiser's body was buried. It measured about 4' x 4' x 6'. Police have cleared a lot of brush from the area and also much dirt that was in the pit.
Here is Daz’s sketch of the pit done blind many months before Reiser led police to the site:

(The caption reads: Close to a road. Hole, rocky, dusty, bushes and Trench like leading to hole.) This is among the best renderings you are likely to find in an RV session. It appears there was an existing hole which Reiser used and dug more deeply into. He had buried Nina head down about 3 to 4 feet below the surface and wrapped in layers of material (which is precisely how viewer Lapis had described the body).
Other RV data suggesting that a knife was used has not been able to be verified. Daz and Lapis both indicated the neck area as where an injury was inflicted. Rumor has it that Reiser told police he had choked Nina to death. The story of how Reiser carried out the murder has not been made public, if he has in fact told the authorities.

At the end of this long sad case, it turns out that young Rory Reiser had had it right: He said he saw his dad carrying a large sack-like object out of the house and reported: "Hans hides Nina."
CONCLUSION

This two-year tragedy has now come to a close. Nina's body has been found and the family and friends can have closure regarding what happened to this engaging young woman on September 3, 2006. An arrogant, unrepentant Hans Reiser has been convicted of the crime and likely will spend the rest of his life in jail.

As another indication of his mindset: he blithely took his two young children out for a walk in those same hills "to look for deer" – the day after he had killed their mother, dragged her into the woods and stuffed her into a hole on the side of a ravine.

As to our work on this case - with all the accurate data we had, how was it that we were unable to come up with the exact location – given the way the case unfolded, the single most important piece of information we could have provided?

As we have shown in this report, the Aurora team developed a large amount of data congruent with the location -- from the surrounding region, to the salient landmarks nearby, to what was in the immediate vicinity, down to the specific spot – that there was a hole, it was near a path, near a road, on the edge of town, wooded area, in a park, etc.

However, as we have mentioned, finding a specific geographical location with remote viewing is extremely difficult. As noted above, the police reported that even when they were in the immediate vicinity, they would not have been able to pinpoint the site without Reiser being there to show them. It was in their opinion a "clever place" to hide a body. In short, getting this vital piece of information was an extremely difficult task which no one was able to accomplish, searchers, police or our RV team. We did not of course know in 2006, going in, that finding the location would be so difficult. Also, as described, we had sought the assistance of an accomplished and highly recommended dowser to get coordinates. Unfortunately in this instance the dowser's location was not accurate.

We were able to arrive at correct conclusions about vital aspects of the case and included these in our report to the authorities -- that Nina Reiser was dead and that Hans Reiser was the likely murderer, and that he did not have an accomplice. We had a great deal of data supporting these conclusions, as well as the above region and site data.

Part of the difficulty for the analyst was that, as we have noted, in remote viewing there is a mix of data which is accurate and that which is diverting. That happened in our work on this case, and the analyst must sort through the data to ascertain where the truth lies. We have omitted much of the unrelated data since it turned out not to be relevant. On the other hand, plenty of the accurate data was repeated and begged to be recognized, making the analytic task easier.
To wrap up:

To those who are unfamiliar with remote viewing – we hope our work on this case has offered sufficient evidence to conclude: "Wow, remote viewing is real!"

An excellent web site to see further examples of remote viewing sessions is tenthousandroads: http://www.dojopsi.info/forum/

In fact, this is the only place on the entire web where there is a large sampling of remote viewing sessions on display. To our knowledge, there is, unfortunately, no current website nor published monograph where you can find a detailed report of an extensive project like the one we have presented above.

To whose who are immersed in the field of remote viewing as we are, we hope this report to the community, as it were, has proven of interest and will be of value. We hope others in the field will post examples of their practice and real world work (the latter carefully selected and sanitized as needed of course to allay client privacy and confidentiality concerns).

The field has developed far too long with very little display of what has been accomplished behind the scenes. An outsider or newcomer has excellent grounds for shouting: "Where's the beef??" Much is claimed in this field, some of it outrageous, but little is shown. If remote viewing is to advance and make headway with the mainstream public, publishing the results of practical work such as we have done here needs to become the norm, not the exception. Remote viewing has been repeatedly demonstrated in the lab – scientists need to start paying attention! Demonstrations of the practical use of remote viewing can help bring its accomplishments and limitations, and its immense promise, into the public eye and eventually the mainstream of society.
Resources on the History and Practice of Remote Viewing

TenThousandRoads (TKR), a comprehensive RV portal: http://www.dojopsi.info/forum/

Most of the following authors have web sites about remote viewing:

Leonard (Lyn) Buchanan, *The Seventh Sense: The Secrets Of Remote Viewing As Told By A "Psychic Spy" For The U.S. Military*


Stephan A. Schwartz, *Opening to the Infinite: The Art and Science of Nonlocal Awareness*

Paul H. Smith, *Reading the Enemy’s Mind: Inside Star Gate -- America's Psychic Espionage Program*


Russell Targ, Ph.D. and Harold Puthoff, Ph.D., *Mind Reach*

Russell Targ, Ph.D. and Jane Katra, Ph.D., *Miracles of Mind*

Courtney Brown, Ph.D., *Remote Viewing: The Science and Theory of Nonphysical Perception*


Jim Schnabel, *Remote Viewers: The Secret History of America's Psychic Spies*

Dean Radin, Ph.D., *The Conscious Universe: The Scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena*

Aurora Remote Viewing Group web sites:

The Aurora Group: [http://www.the-aurora-group.com](http://www.the-aurora-group.com)


Media Accounts of the Hans Reiser Trial

The very thorough blog of Henry K. Lee of the San Francisco Chronicle:

http://www.sfchroniclemarketplace.com/cgi-bin/blogs/localnews/category?blogid=37&cat=1428

*Wired* magazine articles:


A local lawyer, Jay Gaskill, offered insightful analysis at:

http://jaygaskill.com/blog1/2008/05/

CBS's *48 Hours* did an hour-long special and may do another, given the developments since their first show.