

## **PINNEO'S 1975 RESEARCH INTO TECHNOLOGICAL THOUGHT READING**

Pinneo's feasibility study is one of several primary scientific sources which the American biologist and Christians Against Mental Slavery member John McMurtrey references in two of his papers published on the CAMS website.

The Pinneo research alone is sufficient to refute dogmatic but ill-informed assertions often made, even three decades or so after Pinneo's the research was conducted, that it remains impossible even today, and will remain impossible for the foreseeable future, for one person to ascertain what another person is thinking, by analysing biological data, such as the EEG readings which Pinneo used.

From July 2004, it has been possible to access online, in Word format, the results of scanning a printed copy of Pinneo's unclassified work, obtained from the government of the United States of America (but only if you know what to ask for).

### TITLE AND DETAILS

#### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR DESIGN OF A BIOCYBERNETIC COMMUNICATION SYSTEM**

Published August 1975  
Written by Dr L R Pinneo and Mr D J Hall  
Commissioned by: US Department of Defense

149 pages (in print - 147 online), covering three years of research, at the Stanford Research Institute

Published nowadays by: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service (NTIS)

NTIS document reference: **ADA017405**

### KEY EXCERPTS FROM THE OPENING PAGES OF THE STUDY

Page 1, second paragraph of the summary:

**The research was predicated on existing evidence that verbal ideas or thoughts are subvocally represented in the muscles of the vocal apparatus. If the patterns of this muscle activity are at all similar to those involved in normal overt speech, a reasonable assumption is that electrical activity of the brain during verbal thinking may be similar to that during overt speech.**

Page3, second paragraph, numbered (5):

**It was determined that, if all the sources of error could be eliminated, significant gains in correct word classification using biological responses would be achieved (perhaps approaching 90% or better).**

Page 3, penultimate paragraph:

**EEG responses for covert speech mimicked those of overt speech for the same subject, electrode and spoken word. When sources of error were reduced as much as possible, correct computer classification rates ranged from 52 to 72%, which was significant at  $p < 0.001$ . We conclude that both overt and covert speech can be identified by computer classification of electrophysiological responses and that a practical biocybernetic communication system is feasible, provided that sources of error can be removed.**