
Survival Top Forty Evidence Scoring System

A Project of ÆCES

The Association for Evaluation and Communication of Evidence for Survival

We do not do research. We do not assume the role of scientists or investigators. We apply set criteria to the work of scientists and investigators in an attempt to objectively determine which cases are the most convincing and then inform the general public of our results.

Contents

ESS Defined	2
Purpose	2
Coverage Limits and Exclusions	2
Scoring	3
Ranking Principles	3
Meaning of Low Scores	5
Definitions of Terms	5
Determining the Scores	6
CS Calculator (Certainty of Discarnate Source)	
Qualifications	7
Types	8
Physical Occurrences	9
Dreams, Visions, Apparitions	11
Handwriting	14
Mediums, Possession, ITC	15
Recall of Other Lives	19
WR Calculator (Witness Reliability)	22
IC Table (Information/Event Complexity)	26
Request for Comments	27

ESS Defined

This is a system for objectively determining what cases provide the most convincing evidence for Survival of the human personality after the demise of the physical body.

Purpose

There are thousands of cases on record that have been cited by one expert or another as being good evidence for the existence of an afterlife, that is for “Survival” (with a capital S). Up until now, there has been significant disagreement as to which cases make the very best evidence. Although we recognize that the inherent differences among people will always ensure a wide range of personal preferences, we think that a consistent, coherent, and objective system for ranking these cases will enable a clearer and more concerted educational effort. The more agreement that researchers and communicators can demonstrate, the more efficient their work and the more effective their message.

Coverage Exclusions

To minimize damage to the list in the most unlikely – but possible – event that credible doubt is cast on the veracity of a source, no more than three cases from the same source may be part of the Top 40 at any given time.

Any case that has an indication of improper influence, tampering, or fraud is rejected and not considered under this system.

OBEs (Out-of-Body, or Other-Body, Experiences) are limited to people who continue to live. While certainly suggestive of a spirit world, they are not good evidence of what happens after the body dies and, thus, are not considered herein.

This system does not cover arguments for Survival based on deductions from observations of human behavior. For instance the origin of musical genius in children or the origin of unexplained experiential referents in the blind or deaf. Furthermore there are certain characteristics that automatically remove a case from consideration, no matter how strong it may be otherwise. These six disqualifying characteristics are:

(1) **Hard To Comprehend.** If readers have to puzzle out a case, they will assume that they are missing something, and assume that that “something” is the explanation, rather than contact with spirits. This is why the cross-correspondences will never make good evidence for any but the most erudite.

(2) **Hints of Deception.** Any association with magic or illusion will seriously undermine confidence in the evidence, no matter how deserving of confidence that evidence might be. This is one reason why physical mediumship will never convince an unbeliever. Not even when filmed with six cameras in broad daylight. After all, if David Copperfield can do it . . . ?

Nothing is more closely associated with deception than darkness. One is justified in being reticent to accept any effect that requires turning out the lights. There are hundreds of cases of poltergeist and similar activity in which solid objects levitate, fly around in controlled patterns, appear, and disappear in lighted rooms and outdoors in the daytime. Furthermore, there are mediums, such as Sophia Williams (see case 16) and Elizabeth Blake (case 30), whose direct voices have managed quite well in normal room light.

Those physical mediums who will not even allow filming with infrared or other passive systems are asking to be approached with the utmost incredulity.

(3) **Outrageous Personages.** Skeptics often denigrate reincarnation by asserting (falsely) that most people recall lives of famous people. Although it is certainly possible that Napoleon or Lincoln may be born again, any case in which someone claimed such a

provenance should be automatically rejected. Likewise, cases wherein famous people speak through mediums — although they may be true — are so outlandish that they are useless as evidence. Moreover, these cases are worse than useless, because they provide the skeptics with such easy targets for derision.

(4) **Offensive or Disgusting.** Few people can retain open, objective attitudes in the face of goopy stuff oozing from ears or rods extending from abdomens. If one's audience is grossed out, they'll never be convinced.

(5) **Political or Social Agendas.** Cases that seem to promote causes or try to change the behavior of the listener will always be viewed with suspicion. Blatant attempts to gain followers are, of course, the most distrusted; but moral, ethical, and even environmental discourses can also raise suspicions and detract from the evidential value of an incident.

(6) **Alien Suspects.** If there is any evidence or testimony suggesting that the incident was the result of the use of super-advanced technology — whether extra-terrestrial, extra-dimensional, or otherwise alien — then the case is outside the scope of the ESS and should not be ranked; nor will it be considered for the Survival Top Forty.

Scoring

Cases that seem legitimate are assigned three numbers, according to the value assigned under three parameters (see below). The resulting scores may be presented separately (*i.e.*, 144-70-6) or as a total of the first two parameters with the third parameter appended (*i.e.*, $144 + 70 = 214 + 6 = 214.6$).

The first parameter (CS) is the certainty of the source being discarnate. That is, how likely are possible alternatives that might explain the information being communicated or the occurrence of the incident. The less likely the alternatives, the higher the CS rating. This is the main scale and can be used alone.

The second parameter (WR) indicates the reliability of the witness or reporter who provided the details of the case. Having a separate score allows evaluators to see if there are any correlations between who is telling the stories and how evidential are the tales. It also provides a means to distinguish rank between cases with equal CS scores.

The complexity of the information received (IC) is the third parameter. It could be argued that complexity is irrelevant — that a single simple statement makes just as strong a case as do many arcane revelations. This is the “white crow” — “it only takes one” — approach. To facilitate evaluating complexity factors separately, or ignoring them altogether, they are considered in a separate table and not added in to form a total. Rather, the IC score is appended and provides another means to distinguish rank between otherwise equal cases.

For WR, the highest possible value is 100. IC is ranked from 0 to 9, but as tenths. The CS parameter, being most critical, is weighted heavier (up to a maximum of 200).

Ranking Principles

The evidential value for most cases depends on the existence and probability of alternative sources for the information imparted or alternative causes for the incidents. No case is considered if a prosaic explanation is apparent or reasonably suspected. Therefore, the possible alternatives involve degrees of paranormal powers varying from receiving the projected thoughts of an involved individual to tapping directly into an omniscient cosmic consciousness to causing solid objects to dematerialize.

To better understand this concept, imagine that a young man goes to see a medium whom he has never met before. The medium goes into a trance and gives the man various bits of information. If we were to rank those facts according to the difficulty of psychically acquiring the information (without input from the spirit world), our list might look like this:

- The name of a departed friend from whom the sitter hoped to hear. (Reading an involved person's thoughts.)
- The name of the departed friend's fiancé, whom the sitter was not thinking about. (Reading an involved person's conscious mind.)
- The name of the departed friend's first dog, which the sitter had once known but cannot now recall. (Reading an involved person's unconscious mind.)
- That the departed friend had a brother who died in infancy; a fact the sitter had never known. (Reading the mind of an uninvolved person, *e.g.* a still living relative of the sitter's friend.)
- Where the departed friend had hidden some money; a fact that no one else but the friend knew. (Pulling information from a cosmic data bank.)
- That the departed friend's grave marker had been damaged by lightning the day before; a fact that was never known to any person while living. (No alternative explanation known.)

It should be pointed out here that the act of mental telepathy is, in and of itself, strong evidence for the existence of a non-physical plane of consciousness, and thus is indirect evidence of Survival. The problem with telepathy is not in the transmission or the reception but in the tuning. It isn't so difficult to accept that we can mentally send and receive thoughts; it is virtually impossible to imagine how a mind, acting alone, could sort through all the billions of thoughts that are being sent out at any given moment and read only the sought for message. Without some structure, all any mind could ever receive is the 'white noise' created by the intermingling of the thoughts of every being in the universe. This argues strongly for the existence of some sort of universal mind or discarnate communications system that routes and delivers mental images according to our intention or desire. Such a system couldn't be limited to our own minds; it would have to exist in a mental plane independent of the physical.

The same is true for other non-local mental powers such as remote-viewing. Some have conjectured that remote-viewing could account for obtaining information that does not reside in a living mind, but this is most unlikely. Successful remote-viewing procedures require that a target be consciously selected and then carefully concentrated on. If a skilled practitioner were given the coordinates of a particular grave, he might be able to 'view' it and report back as to whether the headstone appeared to have been struck by lightning. But even then, the ability to wend one's mental way through the vastness of the universe to a specific spot demands the existence of some sort of map and navigation system. So, we're right back to the requirement for a cosmic consciousness.

Without being given a specific target, there is simply no way that a medium's mind, operating solo, could first sense that something had been struck by lightning, then identify what it was and who it belonged to, and then discover its placement. Such a feat could only be achieved with the guidance of someone who already knew the location and had observed the damage (presumably, the spirit of the person whose body was buried in that grave).

In addition to cases involving the communication of information, there are some very convincing cases that simply involve some unusual or inexplicable occurrence that, of itself, indicates the presence of a departed spirit. In a manner similar to the "information cases", these are rated according to how difficult it might be to reproduce the effect by mental powers alone. Thus, a radio turning on "by itself" is considered less evidential than a tape cassette disappearing in front of one's eyes, because it is intuitively easier to affect electrical systems by "mind power" than it is to alter the basic structure/existence of materials. Nevertheless, the analyst must remember that we have no solid

evidence that spirits residing in physical bodies somehow gain marvelous powers upon leaving those bodies. We must always ask, therefore, why the effect could not have been caused by the unconscious mind of a living person.

Then there are the instances when the image of a departed person (a ghost or apparition) is observed. If the observer was familiar with the appearance of the deceased, then a memory-based hallucination might be the cause, and the case will not be convincing. If the observer had never seen the person (or a picture of the person) yet is able to describe the person in sufficient detail for others to recognize the person, then we have a strong case for Survival. The case becomes even stronger if the apparition appears at a time and place of significance, such as the deathbed of a spouse. Such a well-timed visitation indicates both awareness and volition on the spirit's part.

Meaning of Low Scores

A low score for a particular case does not mean that it is false or dubious in any way. (As indicated above, if there is reason to suspect deception, then the case would not be considered for scoring.) Nor is a low-scoring case deemed without value or merit to believers. A low score simply indicates that the case does not make a very effective argument when trying to convince an uninformed or dubious public of the existence of life after death.

Definitions of Terms used in the ESS

An **apparition** differs from a vision in that it seems to be manifested in the same locale as the percipient.

A **current event** can be confirmed to have happened at the same time as the perception of it.

Current information is on-going or sufficiently recent that it can be investigated without recourse to historical records.

Information refers to the evidential and confirmable information received or perceived by the percipient. "Confirmable" information consists of descriptions of things, events, or situations that can be verified as existing or occurring. This verification may be achieved in either one of two ways: by direct observation and/or by supporting testimony.

If a supposed spirit tells you that a bar of gold is buried amidst the roots of a certain oak tree, and you dig there and do discover the shining ingot, you have confirmed the information by direct observation. On the other hand, if a discarnate informs you that the streets of heaven are paved with gold, direct observation is not an option, at least not as long as you remain among the living. Nevertheless, fairly reliable confirmation, or denial, is possible by comparing that statement with descriptions of heaven given by other souls. The greater the consensus among many different witnesses, the stronger the confirmation.

Heavenly environments are not the only scenes that cannot be directly observed. Hypnotic regressions to unrecorded lives and progressions to future lives are likewise dependent for substantiation upon corroborating testimony rather than direct observation.

An **interviewer** is a reporter who was not involved in the incident being reported, but who learns about it via communication from one or more persons who were involved.

An **involved person** is any percipient or witness to the event. At a seance or reading, this would include the medium (whether conscious or entranced), the sitter(s), and any others present in the immediate vicinity. Exception: persons being read are not considered “involved” if they are not in the presence of the medium and there is no contact or identification made to associate the person(s) and the medium.

Links are associations – via family, friends, occupation, or other personal history – that might reasonably be followed by an investigator of the case.

An **OBE** (Other-Body or Out-of-Body Experience) is an incident in which a person experiences a current event as if he/she was physically present at a distant location. (Such experiences may be labeled astral travel, remote viewing, or clairvoyance.)

The **percipient** is the direct receiver of the information or the focus of the occurrence. If a sitter receives information through a medium, the medium is the percipient, the sitter is a witness. If three people simultaneously see a ghost, each of the three is a percipient. But, those using a talking board or planchette are considered witnesses not percipients.

The **reporter** is any identified person or persons who writes about, publishes, broadcasts, posts, or otherwise disseminates the particulars of a case. This could be the percipient, a witness, or an interviewer. For a case to be evaluated via the ESS, the reporter must be identified sufficiently to be (or have been) contacted; no pseudonyms, no anonymous submissions.

A **vision** differs from an apparition in that it is accompanied by a feeling or understanding that it is occurring at a different place than the percipient is located.

A **witness** is any person who was in a position to observe the percipient during the manifestation, séance, regression, or other incident. Both operators using a talking board are considered witnesses, not percipients.

Determining the Scores

The Certainty of Discarnate Source (CS) and Witness Reliability (WR) scores are derived by following a path through a collection of questions, each of which can be answered either “yes” or “no,” the answer determining the next question to be answered and the number of points (if any) to be deducted from the base score. These “decision trees” provide an objective and replicable means of assigning a numeric score to each parameter.

If the answer to a question is “yes,” go to the next (occupied) cell below the current one, if the answer is “no,” go to the cell to the right of the current one.

ESS - CS Calculator

Base = 200

(Query Subcategory Indicators: c=confidence, k=akashic, p=personality, t=telepathy, v=clairvoyance)

Q Section: Qualify for ESS		
Q1. Is the case and the reporter of the case free of unanswered allegations of fraud, sloppy research, or misrepresentation?	Reject	
Q2. Are the incidents and their significance easily described and comprehended?	Reject	
Q3. Did the event occur in sufficient light for clear observation?	Reject	
Q4. Does the case involve physical phenomena of the sort commonly associated with illusionists or magicians?	Q5. Does the case purportedly involve the apparent spirits of famous personalities?	-> Q6
Reject	Reject	
Q6. Does the case involve actions or materials that the average person would find offensive or disgusting?	Q7. Does the case involve actions or situations commonly associated with UFOs or alien technology?	->Q8
Reject	Reject	
Q8. Are any involved persons apparently promoting a political or social agenda other than psychic/spiritual awareness?	Q9. At the time the case was first related, was the reporter sufficiently identified to be traceable by other researchers?	Reject
Reject	->Q10	
Q10. Was the reporter in a position to initiate direct contact with an involved party?	Reject	
->T1		

T Section: Determine Type of Case		
T1. Is the evidentiary nature of the case based on information recalled from one or more past lives and later confirmed?	T2. Is the evidentiary nature of the case based on information received via a vision, dream, or apparition and later confirmed?	->T3.
->R1	->D1	
T3. Is the evidentiary nature of the case based on the replication of the handwriting of a deceased person?	T4. Is the evidentiary nature of the case based on information received via a medium, talking board, possession, or ITC and later confirmed?	->T5
->A1	->M0	
T5. Is the evidentiary nature of the case based on a physical occurrence or activity?	Reject as un-rated type	
->H1		

A Section: Physical occurrences indicating a spirit presence		
A1. Was the incident inexplicable in terms of generally accepted principles of cause and effect?	A2. Did the event involve activities or occurrences of such rarity as to justify surprise or consternation among the observers?	Reject
	-10 →A3	
A3. Was the timing or location of the event clearly linked to the supposed spirit?	-12 →A4	
A16. How many separate occurrences of the event took place simultaneously? single event →A4 2 occurrences -4 →A13 3 or more →A13		
A4. Did the event involve the observed appearance or disappearance of a physical object?	A5. Did the event involve the unobserved but apparent appearance or disappearance of a physical object?	→A6
→A13	-10 →A13	
A6. Did the event involve the permeability of a solid object (e.g., items apparently moving through walls)?	A7. Did the event involve the violation of gravity or inertia (e.g. flying items)?	→A8
-13 →A13	-16 →A13	
A8. Did the event involve the activity of an inanimate chemical system or process?	A9. Did the event involve the operation of an electrical or magnetic device or system?	→A10
-18 →A13	-20 →A13	

A10. Did the event involve an unexplained movement or vibration of an object or surface? (This would include raps and bangs that have no intelligible pattern.)	—>A11	
-21 —>A13		
A11. Did the event involve an apparent outside influence on the behavior of a biological organism?	Unknown go to A5–A11 list	
A12. Does the organism have a central nervous system?	-25 —>A13	
-23 —>A13		
A13. Was the event reasonably interpreted as the fulfillment of an agreement or promise made between two or more persons prior to one of their deaths?	-12 —>S1	
A14. Was the event observed by anyone who was unaware of the agreement or promise?	-7 —>S1	
A15. Was the event observed by anyone who was aware of the agreement or promise?	—>S1	
-10 —>S1		

D Section: Evidence based on information received from or about an apparent spirit via a dream, vision, or apparition		
D1. Is there evidence that the percipient was ever aware of the entirety of the evidential information or had reason to be aware of it subconsciously?	D2. Was the entirety of the evidential information ever known to any person or group of persons who ever lived? (This includes the predeceased spirit.)	->D17 (skip k, t, & written v)
Reject	->D3	
D3(k1). Does the apparent spirit seem to show dedication and/or persistence in initiating and/or pursuing communication?	D4(k2). Is the information accompanied by expressions of emotions (anger, worry, exaltation, etc.)?	-12 ->D5
-8 ->D5	-10 ->D5	
D5(t1). Was the apparition or vision perceived by more than one person?	D6(t2). Was the entirety of the evidential information known to any person or group of persons living at the time of the incident? This includes images of people and scenes or locations seen by anyone. (That is, could it all have been gained by mind-reading?)	->D10 (skip to v)
-4 ->D21 (skip remaining t, v, & p)	->D7	
D7(t4). Was all of the evidential information known by a single person or could it reasonably be expected to exist in the subconscious of a single person living at time of event?	D8(t5). Were all parts of the information either known or could reasonably have been known subconsciously within the collective minds of three or fewer people living at time of event?	-4 ->D19 (4 or more minds)
-12 ->D9	-8 ->D9	

D9(t6). Is there a known or probable link between the mind(s) that knew the information and the percipient?	->D19	
-10 ->D19		
D10(v1). Did all of the evidential information consist of descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of one or more locations, documents or artifacts? (That is, could it all have been obtained via clairvoyance?)	D11(v2). Did the evidential information exist in some combination of thoughts and descriptions of locations, documents, or artifacts?(That is, could it all have been obtained via a combination of mind-reading and clairvoyance?)	->D20
->D12	-6 ->D19	
D12(v3). Did all of the evidential information exist in mass-produced public articles, books, or other documents?	D13(v4). Did all of the evidential information exist in a single written, pictorial, or otherwise archived form (book, letter, municipal record, tombstone, etc)?	->D14
-30 ->D19	-12 ->D18	
D14(v6). Was all of the evidential information spread across two or more written, pictorial, or otherwise archived forms (books, letters, municipal records, tombstones, etc)?	D15(v7). Did the evidential information contain descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of one or more artifacts?	-2 ->D17
-4 ->D19	D16(v8). Were three or more specific parameters (e.g. color, shape, size, location, etc.) specified accurately?	-7 ->D17
	-4 ->D19	

D17(). Did the evidential information contain accurate descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of an otherwise unobserved location?	Unrecognized	
D18. Was more than one location described?	-6 ->D18	
-3 ->D19		
D19(v4). Is there a known or probable link (other than the deceased) between the sources used to confirm the information and the percipient?	D20(p1). Does the apparent spirit show personal characteristics recognizable by those who knew the source prior to death but unknown to the percipient?	-4 ->D21
-10 ->D20	->D21	
D21(c1). Does the information contradict either the accepted view or the thinking of persons known to the percipient?	-2 ->S1	
->S1		

H Section: Evidence based on the replication of the handwriting of a deceased person		
H1. Has the medium ever had the opportunity to study the deceased's handwriting [script]?	H2. Has any person other than the medium stated that the sample has a strong resemblance to that of the person whose deceased spirit is claiming to communicate?	Reject
Reject	H3. Has an expert certified by the American Board of Forensic Document Examiners (or a similar group in other countries) stated that the script is indistinguishable from script produced by the pre-deceased?	-15 ->H4
	->H5	
H4. Have more than one person stated that the sample has a strong resemblance to that of the person whose deceased spirit is claiming to communicate?	-17 ->H5	
H5. Is the script written in a language unfamiliar to the medium?	-13 ->H7	
H6. Is the script written in two or more languages unfamiliar to the medium?	-6 ->H7	
H7. Does the script sample(s) contain more than 100 words?	H8. Does the script sample(s) contain more than 10 words?	-18 ->H9
->H9	-7 ->H9	
H9. Does the structure of the incident minimize opportunity for mis-perception and misinterpretation? (That is, the potential for outside factors to unknowingly affect the results.)	-10 ->S1	
->S1		

M Section: Information received from an apparent spirit via a medium, talking board, possession, or ITC		
M0. Is there evidence that the percipient was ever aware of the entirety of the evidential information or had reason to be aware of it subconsciously?	M1(k1). Was the entirety of the evidential information ever known to any person or group of persons who ever lived? (This includes the predeceased apparent spirit.)	->M2
Reject	->M28	
M2(k2). Does the information contain sequential instructions that demonstrate the source's ability to intelligently respond to changing status or position of the percipient?	->M 13 (skip k & t)	
->M23 (skip k,t, & v)		
M28. Do the events include a conversation via a medium with an apparent spirit in a language that the medium does not speak?	M3(k3). Does the apparent spirit react to changes in the percipient's surroundings? [conditions, not conversations]	->M4
	-5 ->M6	
M29. Does anyone aware of the confirming evidence speak this language?	->M23	
->M15		
M4(k4). Does the apparent spirit seem to show dedication and/or persistence in initiating and/or pursuing communication?	M5(k5). Is the information accompanied by personality expressions (anger, worry, reticence, exaltation, etc.) appropriate to the deceased source?	-12 ->M6
-8 ->M6	-10 ->M6	

M6(t1). Was the entirety of the evidential information known to any person or group of persons living at the time of the incident? (That is, could it all have been obtained via mind reading?)	->M13 (skip t)	
M7(t2). Was all of the evidential information present in the conscious thoughts of a single involved person?	M8(t3). Was all of the evidential information previously known by a single involved person or could it reasonably be expected to exist in the subconscious of an involved person?	-M9
-60 ->M25	-25 ->M25	
M9(t4). Was all of the evidential information ever known by a single non-involved person living at time of event?	M10(t5). Were all parts of the information consciously known collectively to several people who are linked to each other by association or family ties?	->M11
-15 ->M12	-10 ->M23	
M11(t6). Were all parts of the information known, or could they reasonably have been known, within the collective minds of three or fewer people living at time of event?	-2 ->M23 (info in four or more minds – go to p)	
-5 ->M23	M12(t7). Was there a link between the mind(s) that held the information and any involved person?	->M25
	-10 ->M23	

M13(v1). Did all of the evidential information consist of descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of one or more locations, documents or artifacts? (That is, could it all have been obtained via clairvoyance?)	M14(v2). Did the evidential information exist in some combination of thoughts of living persons and descriptions of locations? (That is, could it all have been obtained using a combination of mind-reading and clairvoyance?)	->M23 (go to p)
->M16	M15(v3). Is there a known or probable link between the sources used to confirm the information and any involved person?	-5 ->M23
	-11 ->M23	
M16(v4). Did all of the evidential information exist in mass-produced public articles, books, or other documents?	M17(v5). Did all of the evidential information exist in a single written, pictorial, or otherwise archived form (book, letter, municipal record, tombstone, etc)?	->M18
-30 ->M23	-12 ->M22	
M18(v6). Was all of the evidential information spread across two or more written, pictorial, or otherwise archived forms (books, letters, municipal records, tombstones, etc)?	M19(v7). Did all of the evidential information consist of descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of one or more artifacts?	-2 ->M20
-4 ->M22	-7 ->M22	
M20(v8). Did all of the evidential information consist of descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of a single, otherwise unobserved location?	->M21	
-10 ->M22		

M21(v9). Did all of the evidential information consist of descriptions of the current arrangement or characteristics of two or more geographically separate locations?	M22(v10). Is there a known or likely link between the location/document and any involved person?	-6 ->M23
-4 ->M22	-10 ->M23	
M23(p1). Are the personality traits of the deceased important to the case?	-4 ->M25	
M24(p2). Does the apparent spirit demonstrate personality traits or characteristics recognizable by those who knew the deceased prior to death?	-8 ->M25	
M25(c1). Was the event so tightly controlled and/or closely and extensively observed as to ensure no conceivable possibility of influence by outside factors?	-4 ->M26	
M26(c2). Does the information contradict either the accepted cultural view or the consensus of the involved persons?	-2 ->S1	
->S1		

<p>R Section: Evidence based on recollections of one or more past lives. These cases involve a person or persons (subject[s]) reliving – either spontaneously or with assistance – scenes or experiences from another lifetime.</p>		
R1. Is there evidence that the subject was ever aware of the entirety of the evidential information or had reason to be aware of it subconsciously?	R2. When first recalled, did any of the information seem at odds with accepted history?	-4 ->R4
Reject	R3. Did new research confirm the accuracy of the recall?	-15 ->R4
	R4. Did multiple subjects detail the same scene or experience from separate points of view?	-12 ->R8
	R5. Did three or more subjects detail the same scene or experience from separate points of view?	-4 ->R6
	->R6	
R6. Had these subjects been in a position to share the evidentiary information prior to their regression?	R7. Was confirmation also based on information uncovered by research?	-8 ->R15
-10 ->R7	->R13	
R8. Did the subject recall more than one past life?	-5 ->R10	
R9. Were three or more past lives recalled by the same subject?	-3 ->R10	
R10. Did all of the evidential information exist in mass-produced public articles, books, or other documents?	R11. Did all of the evidential information exist in <u>a single</u> written, pictorial, or otherwise archived form (book, letter, municipal record, tombstone, etc)?	->R12
-30 ->14	-8 ->14	

R12. Was all of the evidential information spread across two or more written, pictorial, or otherwise archived forms (books, letters, municipal records, tombstones, etc)?	R13. Did any of the evidential information consist of descriptions of the arrangement or characteristics of one or more yet-to-be-observed locations or artifacts?	-2 ->R14
-4 ->14	R14. Is there any known or reasonably presumed link between any involved person and the records or locations used to confirm the evidential information?	->R15
	-9 ->R15	
R15. During recall, did the subject(s) feel or demonstrate human personality traits (angry, compassionate, curious, envious, exultant, fearful, humorous, nervous, petulant, sarcastic, shy, skeptical, worried, etc.)?	-15 ->R16	
R16. During recall, did the subject(s) comprehend and intelligently respond to questions?	-20 ->R17	
R17. Did the subject(s) seem to experience being different ages of the same person during their regression(s)?	-2 ->R20	
R18. Were the characteristics portrayed consistent with the purported age and situation of the subject(s) in their past life?	-10 ->R20	
R20. Was the regression done for a therapeutic purpose	-3 ->R22	
R21. Did the regression have a therapeutic effect?	-10 ->R22	

R22. Was the event so tightly controlled and/or closely and extensively observed as to ensure no conceivable possibility of influence by outside factors?	-6 ->S1	
->S1		

ESS - WR Calculator

Base = 100

W1. Was the case a result of a recall of another lifetime?	->W2	
->W28		
W2. Was the case a result of a well-designed, controlled, and implemented laboratory experiment(s)?	->W3	
->W21		
W3. Was the case a result of a field test(s) set up and carried out by researchers?	W24. Was the case a result of sessions with two or more mediums who, unknown to one another, provided identical or complementary evidence?	->W0
-4 ->W5	W25. Were different sitters involved during the separate sessions?	-7 ->W5
	-5 ->W10	
W0. Was the case a result of a session(s) witnessed by a researcher known to the research community?	->W99	
-6 ->W5		
W99. Was the case a result of a session of automatic writing done solo by a medium known to the research community?	->W26	
-8 ->W5		
W26. Was the case a result of an apparition, vision, or dream?	W27. Was the case a result of a physical occurrence or activity?	-10 ->W4

-5 ->W4	-5 ->W4	W4. How many persons total either experienced the incident(s) (were percipients) or were involved in the incident(s) (were witnesses)? 1 -10 ->W5 2 -5 ->W5 3-4 -2 ->W5 5+ ->W5
W5. How many persons total reported the incident(s) originally? 1 -3 ->W6 2 -5 ->W10 3+ ->W10		
W6. At the time the report was made, was the reporter a globally or nationally recognized public figure with a reputation for veracity?	W7. At the time the report was made, was the reporter a doctor, police officer, priest, mayor, or other person with an elevated standing in the community?	->W8
-2 ->W10	-3 ->W10	
W8. At the time the report was made, was the reporter a researcher or investigator known to the paranormal community?	W9. At the time the report was made, was the reporter a published author of one or more non-fiction works other than the one in which the case is reported?	-12 ->W10
-6 ->W10	-9 ->W10	
W10. Was one or more of the reporters a witness to the incident(s)?	->W11	
->W21		

W11. At the time of the incident was one or more of the percipients or witnesses a globally or nationally recognized public figure with a reputation for veracity?	W12. At the time of the incident was one or more of the percipients or witnesses a doctor, police officer, priest, mayor, or other person with an elevated standing in the community?	->W13
->W21	-3 ->W21	
W13. At the time of the incident was one or more of the percipients or witnesses a researcher or investigator with an unblemished reputation within the paranormal community?	W14. At the time of the incident was one or more of the percipients or witnesses a published author of one or more non-fiction works?	-12 ->W21
-6 ->W21	-8 ->W21	
W28. Was the case originally reported by the subject who was regressed?	->W15	
W29. Was the subject a globally or nationally recognized public figure with a reputation for veracity?	W30. Was the subject a doctor, police officer, priest, mayor, or other person with an elevated standing in the community?	-10 ->W18
->W18	-5 ->W18	
W15. At the time of the incident was the reporter a trained and certified hypnotherapist?	-10 ->W18	
W18. Are videotapes of the relevant sessions available for public viewing?	->W19	
->W23		
W19. Are audio recording of the relevant sessions available for public hearing?	->W20	

-4 ->W23		
W20. Are transcripts of the relevant sessions available for public reading?	-13 ->W23	
-9 ->W23		
W21. Are there publicly available video or audio recordings that lend support to the case?	->W22	
->W23		
W22. Are there publicly viewable documents (not including the original account) or photographs that lend support to the case?	-8 ->W23	
-5 ->W23		
W23. After initial publication, did others report on further investigations of the incident(s) or confirmations?	-6 ->WRS1	
->WRS1		

#	Information/Event Complexity	Value
1	A single name, relationship, or element. [“There’s a ‘Joe’ here.” “They’re showing me a boat.”]	0.1
2	Two or three NDE elements.	0.2
3	A single warning or instruction that turns out to be important. [“Stop!” “left”]	0.3
4	Four or more NDE elements.	0.4
5	A single instruction to reach an unchanging goal [“Turn onto Vine Street.”]	0.4
6	A single scene, activity, or event. [A car crashing. Someone blowing out birthday candles.]	0.5
7	Observation of event(s) involving a single action/effect (that may or may not be repeated)	0.5
8	A series of two or more steps to reach an unchanging goal.	0.5
9	One or two precise statements or awareness of conditions or events. [John died of leukemia. The insurance policy is in the buffet drawer. Ruth was reading a letter by a window.]	0.6
10	The image of a single discarnate.	0.6
11	The image of multiple discarnates.	0.7
12	Three or more precise statements of awareness of conditions or events.	0.7
13	A series of two or more steps to reach a changing goal [tracking a moving object]	0.7
14	Observation of event(s) involving several discrete actions/effects (that may or may not be repeated)	0.7
15	Several pieces of information are received, either in the conversational style of the discarnate personality, or confirmed personality characteristics of the contact are described by the medium. (The style itself is information.)	0.8
16	A series of steps demonstrating a rare and difficult mental skill [chess master, medical diagnostician]	0.8
17	A vision/dream of an unfamiliar scene having details sufficient to enable recognition by another person.	0.6
18	Performance of skill unique to deceased	0.8
A bonus value of 0.1 point may be added for exceptional quantity, technicality, or conditions. Thus, the maximum score for information complexity is “0.9.”		

Comments Encouraged

The ESS is a work in progress. Comments, especially from scientifically trained minds, are most welcome. [Send to m-media@comcast.net]